

equestrian exercises; and, during the life of Odenathus, accompanying him in the pursuit of the lion and panther of the desert; or, dressed in a military habit, riding with him at the head of his armies. She is yet, besides, we are told, a lover of literature; has read Homer and Plato, with Longinus, a distinguished grammarian and critic, and has herself composed an epitome of history for the use of her three sons; whom also, with a view to the coming contest with Rome, she has had instructed in Latin, of which she has herself some knowledge, being an excellent linguist. Ecclesiastical writers call her a Jewess, because she encourages the building of Jewish synagogues; but her Jewish predilections may be accounted for by her descent from the Ptolomies; whose policy it had always been to appear friendly to the people of Judea. The influence of Longinus, her patronage of Paul of Samosata, and her protection of the Christian sects generally, show us that she was desirous of promoting a belief in the unity of Deity; and we may infer that her own views of religion were those of the Platonic divinity, blended with some respect for the facts and traditions of the Old Testament. Longinus, her tutor, acts also as her private secretary, and sometimes as a minister. He is a nephew of Fronto, and has been a pupil of Origen; not the Origen of Ecclesiastical history but a philosopher of the same name, of the school of Plotinus. Aurelian crosses into Asia Minor; reduces the Province of Bithynia; and after some unimportant sieges, encounters, in Syria, the forces of Zenobia; led by Zabdas, the successful general of her Egyptian conquests, and animated by the presence of the Queen in person. In two pitched battles, fought, the one near Antioch, the other in the neighbourhood of Emesa, the fortune of war favours Aurelian. Zenobia retires upon Palmyra, and Aurelian, after arranging at Antioch for the future administration of Syria in the interests of Rome, and removing from it all persons like Paul of Samosata, represented to him as dangerous, marches into the desert to attack Zenobia in the capital of her empire, and her last stronghold. This expedition is one of considerable danger: Palmyra is a city of the desert; situated in an isolated plain of palm trees, surrounded by an ocean of sand. Aurelian writes to Rome that every part of the wall of Palmyra is provided with two or three *balista*, while artificial fires are thrown from the military engines; and that it is impossible to exaggerate the extent of the preparations of Zenobia for her defence. Both parties are, however, equally distant from their resources and a long siege is at last determined by Aurelian succeeding in intercepting the supplies of Zenobia, while maintaining his own. Zenobia flies for succour, mounted on one of her swiftest dromedaries; but is pursued and overtaken. Palmyra then surrenders; and Aurelian, reserving the Queen to grace his triumph, gratifies a feeling of personal resentment against Longinus, as the author of her defiance, by ordering him for execution. Leaving Palmyra, its inhabitants rise against the garrison, and kill their newly appointed Governor; but Aurelian returns, punishes them with a general massacre; in which according to his own frank acknowledgement, women and children, old men, and an unarmed peasantry, are involved; and converts the city into a heap of ruins. Palmyra, the seat of art, civilization and commerce, never recovers from this blow; but Aurelian takes credit to himself for the permission he accords to the remnant of its population to rebuild their dwellings, and for his efforts to restore a temple of the sun; as belonging to the form of worship he most respects, his mother having been an inferior priestess of the sun, in his native country. He then turns his arms against Egypt, where the people, after a temporary submission to his generals, had attempted to regain their independence, headed by Firmus, a wealthy merchant and paper manufacturer of Alexandria, whose undisciplined forces are soon defeated, and he himself seized, tortured, and put to death.

From Mitchel's Monthly Review.

THE FOUR GEORGES.

The lectures on the four Georges must be pronounced to be neither amiable nor excusable. The lecturer certainly could not have selected a theme which would have afforded him better opportunities of proving his skill as a pessimist. There is so little sympathy now felt for any of the kings in question—unless it be some pitying kindness for the benevolent, but foolish old George III.—and all the admiration which used to be expressed for the first gentleman in Europe, has so completely given place to contempt, that any strictures upon them would be pretty sure to meet with acceptance from the audience. Without mercy, accordingly, and with the full vigour of his sarcastic humour, the lecturer lashes their vices, turns to ridicule their follies and holds up to contempt their coarse and vicious indulgences. But he goes beyond this. Almost every person, and almost everything mentioned in these lectures is mentioned with abuse. Not only is George I. ridiculed and severely handled, as a coarse and sensual profligate, but all those who received him, all his court, all aristocratic England, apparently are denounced as mean and unworthy sycophants. George II. scarcely less coarse, al-

