

THE SENTINEL.

AND NEW BRUNSWICK GENERAL ADVERTISER.

VOL. III.

FREDERICTON, SATURDAY, AUGUST 8, 1840.

N. 1

THE SENTINEL.

IS PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING
By Edmund Ward.

Office.—Phoenix or Tank House—Frederickton.
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
will be inserted
The Debates in the Legislative Council and
House of Assembly.

TERMS.—15s. per annum, exclusive of Postage.
Half in advance.

No Paper will be discontinued at the request
of a Subscriber until all arrears are paid.

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

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.
CENTRAL BANK OF NEW BRUNSWICK.—W
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, be-
fore two o'clock on Mondays and Thursdays. Di-
rector next week, C. P. WETMORE.

COMMERCIAL BANK OF NEW BRUNSWICK.—
Frederickton Branch. Archd. Scott, Esq. Cashier.
Discount days, Wednesdays and Saturdays. Hours
of business from 10 to 3. Notes or Bills for dis-
count are to be left at the Bank, enclosed to the
Cashier before three o'clock on Saturdays and Wed-
nesdays.

BANK OF BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.—Frede-
rickton 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 pre-
ceding the Discount Days. Director next week, S.
BARKER, Esq.

SAVINGS' BANK. Trustee for next week, M.
NEEDHAM, Esq.

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

ALMS HOUSE AND WORK HOUSE.—Commis-
sioner, till Thursday next, W. J. BEDELL, Esq.

CENTRAL CRIMINAL COURT.

Oxford—Courvoisier—Gould.—The sessions
commenced at the Justice Hall, Old Bailey, at
ten this morning. The Recorder was absent on
account of indisposition, but the Lord Mayor,
the Common Sergeant, the Sheriff, Under-Sher-
iffs, &c. were in attendance, and the Court
was much crowded with apparently anxious
spectators. The grand jury were sworn, and
the Common Sergeant said, "There were two
or three cases of a very serious and important
character, upon which he might properly ad-
dress a few observations to the grand jury.
The first, and the most important case, was that
of a charge against a person named Edward Ox-
ford of having attempted to shoot Her Majesty.
The offence would not be of the ordinary char-
acter of offences of that description, but would
amount to high treason. There was also a
charge of murder against a person named Cour-
voisier of a very extraordinary character. Up-
on looking over the depositions, it would certainly
appear from certain facts that a very strong
case of suspicion had been made out that the
murder must have been committed by some per-
son upon the premises. It would appear that
all the marks of blood were upon the inside of
the doors, and it also appeared that a pair of
gloves with blood upon them, belonging to the
accused person, had been found; but, at the
same time, it was due to him to state, that they
were not found until a week had elapsed from
the time of the murder being committed. It
would be for the grand jury to weigh and ex-
amine minutely into all the circumstances of the
case, and see whether they considered it was
not a proper one to be sent for investigation be-
fore a petty jury, where all the matters con-
nected with it would undergo the most rigid and
searching inquiry.

The next serious charge was that against a
person named Gould for committing burglary.
That charge rested chiefly upon circumstantial
evidence, but there was in addition a statement
alleged to have been made by the prisoner to the
officer who apprehended him. With respect to
that statement, however, it appeared doubtful
whether it was not made under some promise
or hope of advantage to be derived by the pris-
oner thereby, and therefore, whether it could
be legally received in evidence." The grand
jury were then dismissed to their duties, and
some petty cases having been disposed of, the
Court adjourned.

THURSDAY, JUNE 18.
MURDER OF LORD W. RUSSELL.

Trial of Courvoisier.

During the night of Wednesday such efforts
had been made to secure accommodation for the
great number of applicants, that the Court had
completely changed its appearance in the morn-
ing. It was soon crowded, but access and egress
was secured, so that order was strictly pre-
served. The whole of the arrangements were
under the superintendence of Mr. Under-Sheriff
France, who was in attendance at eight o'clock.
Among the company were the Earls of Cavan
and Sheffield, Lord and Lady A. Lennox, the
Hon. Mr. Villiers, Lady G. Somerset, and Sir
W. Montague. The ladies were very nume-
rous; and just before ten o'clock His Royal High-
ness the Duke of Sussex entered the Court and
sat with the Judges—Lord Chief Justice Tindal,
Mr. Justice Littledale, and Mr. Baron Parke.
Francis Benjamin Courvoisier was placed at
the Bar; he looked pale, and appeared agitated
and confounded at the assembly before him.
Mr. Clark the clerk of the arraigns, read the in-
dictment, and then asked—"Are you guilty or
not guilty of this murder?" Courvoisier replied
—"I am not guilty, Sir." And to the next
question, answered—"I am content to be tried
by an English Jury." He did not challenge any
of the jury.

