The Weekly Observer.

BEING A CONTINUATION OF THE STAR:
ESTABLISHED IN 1818.

Office in Hatfield's Brick Building, Market-square.

SAINT JOHN, TUESDAY, MARCH 1, 1831.

Vol. III. No. 34.

The Garland.

The Poetry of Mr. Alaric A. Watts.—"We are sure we cannot say any thing in favour of Mr Watts' Poetry, that shall more powerfully recommend it to our readers, than the insertion of these stanzas."—*Eclectic Review.*

TO THE MEMORY OF WILLIAM POWER WATTS,

(Aged three years.)

A cloud is on my heart and brow,—
The tears are in my eyes,—
And wishes fond, all idle now,
Are stifled into sighs;—
As musing on thine early doom,
Thou bud of beauty snatch'd to bloom,
So soon, 'neath milder skies!
I turn, thy painful struggle past—
From what thou art, to what thou wert?

I think of all thy 'winning ways,'
Thy frank but boisterous glee;—
Thy arch sweet smiles,—thy coy delays,—
Thy step so light and free;—
Thy sparkling glance, and hasty run,
Thy gladness when the task was done,
And gain'd thy mother's knee;
Thy gay humour'd, childish ease,
And all thy thousand arts to please?

Where are they now?—And where, oh where,
The eager fond caress?
The blooming cheek, so fresh and fair,
The lips all sought to press?
The open brow, and laughing eye,—
The heart that leap'd so joyously?
(Ay! had we lov'd them less?)
But there are thoughts can bring relief
And sweeten e'en this cup of grief.

What hast thou 'scap'd?—A thorny scene,
A wilderness of woe:
Where many a blast of anguish keen
Had taught thy tears to flow?
Perchance some wild and withering grief,
Had scar'd thy summer's earliest leaf,
In these dark bowers below!
Or, sick'ning chills of hope deferr'd,
To strife thy gentlest thoughts had stirr'd!

What hast thou 'scap'd?—Life's weltering sea,
Before the storm arose;
While yet its gliding waves were free
From aught that marred repose!
Safe from the thousand throes of pain,
Ere sin and sorrow breath'd a stain
Upon thine opening rose:
And who could calmly think of this,
Nor envy thee thy doom of bliss?

I call'd from home's beloved bowers,
To deck thy last long sleep;
The brightest-hued, most fragrant flowers
That summer's dews may steep:
The rose-bud, emblem meet, was there;
The violet-blue, and jasmine fair,
That, dropping, seem'd to weep:
And, now, I add this lowlier spell—
Sweets to the passing sweet! Farewell!

COLONIAL.

From the Quebec Mercury.

PARLIAMENT OF LOWER CANADA.

Expulsion of Mr. Christie, for the Third Time!!!——(Concluded.)

Mr. *Morin* said he only wished to consider the question as it appeared on the Journals, which were our guides. Mr. C. was concerned for a contempt of this house; and members do not seem to pay attention to what they themselves pronounced, namely that he was unworthy of the confidence of government, and unworthy of sitting in this house. A man that is declared unworthy, is not unworthy only for a day, but must be always unworthy. That this is a new Parliament makes no difference; no more than it would in a Court of Justice make any difference of a man convicted on sufficient proof, when new judges were appointed to preside; he could not bring his case forward again. As for disfranchising Gaspé—this measure is so far from taking away the elective franchise, that it is confirming the rights and privileges of all—as soon as the house is organized, it becomes seized of the rights of the electors, and seized of its own rights. The house had declared that he had invaded the privileges of the house; attempted to control the freedom of debate; and had thus attacked the existence and independence of the house; by which he tried not only to destroy the house, but to destroy the rights of all the electors. We therefore cannot keep in our bosom a man like that—we cannot readmit him, unless the resolutions for his expulsion are rescinded; and we must still declare him incapable and unworthy of sitting. Members should recollect that it was not a pardon that was required of the offender, but an absolution; a clearance. As to precedents let it be shewn that there has been a parallel case, and that members have been expelled in England, for infringing the political rights of members while sitting in the house. It has been said that the decision of one house is not that of another; but if that be admitted, all our rules would have to be re-established every Parliament. We must maintain their inviolability; as well as the moral independence of the house. I do not say that the member for Gaspé should be driven back by the Serjeant at Arms, but I say it is the duty of this house, in order to preserve the rights of all, to confirm the vote of censure before passed, which is a justice the house owes to itself.