most more wicked, succeeded him; brave as a lion, but stupid as the stupidest and unclean as the most unclean of animals. His Court is described as base and venal, with Sir Robert Walpole at its head, the man in whose eyes everybody had his price, for which he could sell his honour. The one redeeming feature of that Court was Queen Caroline, otherwise his Majesty was like pitch, which no one can touch without being defiled. Poets and divines vied in almost blasphemous expressions of adulation, being guilty of that deadliest simony by which they sought to purchase bishoprics at the price of their souls' truth. Even Charles Stuart catches the infection as far off as Derby, and does not escape without being called a 'scamp.' George III. as might be expected, escapes from measures of this kind, to which he could not be liable, and is described as generally well meaning, but stubborn and foolish. Perhaps his character is scarcely consistently portrayed, for he is said to have bribed and bullied, and darkly dissembled upon occasion, being nevertheless, perfectly honest, but, on the whole, Mr Thackeray deals with the good-natured old man in a good-natured way. But George IV receives the full measure of the lecturer's wrath. He is described as a monster, with no heart and no brains, consisting of coats and waistcoats, and he thinks them nothing, absolutely nothing. The wits and scholars who dined at his table were disgraced by their position, and the flood of depravity which took its rise at the Court, overwhelmed society in general. Now in all this there is much undoubted truth, but what are we to learn from it? Not simply that the four Georges were bad or foolish kings, for that we knew before. Those who hear these things will naturally draw their own inferences, and their inference will be that depravity and fully are almost, or quite, inseparable from kings and courts in general. Mr Thackeray has simply been asking and answering at length an old riddle; he has taken away the outside from 'Majesty' and left nothing but a 'jest'; and when he represents all courtiers as base and venal, following the example of their head, whoever, and however bad, he may be; all state parsons as truckling for bribes, and flattering for preferment, what is the conclusion which the general illogical mind would come to but this—that statesmen and churchmen are necessarily hypocrites, possessing patriotism nor religion, and, being evil to be got rid of as soon as possible? If he does mean this, let him join Mr Frost on Primrose-hill; but we imagine he hardly would wish to disseminate principles whose natural, we will not say whose logical, tendency is to involve England in a revolution as wild and impious as that which deluged France with the blood of the best and wisest which made a tyranny of anarchy, and set up infidelity as a state religion. It is to no purpose that he mentions the present Sovereign as a contrast in every way to the crowned monsters he holds up to our reprobation, because her individual excellence is, so to speak, an accident; her successor, or her successor's successor might prove—it is almost impossible that he would, but he might—as unworthy as the first of the dynasty, and if so, would English statesmen be described as base and truckling because they still held office, and consulted at the Privy Council? Would English churchmen still be branded as venal 'state parsons,' because they read the ordered prayers for the throne, and called the King 'good and gracious'? Surely Mr Thackeray must know that these things cannot be made to suit every individual character, and that 'good and gracious' may be used in virtue of his office where they may be erroneous in virtue of himself. Every clergyman is not 'reverend,' and every magistrate is not 'worshipful,' but we could not refuse to give customary titles till an inquisition had decided on the propriety of the title, in the particular instance before us. When, also, he ridicules the bowing, and 'walking backwards,' and general jubilation with which George the I. was welcomed to England, he forgets that the King was welcomed not an individual but a principle. And when he points the moral, and adorns the tale by a sneer at the 'walking backwards' before the Queen at the Crystal Palace, he forgets that if we have courts at all, we must have court etiquette; if the custom were abolished, there is nothing either degrading or ridiculous in complying with it. It was a mark not of manly independence, but of foolish obstinacy and want of taste, when, the other day, a certain Republican refused to obey the laws of etiquette at St. James's; yet the custom of requiring a certain dress as arbitrary as the other.

INCENTIVE TO READING.—Everything that passes around you, everything that you meet with in your walk, is a stimulus to read. The very roll of the tide, the fall of the leaf in Autumn, the growth of the grass in spring, the roar of the tempest, or the starry firmament, each and every one of these things is a subject in itself. Do you understand these things? Do you know their changes? If you do not, do not tell that you like a stimulus to read.—Each of them has a study in itself, and they are studies that will amuse you, that will instruct you, and that will elevate you.

Be frugal, and industrious.

[ADVERTISEMENT.]

(Copied from the Fredericton Head Quarters.)

TO THE PUBLIC.