Mr. Adolphus, for the prosecution, reminded
the jury of the many violent deaths that had oc-
curred to individuals of the house of Russell,
remarking that this murder of a venerable no-
bleman, in his own house, was the most horri-
ble of all. He was seventy-three, in good

health, but weak, and lived in a small house
with a quiet family. The model of his resi-
dence was on the table. The two female ser-
vants were of unexceptionable reputation, and
the character of the prisoner, up to the imputa-
tion of this act, was unblemished. He had been
five weeks in the service of his master on the
5th day of May. On that day his Lordship rose
well, spent the morning out, and returned at 5
o'clock, dined, took his coffee, and retired at his
usual hour to that bed from which he rose no
more. The prisoner had forgotten to order the
carriage to Brook's as directed, and he spoke of
his omission to the servants; afterwards he gave
them beer, which made them feel sleepy. Sa-
rah Mancell came down at six in the morning
of the 6th, and found the warming-pan at his
Lordship's door, as if the valet had left it there
instead of going down stairs with it as usual,
and retired to bed immediately after his Lordship.
Seeing things lying about and the street-door
unbolted, she alarmed her bed fellow, the cook,
and then called the valet. The prisoner came
down more quietly than usual, and his first act
was to remove the warming-pan to its proper
place. There had clearly been no burglary, al-
though pains had been taken to give the appear-
ance of a burglary. The prisoner's manner was
suspicious when the murder was discovered;
still more so in pointing to the broken door in
the kitchen as the probable entry of the murder-
ers. It was clear that no one had entered from
the leads or tiles, or by the area: even a cat's
foot would have left its imprint on the dust, and
there was no trace of man's foot there. The
marks were made inside the door, and not out-
side. The rushlight in his Lordship's room had
been extinguished early, and a wax candle was
found burned to the socket, which probably the
prisoner had used to see his way about the house.
The watch and a £10 and £5 note were found
under circumstances, and in a place that threw
great suspicion on the prisoner. The learned
counsel begged to say once for all that he did
not at all rely on anything found in the pris-
oner's box from first to last. Would a burglar
have left the £10 note, the rings, &c. in the
pantry behind the wainscot, or rather, could a
burglar have left the prisoner have laid them there?
The locket which his Lordship lost at Richmond
was found under the hearth stone in the pris-
oner's pantry, and the watch behind the lead in
the sink. The prisoner's motive for committing
this murder might not be easily fathomed, but
if he had no motive, who had? If he had not
committed this murder, who could be suspected
The evidence was circumstantial; true, it was
so. But when the chain was perfect, what evi-
dence was more convincing? The jury had a
difficult task. If they brought in an acquittal,
no one could blame them; and if they pronounced
the prisoner guilty, it would be only on the
evidence laid before them.

Sarah Mancell, the housemaid, in her evi-
dence, said that in the afternoon of the 5th,
the upholsterer's man had been employed to arrange
a bell-rope in his Lordship's room, and after fin-
ishing his job, left the house. Carr, an ac-
quaintance of the prisoner, drank tea with the
servants in the kitchen. A little before seven,
a bellhanger came to fasten the handle of his
Lordship's door. He did not remain more than
ten minutes. The warming-pan was so placed,
that no one could enter his Lordship's room
without stepping over it. The prisoner did not
answer her knock, but when she came up again
and called him, after a lapse of perhaps ten mi-
nutes, he was dressed all but his coat. She had
seen him look pry into his Lordship's prop-
erty, and had often asked him what he wanted
in so doing. On cross-examination, she said she
had always told the same story she did now.
She had never said that she saw her master
"murdered" in bed. She went into the several
rooms on the morning of the murder to open
the shutters, and not because she suspected any-
thing wrong. When she said she felt sleepy af-
ter the ale, she did not mean that the ale was
drugged. The prisoner had plenty of opportu-
nity to escape. She did not know why she said
"Let us go and see how his Lordship is," in-
stead of saying "Let us go and tell his Lordship."
She knew there was a ladder on the premises,
but she did not know that a man standing on its
upper rim, could step over the wall without leav-
ing a mark; she saw it against the wall on the
morning of the 5th. She thought that if the
marks on the kitchen door had been there be-
fore the police came, she must have noticed them;
the police fitted pokers, &c. to the door. She
did not know that Courvoisier's salary was
£45 a year, double what he had from his pre-
vious place. She never had a quarrel with the
prisoner. Her evidence, except in the points
to which we have referred, was exactly as given
at the police-office.

