

The blood went to my heart and head, as if I were shot when I saw that it was Dick Jackson. Was this the end of it all? In the steps of sin which my father had trod, I would rush to my death and my doom. Even where I stood I longed for a weapon to slay him. How dared he come near my Nelly? She too—I thought her faithless, and forgot how little I had ever been in outward action; how few words, and those how uncouth, I had ever spoken to her, and I hated her for a traitress. These feelings passed through me before I could see, my eyes and head were so dizzy and blind. When I looked I saw Dick Jackson holding her hand, and speaking quick and low, and thick as a man speaking in great vehemence. She seemed white and dismayed, but all at once at some word of his, (and what it was she never would tell me), she looked as though she defied a fiend, and wrenched herself out of his grasp. He caught hold of her again, and began once more the thick whisper that I loathed. I could bear it no longer, nor did I see why I should. I stepped out from behind the tree where I had been lying. When she saw me she lost her look of one strung up to desperation, and came and clung to me, and I felt like a giant in strength and might. I held her with one arm but I did not take my eyes off him, I felt as if they blazed down into his soul and scorched him up. He never spoke, but tried to look as though he defied me, at last his eyes fell before mine. I dared not speak for the old horrid oaths thronged up to my mouth, and I dreaded giving them way, and terrifying my poor trembling Nelly.

At last he made to go past me; I drew her out of the pathway. By instinct she wrapped her garments round her, as if to avoid his accidental touch; and he was stung by this I suppose—I believe—to the mad, miserable revenge he took. As my back was turned to him, in an endeavor to speak some words to Nelly that might soothe her into calmness, she, who was looking after him, like one fascinated with terror, saw him take a sharp, shal-ley stone and aim it at me. Poor darling! she clung round me as a shield, making her sweet body into a defence for mine. It hit her, and she spoke no word, kept back her cry of pain, but fell at my feet in a swoon. He—the coward!—ran off as soon as he saw what he had done. I was with Nelly alone in the green gloom of the wood. The quivering and leaf-tinted light made her look as if she were dead. I carried her, not knowing if I bore a corpse or not, to her friend's house. I did not stay to explain, but ran madly for the doctor.

(To be continued.)

Communications.

PROOFS OF PHRENOLOGY.

Being the first of two Lectures delivered by JOHN M. JENKINSON, Junr., Esq., before the Miramichi Mechanics' Institute, January 16th and 23rd, 1851.

As the science of mind, Phrenology would, I think, be established by the enumerated proofs and arguments, and the practical application, whether sustained or not, would not therefore effect its truth.

If as a theory—it accounts for all the varied talents, propensities, and feelings of man, while all other theories, the research, and metaphysical reasonings of past ages, have equally failed to account for these, would it not be presumptuous, not to say unphilosophical, to deny its truth?

If it be shown that a given succession or set of causes—not impossible to exist—but in accordance with all the known analogies and instances of nature—would produce all the varied manifestations of mind, and distinctions of character or genius—while no other causes have been assigned which could produce these, surely it is not too much to ask, that you either take this as the science of mind, or that you furnish another with equal claims.

Seven notes in music can furnish all the distinct airs or tunes, by the mere difference of arrangement and combination; if five primitive colours can produce all the varied shades; if twenty-six letters by difference of position, and in different combinations, furnish all the words in our language; and if again those words, by different arrangement, are made to convey distinct and even opposite meaning, why may not thirty five primary mental faculties, in varied combinations and of different relative power and activity, produce every shade of character which man presents to man?

But as one note, or one color, one letter or one word cannot be so modified or changed so as to give more than one sound, one shade or one meaning unless by the aid of others, so I argue that one organ of mind could only furnish one class of talent, or one form of character.

Least, however, I should not have made myself clearly understood by all, or in case argument may have failed to convince some, I shall close by producing a very few from among the host of anatomical, physiological and scientific authorities, who are now to be found on the side of Phrenology.

The celebrated Dr. Cullen, of Edinburgh, says:—

"We cannot doubt that the operations of our intellect always depend upon certain motions taking place in the Brain."

Dr. James Gregory, speaking of mental faculties, says:—

"A certain state of the brain is necessary to their proper exercise, and the brain is the primary organ of the internal powers."