Mr. *Bedard*, perfectly agreed with those who spoke of the importance of the matter.—It was nothing less than a question whether a subject should be deprived of his rights as a Citizen, and a county of his Representative of its choice—although he had attentively perused the evidence which concerned the member in question, with a view to satisfy himself with the proof given as to the matters of fact imputed to him, and form his judgement upon it, he was not prepared to speak to the point; but he could not help observing with surprise the extreme weakness of the arguments of those who demanded the expulsion of the hon. member. Two things ought to have been proven—first that the hon. member was guilty of the crimes whereof he was accused—and in the next place—that the house has the right of expelling him after a new election.—It was impossible that any member should vote the expulsion of Mr. Christie without being fully convinced of these two propositions; no fact however has been brought forward for discussion,—no precedent has been cited. The sole reason that had been given, was that having been already expelled—and that the resolutions of the last Assembly were binding upon this. The argument fell of itself.—There was no resolution of the house which it could not alter or revoke at pleasure. The rules of the house even were liable to alteration, and in fact were frequently altered, as well as the laws which every one knew were often amended and repealed. Besides could it be imagined for a moment that any case could possibly occur in which one man could be bound to condemn another without being assured of his guilt.—The accusation against the member in question, was that he had caused the dismissal of several magistrates for their votes in the Assembly of the Province. But how is that fact established by the evidence given on the enquiry instituted upon the subject? He considered the proof, although he had perused it with great care, exceedingly imperfect, and he never would consent to the execution of a man merely because it might have pleased all the world to say he deserved it. He considered it out of the question that any member of that house could reconcile it with his conscience and his judgement to vote Mr. Christie's expulsion, before convincing himself that the evidence taken on the enquiry, justified the accusations against him.—The proof was, he repeated, very imperfect. It was true that it had been proven and appeared that Mr. Christie in conversation with different persons, knew that several magistrates were about being left out of the Commission of the Peace, on account of their politics, or votes in the Assembly, and that he had accordingly apprised those gentlemen of the circumstance; and here it might also be proper to remark, that one of the principal witnesses against Mr. Christie, a member of that hon. house, had observed in his evidence that the conversation at which he was present on this subject was a "*badinage*,"—but admitting that in those conversations *badinage* had not been intended, something further was necessary, and they should have gone a step further into the enquiry, and have clearly proven that it was Mr. Christie himself who had advised the dismissals and for the reason alleged. The Committee which had carried on the enquiry seem to have felt this, and examined three of the Judges, as well as the Civil Secretary, in order to ascertain whether Mr. Christie, as Chairman of the Quarter Sessions, was not the person who usually recommended the appointment of the new, and the removal of the old magistrates. One of the Judges, it seems declined answering the question; the other said he knew nothing about the matter; and the third gave answers about as satisfactory as the two others. The Civil Secretary stated that the magistrates had been removed by the advice of one who had given it in writing to the Governor. Who that person was he did not say—it might have been the Civil Secretary himself, or any other. It therefore had not been proved that Mr. Christie had caused the removal of those magistrates from the Commission of the Peace. But let us go still further, and admit that the evidence is much more perfect than it really is, ought not Mr. Christie to have been permitted to have examined witnesses at the bar of the House. He requested it, assuring that he could explain his conduct. It may be said that it is not usual to make a defence before a special committee; but why not have permitted him to examine witnesses, and let them be heard at the bar of this House, and in the face of the public, as he requested permission to do? It may be said that such was not according to parliamentary usage—indeed!—there never was, he believed, any other tribunal than the inquisition, in which a man could be condemned without having leave to attempt to justify himself; and if there be any one tribunal which ought more than another to afford the accused, every possible facility in defending himself, it is this honorable House,—its honor called for it—its character for integrity demanded it. It were infinitely better that a guilty person should escape, than that one honest man out of the whole province should suspect that honorable House of persecution or of party spirit. But he would deny that parliamentary usage was such; there was a precedent to the contrary in the history even of that house, without going further for it. The same Mr. Bourdages, of whom the hon. member for the Lower Town (Mr. Lee) has spoken, was thrice expelled the Assembly, after a legal conviction of conspiracy. He was returned a fourth time, asserted that he could justify himself, and shew that he had been wrongfully condemned. It was ordered that he should be heard in his place, and that his counsel should also be heard, and a day for hearing him and his witnesses at the bar of the House was accordingly fixed. Members might satisfy themselves of the correctness of what he was stating by referring to the fourth volume of the Journals of the House, where they would find the whole of the proceedings on the subject alluded to. The motion was made by a member who is now no more,—it was by his (Mr. Bedard's) father.