Mary Hanwell said that on the night of the
5th she saw Courvoisier lock, bolt, and chain
the door, and she bolted the door of the lower
yard. Mancell did not go to her, (the cook's)
knowledge leave the bed-room that night, nor
were they at all disturbed during the night.
She was going to leave the service, but had never
quarrelled with the prisoner. The ladder in the
yard was a set of steps seven feet high,
scarcely as high as the wall at the back of the
premises. The coachman and the groom came
to the house very soon after the housemaid gave
the alarm. She did not know who sent for Mr.
William Russell. Much plate was still missing.
The other points of her statement were merely
the repetition of her former evidence.

There was no new fact in the statement of W.
York, the coachman.
Emanuel Young, Mr. Latham's butler, said
that he was told by the maid Mancell "that his
Lordship was murdered." He described the
room and its appearance, and said when the pris-
oner came into the room he raised his hands,
clenched them, and fell back into an arm chair,
and appeared greatly distressed at the time.
The prisoner remained in the chair for ten mi-
nutes or a quarter of an hour, and during that
time he continually said—"What shall we do—
what shall we do?" At the end of that period,
the prisoner got up and began to examine a
dressing-case. He took out the inner part and
carried it to the fire-place, and looked closely at
it. He then came back to the place where the
dressing case was, and I saw him move some
rings. The prisoner then told me he had only
lived with his Lordship five or six weeks, and he
did not know what he should do for a character.
The prisoner told me some things were missing,
but I do not recollect what he said. I remem-
ber, however, he said that some rings and his
Lordship's watch and pin were missing.
Mr. Elsegood, the surgeon, proved that the
wound could not have been inflicted by his Lord-
ship's hand, and Mr. Nursey, the apothecary,
said Courvoisier assisted him in placing his mas-
ter's body exactly as he has been discovered.
He thought one of the carving knives might

have inflicted the wound. Selwyn, Mr. Cut-
ler's servant, and Baldwin, the police-constable
were examined without the discovery of any
new matter, and the court adjourned.

FRIDAY, JUNE 19.
The Court, which was again crowded to ex-
cess, was opened by Mr. Sergeant Arabin at 10
o'clock.

John Tedman, Inspector of Police, was ex-
amined. His evidence was the same as at the
police office, except that he now mentioned a
glass door in the entrance passage of the house,
with a casement which shut and opened; the
door was chained, but the window remained
practicable; the gate to which it led was lock-
ed. The window of the pantry was opened.
The prisoner appeared to have on a perfectly
clean shirt that morning. He then described
the finding of the gloves marked with blood,
and said there was now marks of blood on the
glass-door, which were not there on the 6th;
they were not there by his orders, or with his
knowledge.

The constable, William Rose, repeated his
former evidence, and on cross-examination
stated that he believed the hearthstone in the pan-
try had not been removed for a length of time
before the 6th. He could not positively swear
that any of the marks which now appeared,
could be made by the screw driver produced,
nor that the chisel, if it had been used against
hard wood, would present the appearance it now
did. He had said to the prisoner "these things
were found in your pantry, can you now look
me in the face?" He did not mean that to in-
timidate, but it might have the effect on a guilty
man. He expected a share of the reward if
the prisoner were convicted. If the prisoner
were acquitted, there will be no reward. Had
the things marked with blood been in the trunk
on the 6th, he must have seen them.

Mr. Christie, a carpenter, gave it as his opin-
ion that the kitchen-door had not been forced
from without. George Collier, in his cross
examination, was asked why, having searched
the prisoner's box on the 6th, he did again on the
9th, and why the box and the room had been
left so long unlooked? He did not know. The
things he found on the 9th must have been seen
on the 6th, had they been in the box. Shaw
and Cronin were then examined. Ellis repeat-
ed his evidence with these additions:—"That the
plate box is produced; the list of the plate is in-
side it." I examined the contents of the box by
my list before it was removed from the house,
and before I deposited the list in it there were
missing four table-spoons, four large forks, four
dessert spoons and two teaspoons. The greater
portion of the plate was kept by me in my bed-
room at the top of the house. The plate in use
was kept in a cup-board in the pantry.

Mr. Comyn, a pawnbroker, here produced
certain silver articles, which were shown to the
witness.

