

Volume 4. SAINT ANDREWS, THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 1897. Number 24.

MONTHLY ALMANAC.						
1887. June.	First week	Second week	Third week	Fourth week	Old style.	
Thursday	1	8	15	22	29	—
Friday	2	9	16	23	30	—
Saturday	3	10	17	24	—	—
Sunday	4	11	18	25	—	—
Monday	5	12	19	26	—	—
Tuesday	6	13	20	27	—	—
Wednesday	7	14	21	28	—	—
M R S R & S			MOONS PHASES.			
1	4	17	8	33	10	45
2	5	16	18	55	1	00
3	6	15	19	58	3	45
4	7	14	20	59	6	00
5	8	13	21	59	9	15
6	9	12	22	58	12	30
7	10	11	23	56	15	45
8	11	10	24	53	18	00
9	12	9	25	49	21	15
10	13	8	26	44	24	30
11	14	7	27	39	27	45
12	15	6	28	33	30	00
13	16	5	29	27	33	15
14	17	4	30	20	36	30
15	18	3	31	13	39	45
16	19	2	—	6	42	00
17	20	1	—	—	45	15
18	21	—	—	—	48	30
19	22	—	—	—	51	45
20	23	—	—	—	54	00
21	24	—	—	—	57	15
22	25	—	—	—	60	30
23	26	—	—	—	63	45
24	27	—	—	—	66	00
25	28	—	—	—	69	15
26	29	—	—	—	72	30
27	30	—	—	—	75	45
28	31	—	—	—	78	00
29	—	—	—	—	81	15
30	—	—	—	—	84	30
31	—	—	—	—	87	45
32	—	—	—	—	90	00
33	—	—	—	—	93	15
34	—	—	—	—	96	30
35	—	—	—	—	99	45
36	—	—	—	—	102	00
37	—	—	—	—	105	15
38	—	—	—	—	108	30
39	—	—	—	—	111	45
40	—	—	—	—	114	00
41	—	—	—	—	117	15
42	—	—	—	—	120	30
43	—	—	—	—	123	45
44	—	—	—	—	126	00
45	—	—	—	—	129	15
46	—	—	—	—	132	30
47	—	—	—	—	135	45
48	—	—	—	—	138	00
49	—	—	—	—	141	15
50	—	—	—	—	144	30
51	—	—	—	—	147	45
52	—	—	—	—	150	00
53	—	—	—	—	153	15
54	—	—	—	—	156	30
55	—	—	—	—	159	45
56	—	—	—	—	162	00
57	—	—	—	—	165	15
58	—	—	—	—	168	30
59	—	—	—	—	171	45
60	—	—	—	—	174	00
61	—	—	—	—	177	15
62	—	—	—	—	180	30
63	—	—	—	—	183	45
64	—	—	—	—	186	00
65	—	—	—	—	189	15
66	—	—	—	—	192	30
67	—	—	—	—	195	45
68	—	—	—	—	198	00
69	—	—	—	—	201	15
70	—	—	—	—	204	30
71	—	—	—	—	207	45
72	—	—	—	—	210	00
73	—	—	—	—	213	15
74	—	—	—	—	216	30
75	—	—	—	—	219	45
76	—	—	—	—	222	00
77	—	—	—	—	225	15
78	—	—	—	—	228	30
79	—	—	—	—	231	45
80	—	—	—	—	234	00
81	—	—	—	—	237	15
82	—	—	—	—	240	30
83	—	—	—	—	243	45
84	—	—	—	—	246	00
85	—	—	—	—	249	15
86	—	—	—	—	252	30
87	—	—	—	—	255	45
88	—	—	—	—	258	00
89	—	—	—	—	261	15
90	—	—	—	—	264	30
91	—	—	—	—	267	45
92	—	—	—	—	270	00
93	—	—	—	—	273	15
94	—	—	—	—	276	30
95	—	—	—	—	279	45
96	—	—	—	—	282	00
97	—	—	—	—	285	15
98	—	—	—	—	288	30
99	—	—	—	—	291	45
100	—	—	—	—	294	00
101	—	—	—	—	297	15
102	—	—	—	—	300	30
103	—	—	—	—	303	45
104	—	—	—	—	306	00
105	—	—	—	—	309	15
106	—	—	—	—	312	30