But let us admit the proof of the charges against the hon. member to have been complete—let us admit that he was allowed to be heard in his justification; have we even then the right of expelling him twice? If there be a doubt on the subject, the advantage of that doubt ought to be in favor of the accused; and no advantage if it be taken against him. In respect we owe the Elective franchise of the inhabitants of the Province should induce us to make this doubt weigh in favor of the Electors of the County of Gaspé—He again called upon the mover and supporters of this measure to say whether it could be possible that we have the right to expel the hon. member for Gaspé, after this new and general Election? The hon. member for the County of Leinster, (Mr. Cuvillier) had shewn the house by the best established precedents in the several cases of Wilkes, Walpole, Wilkes and Lord Cochrane, that the British House of Commons had declared that there was no right in that body to expel a member, re-elected after an expulsion, unless some new offence were committed—But finally let us admit (said Mr. Bedard) for argument's sake, that we have the right to expel; moderation, Mr. Speaker, is a fine thing.

Mr. *Demers* enquired whether the learned gentleman who spoke last, meant to say that Mr. Christie would be deprived of his right of citizenship by being excluded from this house. He would possess those rights as much when he was outside that bar as within it. He might when outside of the bar have his Habeas Corpus, as well as inside. He may come here like other citizens, and hear our proceedings. To say so was to say that all who are not inside our bar are deprived of the rights of citizens—yet no one dare say that those respectable citizens then at the Bar were deprived of their rights of citizens.