Witness—"The articles produced correspond
in number and description with the articles of
silver missing. They have the crest of Lord
W. Russell upon them, and I believe them to be
his Lordship's."

Mr. R. Harrison, clerk to Messrs. Hoare, of
Fleet-street, and Mr. Wing, solicitor to the Bar-
oness De Clifford, proved that the £10 note
now produced was given to Lord W. Russell for
purposes of charity.—Lady Sarah Russell iden-
tified the locket produced.—Harris, the up-
holsterer's man—Lovett, the bellhanger, and Dou-
bleday, the groom, proved nothing material to
the case. The cook and housemaid were recal-
led on the subject of the glass door in the pas-
sage, but remembered nothing of it.—Mr. Ellis
of the Castle Tavern, at Richmond, spoke to
Lord W. Russell's anxiety concerning his lock-
et, and its loss.—Charles Ignatius Clafenberg-
er identified the watch produced as his Lord-
ship's.

New Evidence.

Charlotte Pielaine was examined for the first
time. Her husband's name, she said, was Lou-
is. She knew the prisoner, he called her a wait-
er at her house, an hotel in Leicester-square,
for five weeks. Six weeks ago he called there,
and reminded her of his former residence with
her. He called again on a Sunday, and desired
to leave a small brown paper parcel with her
for which he said he would call on the following
Tuesday (the 6th of May.) She had not seen
him since. On Thursday morning having her
attention drawn to a paragraph in a French pa-
per suggesting that the missing property of Lord
W. Russell might probably be found in the
house of a foreigner, she opened the parcel, and
found there some forks and spoons, two pair of
new stockings, an ear-trumpet and a jacket. On
cross-examination she said they had a billiard-
table in the house which was not limited to the
use of the guests, but denied that any gang of
disorderly persons had lately been turned out
from her house, or that the police had been
there lately. She had not mentioned her suspi-
cions to her husband or his partner. She had
not the least idea that "Jean," their waiter,
was Francois Benjamin Courvoisier.

Lotis Garde said he was by when a brown pa-
per parcel was given to Madame Pielaine some
weeks ago, but did not know that the prisoner
was the man who had left it, nor that the pa-
cel now produced was the same parcel. He
was summoned on Thursday with Mr. Cumming
a solicitor, to see the parcel opened, and an in-
ventory of the contents was made out in his
presence.

Richard Cumming, a solicitor, said he was
present at the opening of the parcel, and he ad-
vised that course. He made a list of the arti-
cles it contained, and put it up again. Before
doing it, he saw the crest on the forks and
spoons, and he went to a bookseller's shop to as-
certain whose crest it was. He found it was the
crest of the Bedford family, and he went to a
magistrate and was told to come here. He
came about six o'clock, and sent a note to the
solicitor for the prosecution. He then came in
and made a communication to Mr. Wing and
Mr. Hobler. The parcel was wrapped in
brown paper. The spoons, forks, and plate
shown to Ellis were those found in the parcel.
There has been an address on the parcel. It is
nearly erased. Besides the spoons and forks,
there was an ear apparatus in the parcel. It
contained in all, four table spoons, four dessert
spoons, two silver tea spoons, four silver forks,
one leather box containing an instrument for the
ears, two pairs of white stockings, one pair of
white socks marked "C 4" one flannel jacket,
and a small quantity of tow.

W. F. Molteno proved that the envelope of
the parcel had been sent from his shop round a
print which he had forwarded to Lord W. Rus-
sell.

Henry Carr proved that he had seen the pris-
oner wear a jacket like that in the parcel, while
in Mr. Pector's service.

Eleanor Banks, the prisoner's laundress, proved
that the socks of the prisoner were marked
C. B. at the top, and these were merely C. at
the heel.—Thomas Davies proved that the in-
struments to assist hearing were supplied by
Mr. Webster, the optician to Lord W. Russell,
in June, 1836.—Ellis proved them to be the
property of his Lordship, and Sarah Mancell that
they were in the house a fortnight before the
murder.

This was the case for the prosecution, and the
Court adjourned till his day.

LONDON PRESS.

BREAD RATHER THAN WHISKEY.