Tyranny never flourishes more luxuriantly than when fanned by the sighs, or watered by the tears of the defenceless and the submissive; and experience teaches us that however the heart of an individual oppressor may be touched by the meekness or forbearance of his victim, a spirit of non-resistance has no effect on the tyranny of the multitude,—with them what to-day is fact, to-morrow is precedent, and he whom they oppress to-day, if he tamely submit, might be sure of the like treatment to-morrow perhaps with increased malignity. Therefore to prevent the establishment of a bad precedent, and to curb the rampancy of tyranny, it is proper that all proceedings, particularly those of Legislative bodies, in which the public interests may be concerned, should be fearlessly and faithfully exposed to public view. Public opinion is a good and wholesome court of appeal—a glorious check upon the abuse of power—its deliberate judgments have been seldom or never reversed, and they stand well out, a warning to the guilty and a protection to the innocent, in all time to come. Whenever an act of oppression happens to be committed, where might, or mere numerical brute force tramples truth and justice under foot, and being exposed and understood, receives its due reward from an indignant public,—the perpetrators will scarcely insist on that as a precedent which is known to have elicited the unequivocal expression of public condemnation. These are the general principles which have induced me to make this public appeal—to exhibit a plain statement of facts, which, although apparently only affecting myself and the constituency of the County of Gloucester, will be found to involve some of the most important interests of the whole Province.

I was returned, at the last General Election, one of the members of Assembly for the County of Gloucester, by a majority of forty-nine votes over Mr McNaughton. At the session held in July, 1856, a petition was presented on behalf of that gentleman complaining of the "Return" on the ground of an informality in the appointment of the Returning Officer. The informality was that his appointment did not happen to have been advertised in the *Royal Gazette*.—This petition was presented on Friday the 18th July. On the Wednesday following the House ordered that a committee should be struck next day, to try the merits of this petition, which was accordingly done. The committee consisted of Messrs. McAdam, Ferris, O. Perley, Smith, and Harding, with Mr Hatheway nominee for petitioner, and Mr Botsford, nominee for me. They went to work with a zeal altogether unprecedented in Legislative proceedings, and on the Saturday following a majority of them had agreed to report "that the under Sheriff who made the return was not appointed according to law, and that the return should be amended by striking out the name of William End and inserting that of Patrick McNaughton." When my counsel, Hon. J. A. Street, and myself became aware of the conclusion of the committee, and before they had reported, we offered to proceed with the scrutiny of votes, by which I could easily have shown my legal and just right to the seat, but the committee replied that they could not enter into a scrutiny, that they merely decided the preliminary fact of the return; and, as they considered that return irregular, having been made by an officer informally appointed, that they thought it unfair to keep Mr McNaughton out of the seat, pending a scrutiny of votes, which, they stated I was quite at liberty to apply for, in like manner as if the Sheriff had originally returned Mr McNaughton as duly elected—that their Report would not debar me from my right of scrutiny—the Return, and that alone being adjudicated upon by them; Mr McNaughton having in fact abandoned that part of his petition which prayed for a scrutiny of votes. This view of the case is sustained by the language of the Petition, the proceedings, and the Report,—all speaking of "Return," alone, and not of "Election and Return."—as may be seen on reference to the Journals of the July session. Those statements were repeated in the House by several members of the committee, and no member of the House supposed that it was the intention of the committee to deprive me of my right of scrutiny. If there existed at the time in the breasts of the committee (which I am inclined to think there did) a latent design to deprive me of my rights, I can only say that it was well masked, for nothing was expressed in the slightest degree calculated to excite suspicion. Not being satisfied, however, with the behaviour of some of the committee which I considered, to say the least of it as indicating that the vile element party had in some degree affected these men under oath, I confess that I was not without some apprehension of a plot, and in order that the subject should be fully understood by the House, I introduced a petition (now on file) calling the attention of the House to the Report that was in progress and praying protection. On hearing which, I may venture to say not three members (outside the committee) expected that a Report concerning the "Return," was to deprive me of my right of scrutiny. The Chairman of the Committee, Mr Harding of St. John, immediately brought in the Report. The Return was altered; Mr McNaughton and I changed places, he became sitting member, and I petitioning candidate. I at once prepared a petition, praying a scrutiny of votes; it was presented by Mr Botsford, accepted by the House without any objection, and ordered, with

others of the same nature, to stand over until the present session.