"I readily concur," says Abernethy, "that

the brain of animals ought to be regarded as the organization by which perceptive principle becomes variously affected.

"First—Because in the senses of sight, hearing, &c., I see distinct organs for the production of each perception."

"Second—Because the brain is larger and more complicated in proportion as the variety of the perceptive principle is increased."

"Third—Because disease and injuries disturb and annul particular faculties and affections, without impairing others."

"Fourth—Because it seems more reasonable for me to suppose that whatever is perceptive may be variously affected by means of vital actions, transmitted through a diversity of organization, than to suppose that such variety depends upon original differences in the nature of the perceptive principle."

Lawrence, after shewing the distinction of the animal brain and that of man, says:

"In conformity with the views already explained respecting the mental part of our being, I refer the varieties of moral feeling and of capacity for knowledge and reflection, to those diversities of cerebral organization which are indicated by, and correspond to, the difference in the shape of the skull."

Dr. McNish says:

"The more closely I study nature in health and disease, the more firm are my convictions of the soundness of Phrenological doctrines."

Sir Charles Bell, in his Anatomy, 2 vol., 6 Am. Ed., by Goodman, pages 78 and 9:—

"When we compare the structure of the Brain in different animals, we find that in certain lower classes there are no convolutions, the surface of the cineritious matter is uniform; as we ascend in the scale of beings we find the extent of the cineritious matter increased. To admit of this it is convoluted, the depth of the sulci are the consequence of the extension of the cineritious mass, and in man above all other animals are the convolutions numerous and the sulci deep, and consequently the cineritious mass great, and its extension of surface far beyond that of all other creatures."

Another circumstance which points out the importance of the cineritious matter of the brain is, that every portion has a fibre of the dulatory matter which runs across and forms a commissure with the corresponding portion of the opposite side."

Unless the cineritious masses were important organs, why should there be commissures, or nerves, forming a distinct system, arising and terminating in nothing."

"I have found, at different times, all the internal parts of the brain diseased without loss of sense, but I have never seen disease general on the surfaces of the hemispheres, without derangement or oppression of the mind during the patient's life."

Dr. Neil Arnott—(Introduction to Elements of Physics, 3 Ed. 1 Vol. Page 26.):—

"An originally misshapen or deficient brain causes idiocy for life.—Childhood, maturity, dotage, which have such differences of bodily powers, have corresponding difference of mental faculty; and, as no two bodies, so no two minds, in their external manifestation, are alike. Fever, or a blow on the head will instantly change the most gifted individual into a maniac, causing the lips of virgin innocence to utter revolting obscenity, and those of pure religion to utter horrible blasphemy. And most cases of madness and eccentricity can now be traced to a peculiar state of the brain."

Sir Evered Home, and Doctor Elliotson say:

"Different parts of the brain have different offices, and the particular faculties, sentiments and propensities of each individual may be ascertained by external examination of the cranium."

Magendie writes thus:

"The dimensions of the brain are proportioned to those of the head, and the volume of the brain in direct proportion to the capacity of the mind."

Chitty's Medical Jurisprudence, page 247:

"The defective conformation of the Brain is a source of idiocy, and its disease the cause of insanity."

So also say Dr. Marshall, Blumenbach, Magendie and others.

Dr. Elliotson again says:

"If the facts collected by Gall did not convince the most sceptical, those of Vimont would overwhelm the most incredulous."

Doctor Robert Hunter, Professor of Anatomy in the Andersonian University, Glasgow, says:

"For more than thirteen years I have paid some attention to the subject, and I beg to state that the more deeply I investigate it, the more I am convinced in the truth of the science. I have examined it in connection with the anatomy of the brain, and find it beautifully to harmonize."

Dr. Gordon, of Edinburgh, undertook to denounce Gall and Spurzheim as pretenders to phrenological knowledge. But Spurzheim shortly after, in the lecture room of Dr. Gordon, under his eye, and in presence of some of the first medical men in Britain, demonstrated the soundness of his own, and the fallacy of his opponent's positions, by reference to Dr. Gordon's written attack, and the actual anatomy or rather unfolding of the human Brain.

When Le Verrier predicted the existence and position of the new planet with such accuracy that the astronomer had but to direct the telescope and discover it as and where predicted, he certainly established a claim to astronomical knowledge; and so, if Spurzheim had predicted not existence only of distinct nerves, but their distinct functions long before Sir Charles Bell established the fact by

dissection, it should be denied that he had some skill in human physiology.