But it is sad that "labour is so abundant
in this country that our legislators are contin-
ually occupied with schemes of emigration to
get rid of heaps of people for whom, it
seems, there is no work! This is a mistake.
There is plenty of work for them, and by
their work this country would have supplies
of corn much more than it is likely to want
for a hundred years to come. But, somehow
or another, the views of those who call them-
selves "improvers" do not take this direction.
They prefer "free-trade." And why? The
reason is plain enough. Free trade would
be more profitable for the capitalists who
wish to have the benefit (benefit to them-
selves) of the cheap labour of other countries.
But if the welfare and security of this coun-
try, and this people, were looked to—if the
employment and comfort of our own labour-
ers were, as it ought to be, the leading con-
sideration with those who attend to matters
of trade and domestic management—then
would we see the improvement of agriculture,
and of our waste land, steadily proceed. For
such a noble national object national taxation
ought to be cheerfully submitted to. The
nation which can vote twenty millions of mo-
ney for the emancipation of Africans from the
condition of well-fed slavery, ought
not to hesitate about giving a much larger
sum to employ the labourers at home, who
have neither employment nor food, and to
employ them to work which hereafter would
far more than repay the sums laid out. In-
dependently however, of the new sources of
increased supply of food which are within
the country, and within the national power,
the circumstances of the present time are in
favour of the supposition that more ground
will be left free for the food of the people
than hitherto there has been.

From the use of steam as a locomotive
force upon railroads, it seems but reasonable
to expect that the feeding a prodigious num-
ber of horses will be saved, and that ground
cultivated for them will be left free for the
cultivation of human food. Again, sup-
posing the habits of temperance to proceed, as
many persons fondly calculate upon, both in
England and Ireland (no one as yet seems to
have any hope of Scotland in this particular),
an immense quantity of corn, heretofore de-
voted to the production of ale and more ar-
dent spirits, will be left free for food. It is
true that, with our present knowledge of a-
griculture, we cannot make all the lands
which produce oats and barley produce
wheat; but it is equally true that both oats
and barley make very good food for human
beings, and that they who are accustomed to
such food oftentimes prefer it to the bread
made from wheat. From all these considera-
tions we look without the slightest apprehen-
sion upon the combined facts that there is an
annually increasing demand for food, and
that the policy of this country is directly ag-
ainst any habitual dependence for a supply
of food upon foreign countries.—*Morning
Post.*

THE GREAT OBJECT OF GOVERN- MENT.

THE PUBLIC HEALTH.

Quarterly Review.—Paradoxical as it may
appear, it is certain that a man's health, nay
life, is nearly as much in the keeping of
those of whom he knows nothing as in his
own. Of the three influences mainly acting
on it—himself, society, and external nature
—the first bears on it most intensely, the se-
cond most covertly; the last most constantly.
Moral culture may teach the individual so to
curb his passions and appetites as to develop
all the forces of his organization in their most
healthful scope, or its neglect may set them
loose as deadliest instruments of self-de-
struction. The social system act upon us not
only through its fashions and customs, but
by the power of government; and an ill con-
sidered impost indirectly affecting the food,
the habitation, or the clothing of the commu-
nity, shall send more to their graves than e-
ver fell by sword or spear. Climate is al-
ways so greatly ameliorated by civilisation
that we may safely say that it forms no ex-
ception to the general fact, that all the sources
enumerated as influencing life are great-
ly modifiable, so that, though we may not
believe with M. Quetelet in the perfectibility
of our race, we may yet be sure that all its
numerous ills may be immeasurably lessen-
ed. Nothing is truer than that the mortality
of a kingdom is the best gauge of its happi-
ness and prosperity. Show us a community
wallowing in vice, whether from the pam-
perings of luxury or the recklessness of pov-
erty, and we will show you that there truly
the wages of sin are death. Point out the gov-
ernment legislating only for a financial re-
turn, regardless or ignorant of the indirect
effects of their enactments, and we shall see
that the pieces of silver have been the price
of blood.

The Morning Chronicle, vomits fourth a
torrent of vituperation against Lord Stanley's
Irish Registration Bill, upon the express
ground that it exposes any attempt to obtain
or to preserve the franchise which, in the o-
pinion of the tribunals appointed to decide
such questions, shall be founded merely up-
on fraud and perjury, to the risk of being
taxed to the amount of 5l. towards the costs
of the party who, without fraud or perjury,
shall have succeeded in resisting the claim.