Early in this session I entered into the recognition required by law, filed it with the Speaker, and on the 26th inst. procured a Resolution to be moved to appoint a day for striking a committee on my scrutiny. But, to my utter disgust, although not greatly to my surprise, every member of that committee (except Mr Botsford,) those very persons who, in July when bringing in their Report, had disclaimed all intention of depriving me of a scrutiny of votes, and who had protested that their Report, confined as it was to the "Return" alone, had no excluding effect on my claim for a scrutiny, and who by that means induced the House to accept their Report, now turned round and spoke or voted against that right, and contended that their Report was final. The Resolution was consequently lost, the House dividing 19 to 14. Yeas.—Messrs., Gray, Wilmot, Montgomery, McPhelim, Botsford, Lewis, Dr. Earle, Des Brisay, Lawrence, Godard, Scovil, McMonagle, Boyd, Street. Nays.—Messrs. Kerr, McClellan, Gilbert, Landry, Watters, Johnson, Mitchell, Sutton, Harding, McAdam, W. E. Perley, Tapley, Ferris, Connell, C. Perley, Tibbits, Fisher, Gilmour, Hatheway.—Mr Smith of Westmorland, one of the committee, taking an active part in the debate and arguing strenuously in favour of the finality of the Report, but, although present at the decision, declining to vote or to allow his name to be recorded; shrinking from that tribunal—the public—before which I now arraign him. I shall make no reflection on the majority in this decision; I leave them to public opinion, believing that they will receive their reward. It is to be noted, however, that this nineteen, with the exception of Messrs. Landry and Kerr, are nineteen of the twenty who voted against the Government on Mr Fisher's want of confidence resolution.—Mr McNaughton making up the score. Thus Mr McNaughton has been saved by his party from a scrutiny which would have ousted him, and this is accomplished in direct violation of statements, declarations, protestations, and assurances to the contrary, as well as of the law of the land. Here is one of the blessings of Departmental Government, and here is a specimen of the kind of justice the people may to receive under the baneful and demoralizing influences of a system in which truth is a mere secondary consideration, which knows no motive but party and self interest, which generates feelings of envy, hatred, and malice, and, as it is nurtured and fed, can only exist on the grossest and most palpable corruption. Already has the Fredericton Reporter, the opposition organ, gloated over the disgraceful proceeding, and in alluding to it falsely stating that I applied for a second scrutiny, has exultingly told its readers, not that justice has been done, but that "the political supporters of the Government are left in a minority of five!" This comes from the "Liberals." Liberals forsooth; there must surely be something in a name.—When bands of ruffians crossed the Canadian border for rapine and blood, they called themselves "sympathisers." The patriots of the present hour, whose object is also plunder—political plunder—who tell us (as did the sympathisers) that "to the victors belong the spoils," who are ever ready to sink all regard for truth and justice in order to subserve the intrigues of party—call themselves "Liberals." The sympathy of the sympathisers and the liberality of the Liberals are very much of the same character—the one has found its ignominious level in the Upper Provinces—the other is in course of being understood in the Lower.

WILLIAM END.

February 29, 1857.

The Politician.

COLONIAL PRESS.

From the St. John Morning Freeman. ST. PATRICK'S DAY.

This festival was celebrated by the Irishmen of St. John in the usual manner, and although there was not here, as elsewhere, any procession or street display of any kind nowhere was the day more worthily and meetly honoured.

The celebration of these national festivals, instead of keeping the people asunder, and perpetuating jealousies and feelings that were better forgotten, can be made—if properly directed, the means of great good, inciting the people of the various races to an honorable and useful rivalry in all that is good and noble. For Irishmen the celebration of St. Patrick's day should serve, and we trust does serve, not only to keep the memory of the old land, and all its sad yet glorious history green in their souls; but also to remind them that their peculiar duty is to be faithful to the wonderful mission of their race, and to prove to the world its true nobility by themselves practising every public and private virtue. They have the world's scorn, and the world's sneers to combat, and these are far worse than the world's hate. The best mode of observing St. Patrick's day is that which will nerve their resolution to belie by their conduct all the taunts and scoffs to which they are exposed, and to vindicate the character of their race and nation.

The Catholic Irish of the city crowded the Cathedral from early morning in attendance at the several masses. At eleven o'clock, Pontifical High Mass was sung by his Lordship the Bishop, assisted by the Very Rev. Mr Sweeney, Roy, Mr Quin, as deacon; Rev. Mr Farrell, as