Several years before the discovery of the nervous system, viz 1815, Dr. Spurzheim published the following in his Physionomical System:

"It has been observed that in pulsy voluntary motion and sense of touch are both destroyed at the same time, but that sometimes the one has ceased while the other remained. From this it has been inferred that there are two sorts of nerve. Anatomy has not yet demonstrated the but I believe them to exist for the following reasons:—The same nervous fibres do not go to the muscles and to the skin, and each of these parts has a distinct function. The nerves which are necessary to voluntary action cannot propagate the sense of touch or the latter the impressions of movement."

THE ELECTION.

"Tempora mutantur et nos mutamur cum illis." Mr. Pierce.

Sir, May it not most of the freeholders of this county will probably experience some difficulty in making up their minds, whether to congratulate themselves or not upon the result of a late election—whether to claim Mr Street as a victory, or to acknowledge it a defeat. "We change with the times" is an old saying, and a saying which rarely receives a more forcible illustration than was given at the election of last Monday. No could ever have dreamed that Mr Street, the true-blue, thorough-paced Tory—and who, if we might judge by his former avowed principles, should have been born a hundred years ago—who could imagine that he would veer round so suddenly—that he, all at once, would become a Liberal; fall in with the views of the people, and, as their general, lead them onward in the march of Reform? We were prepared for such a solecism as this? At yet, if we may judge him by his Card, any his speech on the hustings, Mr Street is a Proteus who can assume any shape—He can become all things to all men, to carry his point. What will selfish ambition not do? What will the aspirant to office not do, rather than miss the coveted object?

But, after all, is it right, is it fair, to judge Mr Street so harshly? Perhaps not. History abounds with examples of men who changed their political principles—who turned to the right about, either from the convictions of reason, or by the force of circumstances. Great men have done this—greater men than Mr Street have done this. And if he has changed his creed, ought that fact to derogate from his reputation? Ought it to sink him in the popular estimation? Perhaps not. As we grow older, we certainly ought to grow wiser. Of what use is it to add to our stock of knowledge, or to enlarge our experience, if it be not to give us clearer and broader views of the relations of things? Of what use to the mariner is all his nautical information, if he must still cleave to the same spot in the midst of the ocean? But, has Mr Street changed his political views? That is the question, and it is unsettled, unanswered. Therefore I said at the outset, the Electors and a difficulty in coming to a conclusion, whether they have triumphed or been defeated. One party stoutly contends that Mr Street has been a Tory from the beginning; and, as he told them at the hustings, that he is the "same, John Ambrose Street," the "same old coon," ergo, if he does not speak false, he is a Tory still. This party is pretty well pleased and satisfied.

On the other hand, the Liberals as strongly contend, that if the question were to be decided by twelve men on their oaths,—if the printed address and the speech, the whole speech at the hustings, and other things belonging to the *Res gestae* (as we lawyers say), were given in evidence, their verdict would be in favor of the Liberals. This party likewise seems to be pretty well satisfied. So we go. In this state of uncertainty, both parties are conquered or conquerors, as the case may be. In the meantime, Mr Street is made Attorney General; and as he has a good stomach, which is by no means squeamish, so he will not be likely to disgorge an office merely because it is a fat one. The people may call him a Tory or a Liberal. They may even taunt him with being a Radical. And what then? Like Sir John Moore in his grave,

"But little he'll reck if they'll let him (hold) on."

I am, Sir,

COKE.

22nd February, 1851.

Synopsis of a Speech, delivered by P. MITCHELL, JUNR., Esq., at the Court House, Newcastle, on Monday, the 17th February.

Gentlemen Freeholders of the County of Northumberland.—I appear before you at this time not as a Candidate for your suffrages, but at the request of several gentlemen of the Liberal, or Reform party of this County, for the purpose of eliciting from the Hon. Attorney General, who now seeks to represent you in Provincial Parliament, a more explicit and detailed statement of his views on the various questions which now agitate the public mind, or have been brought under the notice of this meeting; and I in common with many of the Freeholders of this County, do not feel satisfied with the statements which have just been made, as the card of the hon. gentleman as well as his address deals too much in generalities to be satisfactory. The Honorable Attorney General informs you that he has been appointed to that office, and that he gives you an explanation of his motives for accepting it under existing circumstances.