Mr. *Duval* would not repeat a thrice told tale, but it was the duty of every man of honour to reflect long before expelling Mr. Christie. He cared but one penny whether Mr. C. sate in the house or not; we could get another individual, fully as able and industrious; but it was the principle—The very thing for which Mr. C. was condemned, namely, that he attempted to abridge the liberty of speech in this house, was now attempted to be done—we are told we have no liberty to give our opinions, as an opinion has been given before. Upon this principle, if it had happened that Lord Dalhousie's friends had had a majority in the house, would you Mr. Speaker or any of us, have retained our seats;—all those who did not vote in favour of the administration would have been turned out.—This is a question that most vitally affects the liberty of the subject; and yet it is strange that no one on the other side has given a single argument. All precedents are against them. The learned gentleman then requested the precedents, and laid peculiar stress on Wilkes's case. He felt surprised at the idea that had been held out, that the entries in the Journals against Mr. Christie ought previously to be expunged. What right can we have to erase the legal work of our predecessors? It was an idle farce to expunge any entries—they will remain in the memory of men, and in history, and will still continue to be read in the Journals of the house, though they may have been ruled to be expunged. To expunge is not the means of suppressing the historical truth that such resolutions were made. By continuing our judgments these gentlemen show more disregard for the liberty of the subject, than any thing Robert Christie could have done. He did not mean to advocate his cause, but his political crime was not so much here in question, as were the rights of the country. The authority of Junius was not to be countenanced. The gentlemen who did so, must be ignorant that there is no work in the English language, where this particular subject is treated with so much regard both to the liberty of the subject, and to the just rights of the Crown. To resort to the grand and only argument; that this house is bound by preceding resolutions. Is a resolution more sacred than an Act of Parliament, which we may every day alter? To argue that we can't do so to a resolution, refutes itself; and to act on such a doctrine, would be subverting the principles of the British constitution, and destroying the rights of the three branches of King, Lords, and Commons. The consequences would be that the majority might always turn out the minority. Is it possible to say that a resolution of this house can deprive a British subject of his rights? It has been fully proved that expulsion does not create incapacity. Besides though the House of Commons has the power, it is very seldom exercised—as in the same manner inferior Courts have the power of commitment for contempt it is only in extreme cases put in practice. In the case of Wilkes the people of England, rose en masse, as it were to espouse the cause of an oppressed individual; here the people will rise en masse, as they did at the time when the oppression of Lord Dalhousie made it incumbent on every man to join in the representations made against him; every man whether he could write or not, who felt for his country, joined in it, and the crosses to the petition, so much talked of, were only so many more evidences that the urgency had come home to the feelings of the lowest classes as well as others. Now the opposite side are actually following the example of Lord Dalhousie, who would not allow any man to think for himself. It seemed as if we were "in Tunis or Tripoli," instead of in a British Colony.

Mr. *Stuart* enquired what was the question before the House; to which Mr. Speaker replied that the motion was, that Mr. Christie was the same Robert Christie who had been expelled the house on the 14th Feb. 1829, and 22d Jan 1830.——Mr. *Stuart* then said, this is merely a question of fact.

A division then took place, when the motion was carried by 43 ayes, against 22 nays.

Mr. *Thibaudeau* moved that in consequence thereof, the said Robert Christie cannot sit or vote in this house.

Mr. *Stuart* said he was in the house when the first vote of expulsion took place. He then thought, and still thinks, that the grounds were insufficient. He was also in the house when the second vote of expulsion took place. Although he was perfectly convinced that the first vote was unjust; yet, in the same parliament he did not feel himself at liberty to vote against the first. He could not shut his eyes to the fact that judgment had been given, and that there would be a great deal of inconsistency in reversing it in the same parliament. But circumstances were entirely changed by the convocation of an entirely new parliament. Here to expel, we must have evidence of crime. We have no privity of knowledge upon what grounds the late house exercised their power in so extraordinary a manner. Mr. Speaker, I do not understand the distinction between old and new members. No member can know aught of what passed in a former parliament, but by what they read in the journals. For my part, I obliterate from my mind all that passed on the occasion, except what I see recorded. Now what I see recorded is, that the last parliament exercised an extraordinary power, in an extraordinary manner, in favour of their own body; but I hold it impossible that a new parliament can adopt the proceedings of an old one, without enquiry as to their propriety. Whether I sat in the last parliament or not, I am a new man, I have been sent back by a new with, and entitled to give a new vote. Every parliament is one and individual; the last was for the last four years; we are for the next four years, and we are separate and independent bodies. We have nothing to do with any offence committed against the last parliament, or if we had, it ought to be with feelings of forbearance and forgetfulness as to any offence. Some hon. members had treated this matter as if it were a conviction, but it has none of the qualities of a conviction. Where are the formal circumstances that attend a conviction? Where are the forms, the outworks, the bulwarks, that protect a man—they are thrown down, and I am to be tried by my accusers, and executed by my accusers. Where are the oath required? Where the penalties for perjury? Where the jury to stand between me and passion, and venality? Where is the congregated wisdom of ages that has been engaged in protecting me from oppression and injustice? Can any determination be come to in the case in question, which can stand on the same footing as the solemn determination of a court of justice? Here I stand with honour, fortune, character, at the mercy of any one who chooses to accuse me—We are thus made outlaws—pariahs and the proscribing arm of the law; and a simple record of conviction, without any forms of law, is an irrecoverable sentence against us. He wished again to impress on the minds of members that no power upon earth could remedy such an unjust sentence here; the power of the assembly was omnipotent and irresponsable—no human tribunal could be appealed to. Every one might, as I do, consider himself as alone answerable to the Almighty for his vote, and that therefore in passion, no prejudice, no personal or party feeling should influence it.