And in this tirade the organ of the ministry
and Mr. O'Connell altogether overlooks the
fact that the bill of Lord Stanley, subjects to
the same tax any attempt to withstand a fair
and honest claim to the franchise upon frivo-
lous or vexatious grounds. This line of ar-
gument, must appear to every conten-
tious man to be decisive of the whole ques-
tion. It is an impudent proclamation on the
part of the opponents of Lord Stanley's bill
of the sympathy with perjury and fraud, of
their desire that perjury and fraud should con-
tinue to predominate in the Irish elections o-
ver the constitutional influence of honest and
legal votes, of their consciousness that to
strip perjury and fraud of their power would
be detrimental to the great Irish borough-
monger, whose burgrave tenures they are,
and consequently fatal to the administration
which exists by his support.—*Morning Post.*

The question at issue is announced by mi-
nisters to be the first clause of the bill of Lord
Stanley; whether it shall be adopted or
thrown out. The opposition to it assumes
as justification that it disfranchises every I-
rish elector from north to south and east to
west of the island. We have shown beyond
all cavil, that if it does so, the three registra-
tion bills to which Lord Morpeth was a
party did precisely the same thing, and em-
ployed the same language for effecting it. Is
it morally possible that any members of Par-
liament can have the face to act with such
daring and flagrant inconsistency? It is
physically possible that any man, professing
common political honesty, and at the same
time asserting the rights and attributes of an
independent supporter of the ministry, can
screw up his courage to vote against such a
measure and on so degrading a pretence?—*Times.*

What is the mighty evil complained of?
A score or two, or a hundred or two, Irish-
men vote at elections more than is agreeable
to the landowners. That is the sum of the
evil. Who complains of it? Some score or
two of landlords. The Tories are kept out
of office. The political influence of the O-
range landlords is not equal to their wishes;
they petition a few fellow landlords; they
complain of perjury and fictitious votes; and
the anxiously moral—the virtuous beings
they address, cannot rest till these fictitious
votes are removed, and till the registration
be so arranged as to be completely under the
control of the landlords. To attain that end
he has wasted eight or ten days' precious
public time; and to attain it he is sacri-
ficing the character of Parliament, and
will sacrifice the peace of Ireland. The
whole proceeding is mere seamy faction
assuming the garb of patriotism.—*Sun.*

PROGRESS OF ANTI-CORN LAW OPINI- ON IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

It was emphatically denied by the Duke of
Richmond and Lord Western, in the debate
on Earl Fitzwilliam's motion, that the object
of the corn laws is either to keep up the price
of corn or to keep up rents. The denial is a
concession to the moral judgment of the pub-
lic. It allows that such an object would be
a nefarious one. People do not indignantly
disclaim the imputation of an honourable mo-
tive. Just in proportion to the strenuousness
of the noble lords' denial, do they thereby
confess that laws passed for the purpose of
keeping up rents and prices, would be an in-
decent disgrace upon the legislators by whom
they were enacted and supported. The asser-
tions of the Duke of Richmond and Lord
Western are the hypothetical confession of a
crime. They have not a word to say in
praise or in defence of laws to keep up rents
and prices. They do not pretend to contest
the culpability, they only, with becoming ur-
gency, deny the fact of any such intention;
and their urgency is not misplaced. The
purpose is at variance alike with justice, hu-
manity, and religion. It implies the grossest
abuse of the power of legislation; it is pro-
stitution of the highest functions to the basest
purposes. But the noble lords should have
looked to the consequences of their conces-
sion. They should have foreseen its rebound
upon their own arguments, and even, if they
do not forego their hostility to untaxed
bread, upon their own characters. Those
who sincerely disclaim the purpose of com-
mitting a wrong, will not sit down quietly
under the fact of having committed it unwil-
lingly. Designedly or undesignedly, the corn
laws have enhanced rents and prices. That
this result may be accepted as an excuse for
the past, but does not exonerate them as to
the future. In prices not less than 30 per
cent above those of the Continent, and in
rents from double to treble what they were
at the commencement of the French war,
the conclusion of which coincided with the
corn bill, the fact is before their eyes. They
are parties to the injustice which they pro-
fess to hold in such virtuous abhorrence.—
The consequence which they deprecate has
actually been produced. They may ask, in
their assumed simplicity, who could have
thought it? But the confession of their in-
competency as legislators still leaves them
under the moral obligations of honest men.
The only creditable mode of disavowing the
intention is to assist in correcting the opera-
tion. The vote of one absent bishop (St. A-
saph) was recorded against the motion; but
the six bishops present were equally divided
in their votes, and several are said to have
left the house before the division. Consider-
ing how much the temporalities of the church
are connected with the sinister interests of
the landed aristocracy, we take these facts
so far to have in them some encouragement.
A spiritual peer is not compelled, like a par-
ish clergyman, continually to repeat to his
God, in the face of the people, "Give us this
day our daily bread." The incongruity of
the Christian prayer with the bread tax may
not, therefore, be brought home to his con-
science in all its glaring absurdity, when he