To me these seem very unsatisfactory and not sufficient to justify the act, more especially so as the present professions of his honor are not in keeping with his past career. We are told by the hon. gentleman that 'he is in favor of Responsible Government, and is determined to carry out its principles.' I would ask now if he can do so consistently with his present colleagues—with that Government which the hon. gentleman denounced at the election of July, last as 'politically dishonest, and rotten at the core.' To me it appears rather inconsistent in a gentleman professing to entertain liberal measures and advocating liberal principles, that he should in so short a period gain confidence in a Government which he had previously denounced, the only apparent change in which is, that while it retained the whole of its Tory composition, it has lost three liberals, and secured the talents of the honorable gentleman. I therefore ask more explicitly than has been stated, his reasons for such a change in his sentiments? The proper course of the honorable gentleman would, it appears to me, have been to have refused taking office in a government in which were so many individuals obnoxious to the country, and in whom His Honor so recently possessed 'no confidence.' Had he refused, no other person could have been found to take the office, and the present Government would have been compelled to resign and make way for better men. He says that he is an advocate of Responsible Government, and is 'determined, as leader of the Government, to carry out its principles.' One of the principles of that system is, that the country shall be governed by Party, and I would now ask the hon. gentleman to what political party the present government belong? The general opinion is that they are a Tory Government, and rather ultra in their views, and, therefore, the acceptance of office by that gentleman, while professing to entertain the sentiments of the Liberals, seem to be rather inconsistent, and not in accordance with the principles he professes. It is not party government, or if it is, it is of the wrong party!

The honorable Gentleman tells you that 'he is in favor of Responsible Government, and always has been.' In this the hon. Gentleman is I think in error; and I would ask whether he did not oppose its introduction, when an attempt was made to introduce it, during the early administration of Sir William Colebrooke, contending that we were not ripe enough for such a measure, and strenuously opposing it until 1848, at which time the pressure from without, with some assistance from Downing Street, secured the recognition of the principles, although the detail of the system, with its substantial advantages, have hitherto been refused. And though of the three Provinces of Canada, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, we were the first to whom the boon was offered, we were the last to accept it, and have thus been for the past ten years deprived of a system, the principles of which we have followed the example of those other two colonies in at least adopting.

(A gentleman present contended that they had not adopted Responsible Government in Nova Scotia.)

I contend that they have adopted it both there and in Canada, but the difference between the system in the two Provinces is this: that in Canada, when they recognized the principles of Responsible Government, they at the same time established the detail of the system, consisting of Municipal Corporations, Initiation, Departmental Government, Board of Works, together with a suitable system of Education, &c., while the carrying out of its principles fell into the hands of its advocates, the Liberals, and has proved most successful in its working.

In Nova Scotia, however, like our own Province, the principle only, was recognised, and the detail of the system (without which it is useless) was resolutely refused, while the working of the system fell into the hands of coalition governments in both these Provinces, a large majority of whose members were Tories, and opposed to the system, and consequently the hitherto partial failure of the system may be easily accounted for. I would therefore caution the Hon. Attorney General on two points in reference to this question; first, against piece-meal legislation—a practice contrary to what has been so successfully adopted in Canada—and secondly, against attempting to carry out such principles by a Government—a majority of persons known to be Tories, and therefore opposed to such measures, the evil effects of attempting a trial are apparent both in our Province and in Nova Scotia.

I am glad to find the Hon. Gentleman advocate the principle of Municipal Corporations, and the giving up of the Initiation of money votes to the Executive—but regret to find from the sentiments expressed by the Hon. Gentleman, that the former is likely only to be a partial measure, as he contends that some Counties are not ripe for it, and would not receive it as a boon, and that before it is introduced a county meeting should declare in favor of it! This is throwing a difficulty in the way of its introduction into many Counties, not because a majority of the people do not wish it, but because as few of the leading men, who now possess the control of the local affairs, and who desire to retain that power, may bring their influence to bear, and successfully oppose its introduction. There are many, too many, in these Northern Counties who are ignorant of the system, and therefore cannot now appreciate its advantages, and therefore may not (to use the words of the hon. gentleman) be 'ripe for their introduction,'—but the first thing to make them