Mr. *L. Lagueux*, could not give a silent vote on the occasion. He was fully convinced of the guilt of the party—he had heard nothing to prove that that individual was less dangerous in 1831 than he was in 1829. The very existence of the house was in question—he had attempted to destroy that very existence. Here was not a simple expulsion, but a declaration that he was unworthy. I do not pretend that we are bound to go by the decisions of the last parliament, but I say that the same reasons and the same dangers exist now as then, though we may not be bound by the same resolutions, we are bound by the same motives of prudence, policy, and justice. The representatives of the people are the same here, as then; jealous of their liberties; and can not but come to the same decision. The same people who decided by their representatives then, are here present by their representatives. It has been said a punishment can not be twice inflicted for the same offence—but this is not a punishment—it is a censure—and the consequences are that future confidence is withdrawn. Mention has been made here of expunging the entries, and of absolution from the offence; but neither can be done. It remains the same as in 1829. The *corps de delit* remains.—We do not want to be conscious of it, to see all the particulars of the process, all we have to do with, is the record of the judgment—the conviction is sufficient.—Had any one shewn that in 1829, we were wrong, it might be otherwise; but as long as that conviction is recorded we have no occasion for other proofs.

Mr. *Lee*—again rose, amidst cries of question? and repeating his preceding arguments, contended that we were now trampling upon liberty, and upon those principles, which those great advocates of freedom, Fox, Burke, and Sir Francis Burdett, had constantly maintained. He asked the gentlemen on the other side would they have studied precedents, by which they would have been considered that no expulsion could stand good, except in the terms of that of Mr. Walpole, "for the present parliament."

Mr. *Cuvillier* followed in another unfounded speech in favour of Mr. Christie; but which did not appear to embrace any argument of importance that had not before been advanced by himself and preceding speakers.

Cries of question, question! now became general, but Mr. *Quesnel* (hear him, hear him!) in a neat speech said that if any one could produce but one similar instance of the political crime for which Mr. Christie had been expelled, he would submit. But all the precedents were for different matters. This was a debt unique, and could not but be cited as such. He wondered at the hon. member for the Lower Town taking the present course, as on the former occasion he had expressed himself very differently.

Mr. *Lee*—rose (amidst the cries of question, and hear him!) to explain, that if his previous argument had been listened to by the hon. member who spoke last, he must have clearly comprehended why on this he felt himself bound to follow a different course, from that which he had followed on the previous occasion.

A division then took place, by which Mr Thibaudeau's motion "that Robert Christie cannot sit and vote in this house, as a member thereof, for having as stipendiary Chairman of the Quarter Sessions, for the District of Quebec, called in question the freedom of debate in this house," was carried by a majority of 41 to 22.

The names being called for after the division, were taken down as follows:

Yeas—Archambault, Beaudet, Blanchard, Bolsoneault, L. Bourdages, R. S. Bourdages, Brooks, Bureau, Cazeau, Cameron, Courtemanche, Demers, Deschamps, Desaulles, Dewitt, P. A. Dorion, Dumouchel, Faribault, Gauthier, Hamel, Jobin, Kimmon, Lacoste, Lagueux, Malhiot, Merrill, Morin, Nelson, Nerbonne, Noel, Panet, Perrault, Rolton, Scott, Tabeau, Taschereau, Tremblay, Turgeon, Vallée, Vigeé, Wallace, Quesnel—41.

Nays—Baker, Baxter, Bedard, Caldwell, Cazgain, Cornet, Cuvillier, Dallaire, De Montenac, D. St Ours, D. Ste. Dorine, Fitzgibbon, Gaudet, Hedge, Hale, Hunter, Latour, Lateriere, Lee, Leslie, Lemoine, Perrault, A. S. Ours, A. C. Taschereau, Taylor, Wilkes, Young—28.

The Speaker was then ordered to issue his warrant for a new writ for the County of Gaspé.

BRITISH NEWS.

Ex-Premiers.—There are, at present, living in Great Britain not less than five Lords who have, since the commencement of the present century, held and resigned the office of First Lord of the Treasury and Prime Minister. Mr. Addington (Viscount Sidmouth) who resigned office on the 15th of January, 1804; Lord Grenville, who was appointed February 11th, 1806, and resigned on the 31st March in the following year; the Duke of Portland, who succeeded the last Lord, and retained office until the 23d of June, 1810; Viscount Goderich, who was First Lord of the Treasury from the 8th of September, 1827, until the 25th of January in the ensuing year; and the Duke of Wellington, who occupied the office from that day until his resignation on the 16th November.

Royal Legislators.—In the present British Parliament are some connections (and some as alledged, in the direct collateral line) of royalty sitting as representatives of the Commons. Mr. T. Wyse, jun. the member for Tipperary, is nephew-in-law of Napoleon, his marriage with the daughter of Lucien Bonaparte entitling him to that degree of relationship. Mr. O'Conor, or as he is styled in Ireland, "the O'Conor Don," is a lenial descendant of Roderick O'Conor, the last native King of Connaught; and Mr. Kearnagh, one of the members for the county of Carlow, is a lenial descendant, also, of the Kings of Leinster, and possesses, at his family residence, the identical crown worn by the last monarch of his family.

From the London Morning Herald.

The Pension List.—Those honourable and most considerate members of the "collective wisdom" of the nation who wish to engage the present government in prosecutions against the press, by the way of putting down the disturbances which are the inevitable, and not unforeseen result of the impoverished and debased condition of the labouring classes, have not taken any hostile notice of the most inflammatory production that has issued from the great and dreaded engine of illumination in modern times—a production, however, which ministers are not likely to prosecute, inasmuch as they have themselves been accessories, before the fact, to its publication. Need we name the "Pension List," in which every poor man "who rises early and lies down late, and eats the bread of carefulness"—that is, if he can get any bread to eat at all—finds that a large portion of the taxation which keeps him in degrading indigence goes to feed and pamper hordes of splendid paupers—the relations, dependents, followers, and sycophants of the great and noble of the land, who labour not at all, and who receive, in glittering idleness, the fruits of the poor man's industry? To those mendicant partakers of the bounty which they do not contribute to earn, no stigma of pauperism attaches—at least in their own eyes—if we may judge by the aristocratic names in which many of them rejoice, and the rank and opulence to which they are allied. This arises, perhaps, from such pauperism not being accompanied by any of the "outward and visible signs" which mark out that condition of life among the "lower orders." The plebeian pauper must bear about with him the badge of his dependence. He must solicit the public bounty through the churlish authority of the overseer; he must work for the public, if work can be found; and, if the workhouse be his home, he must feed on such fare as the contractor provides, or take his portion with those whom the parish authorities farm out to the best bidder, who makes a luxurious livelihood by the profit which he derives from the subsistence of the poor. If his settlement be litigated, he must appear in a court of justice, and prove his pauperism upon his oath; and for any of the ebullitions of his discontent against the provisions of the statues in that case made and provided, there is the cooling process of the tread mill and prison discipline. From all such degrading regulations the aristocratic pauper is perfectly free. Once admitted into the paradise of the "pension list," he may, like the rich man in scripture, say to his soul—"Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; eat, drink, and be merry." He need not thenceforth disquiet himself about providing for the morrow. Whoever tills the ground, he knows the produce will ripen for him; whoever puts the sickle into the harvest, he knows that for him the sheaves shall be gathered into the garner. His is a life of joyous dependence; and satisfied debasement—no badge marks him out as the recipient of public bounty amid the fluttering children of vanity and pleasure—for him no surly overseer stands at the gate of the temple of charity, to make him feel his abject situation by half shutting it in his face—he receives the public alms with the air of one who condescended to honour the giver by accepting them; and, unconscious of a blush for the dependence of his situation, bears about fantastic notions of dignity and rank to "midnight revels and the public show." This description, of course, does not apply to those pensioners who have performed meritorious service of a public nature, and who are not otherwise provided for; such persons receive not the public bounty, but a remuneration for their honourable labours, to which they are well entitled.—Such names are, however, on the pension list, "like angel visits, few and far between," and, therefore, we are justified in saying that the publication of this document is more calculated to increase the popular irritation and discontent than any thing which has obtained circulation through the press in modern times. When the Irish pension list was under discussion in the Irish Parliament in the year 1786, the celebrated advocate, Curran, then a member of that Parliament, applied to it, in a speech replete with the richness of his peculiar humour, the following sarcastic observations, which are equally applicable to the triple pension list of the present day:—"This polyglot of wealth, this museum of curiosities, the pension list, embraces every link in the human chain, every description of men, women, and children, from the exalted excellence of a Hawke, or a Rodney, to the debased situation of the lady who humbleth herself that she may be exalted. But the lessons it inculcates form its greatest perfection; it teacheth that *sloth* and *vice* may eat that bread which *virtue* and *honesty* may starve for after they had earned it. It teacheth the idle and dissolute to look up for that support which they are too proud to stoop and earn.—It directs the minds of men to a complete reliance on the ruling power of the state, which feeds the ravens of the royal aviary, that cry continually for food. It teaches them to imitate those saints on the pension list that are like the lilies of the field—they toil not, neither do they spin, and yet are arrayed like Solomon in all his glory. In fine, it teaches a lesson which, indeed, they might learn from Epictetus, that it is sometimes good not to be over-virtuous. It shows, in proportion as our embarrassments increase, the munificence of the crown increases also.—In proportion as our clothes are rent, the royal mantle is extended over us."—Thus, in a spirit of caustic pleasantry did the genius of Curran characterise the pension list of that day, and accurately prefigure that which excites the public surprise and indignation at present. The animation of the portraiture may be ascribed to his peculiar talent, but its severity is its truth.

The Army.—Recruiting appears to be the brisk-est business at present in the kingdom. The private instructions to the recruiting parties are unusally explicit, not only regarding the height, age, and health, but also respecting the character of the recruits; and consequently recruiting is likely to last for several months. The following additional parties are ordered for Scotland.—*Scots Greys*, Edinburgh and Dunse; 2d Dragoon Guards, Glasgow; 15th Foot, Hamilton; 17th do. Glasgow; 22d do Ayr; 25th do. Edinburgh; 25th do. Aberdeen; 25th do. Berwick; 42d do. Edinburgh; 47th do. Edinburgh; 59th do. Inverness; 64th do. Edinburgh; 79th do. Aberdeen; 79th do. Dundee; 79th do. Stirling; 82d do. Hawick; 90th do. Glasgow; 90th do. Inverness; 90th do. Perth; 91st do. Edinburgh; 94th do. Wick; 93d do. Glasgow; 94th do. Perth; Rifle Brigade, two Battalions, Berwick.—*Scotsman.*

Those scourges of infant population, measles and hooping-cough, are at present making dreadful ravages among the young in this town. So great a mortality has not occurred here for the last twenty-four years. During the past week, no fewer than 26 died of measles, fifteen of hooping-cough, and ten old people of divers diseases—which, taken together, is sixteen more than during any former week now in remembrance. The present week threatens to be equally fatal. On Sunday last, eight were buried, six of whom died of measles and two of hooping-cough,—two being out of one family. There are few families wherein there are young children, in certain districts of the town, who have not been visited by these diseases. "While I am writing," says a correspondent in the Newbergain, "the measles are raging in my own family, in my contiguous neighbour's on each side, and in the families of many of those behind me." We have seen a calculation making the number of patients under treatment for measles and hooping-cough 489; and, if those afflicted, but not under medical treatment, be taken at one half more, the total number will thus be 729.—*Dundee Adv.*

It is with feelings of the deepest gratification we announce to the public that our most gracious Queen Adelaide has ordered four dresses of tabet for her Royal person, from the manufacturers of the Earl of Meath's liberty.—"The eye of goodness espyeth all things"—and never did it light upon objects of greater sympathy, or of more merit, than in this instance.—*Dublin Even. Post.*

From the New-York Observer.

POLAND.

There have been so many partitions, and re unions, and re partitions of Poland within the last forty years, that it requires some attention to Geography and History to understand what is meant by the term. We presume, therefore, that the following brief sketch of the modern history & present state of this ill fated country will at this moment prove acceptable to our readers.

Ancient Poland was a large country of Europe, lying between Germany, Russia, Turkey and Hungary. Including Lithuania, it contains 284,000 square miles, and 15,000,000 inhabitants.—The partition of Poland between Russia, Austria, and Prussia, took place at three distinct epochs, 1772, 1793, and 1795; and the result of the whole was as follows:—

	Sq. Miles.	Population.
To Austria,	64,000	4,800,000
To Prussia,	62,000	3,500,000
To Russia,	168,000	6,700,000
	284,000	15,000,000

At the peace of Tilsit, (July, 1807) Bonaparte stripped Prussia of the greatest part of her Polish possessions. Of these he gave a small portion to Russia, and erected the rest into a new State, called the grand dutchy of Warsaw, which he assigned to the King of Saxony. In 1809, after vanquishing Austria in the field, he compelled her to cede part of Galicia to Russia, and another part to his new grand dutchy. But all the arrangements of Bonaparte were overturned by the disastrous campaign of 1812: the Russians re-occupied Poland; and the congress of Vienna, while it decreed to Austria and Prussia a partial restitution of their late cessions, confirmed to Russia all the Polish and Lithuanian provinces acquired before 1795, conferring on her, in addition, the sovereignty of the central provinces, which constitute the present kingdom of Poland. Each of the three powers was enjoined by the congress to give to its respective portion of Poland as free a constitution as circumstances should permit.

The following table shows how the territory and population were divided between the three powers at the congress of Vienna.

	Sq. Miles.	Population.
To Prussia,	29,000	1,800,000
To Austria,	30,000	3,500,000
Kingdom of Poland,	47,000	2,000,000
To Russia,	178,000	6,900,000
	284,000	15,000,000

The *kingdom of Poland*, as constituted at the congress of Vienna, is the seat of the present revolution. It comprises the chief part of that which, from 1807 to 1813, formed the dutchy of Warsaw. It consists of the central provinces of Ancient Poland, bounded all along its frontier by the respective acquisitions of Russia, Austria, and Prussia. Area 47,000 sq. miles. The population at present is estimated at 4,000,000.—This country, though subject to the same sovereign as Russia, was governed in every respect as a separate monarchy. The regal dignity is vested in the czar, represented by a viceroy, in whom, and in a cabinet of ministers, the executive government resides. The religion of the majority is the Catholic. The Protestants of different sects are also numerous; and there are many members of the Greek church. The Jews are computed to form a seventh of the whole population.