107	—	—	—	—	315	45
108	—	—	—	—	318	00
109	—	—	—	—	321	15
110	—	—	—	—	324	30
111	—	—	—	—	327	45
112	—	—	—	—	330	00
113	—	—	—	—	333	15
114	—	—	—	—	336	30
115	—	—	—	—	339	45
116	—	—	—	—	342	00
117	—	—	—	—	345	15
118	—	—	—	—	348	30
119	—	—	—	—	351	45
120	—	—	—	—	354	00
121	—	—	—	—	357	15
122	—	—	—	—	360	30
123	—	—	—	—	363	45
124	—	—	—	—	366	00
125	—	—	—	—	369	15
126	—	—	—	—	372	30
127	—	—	—	—	375	45
128	—	—	—	—	378	00
129	—	—	—	—	381	15
130	—	—	—	—	384	30
131	—	—	—	—	387	45
132	—	—	—	—	390	00
133	—	—	—	—	393	15
134	—	—	—	—	396	30
135	—	—	—	—	399	45
136	—	—	—	—	402	00
137	—	—	—	—	405	15
138	—	—	—	—	408	30
139	—	—	—	—	411	45
140	—	—	—	—	414	00
141	—	—	—	—	417	15
142	—	—	—	—	420	30
143	—	—	—	—	423	45
144	—	—	—	—	426	00
145	—	—	—	—	429	15
146	—	—	—	—	432	30
147	—	—	—	—	435	45
148	—	—	—	—	438	00
149	—	—	—	—	441	15
150	—	—	—	—	444	30
151	—	—	—	—	447	45
152	—	—	—	—	450	00
153	—	—	—	—	453	15
154	—	—	—	—	456	30
155	—	—	—	—	459	45
156	—	—	—	—	462	00
157	—	—	—	—	465	15
158	—	—	—	—	468	30
159	—	—	—	—	471	45
160	—	—	—	—	474	00
161	—	—	—	—	477	15
162	—	—	—	—	480	30
163	—	—	—	—	483	45
164	—	—	—	—	486	00
165	—	—	—	—	489	15
166	—	—	—	—	492	30
167	—	—	—	—	495	45
168	—	—	—	—	498	00
169	—	—	—	—	501	15
170	—	—	—	—	504	30
171	—	—	—	—	507	45
172	—	—	—	—	510	00
173	—	—	—	—	513	15
174	—	—	—	—	516	30
175	—	—	—	—	519	45
176	—	—	—	—	522	00
177	—	—	—	—	525	15
178	—	—	—	—	528	30
179	—	—	—	—	531	45
180	—	—	—	—	534	00
181	—	—	—	—	537	15
182	—	—	—	—	540	30
183	—	—	—	—	543	45
184	—	—	—	—	546	00
185	—	—	—	—	549	15
186	—	—	—	—	552	30
187	—	—	—	—	555	45
188	—	—	—	—	558	00
189	—	—	—	—	561	15
190	—	—	—	—	564	30
191	—	—	—	—	567	45
192	—	—	—	—	570	00
193	—	—	—	—	573	15
194	—	—	—	—	576	30
195	—	—	—	—	579	45
196	—	—	—	—	582	00
197	—	—	—	—	585	15
198	—	—	—	—	588	30
199	—	—	—	—	591	45
200	—	—	—	—	594	00
201	—	—	—	—	597	15
202	—	—	—	—	600	30
203	—	—	—	—	603	45
204	—	—	—	—	606	00
205	—	—	—	—	609	15
206	—	—	—	—	612	30
207	—	—	—	—	615	45
208	—	—	—	—	618	00
209	—	—	—	—	621	15
210	—	—	—	—	624	30
211	—	—	—	—	627	45
212	—	—	—	—	630	00
213	—	—	—	—	633	15
214	—	—	—	—	636	30
215	—	—	—	—	639	45
216	—	—	—	—	642	00
217	—	—	—	—	645	15
218	—	—	—	—	648	30
219	—	—	—	—	651	45
220	—	—	—	—	654	00
221	—	—	—	—	657	15
222	—	—	—	—	660	30
223	—	—	—	—	663	45
224	—	—	—	—	666	00
225	—	—	—	—	669	15
226	—	—	—	—	672	30
227	—	—	—	—	675	45
228	—	—	—	—	678	00
229	—	—	—	—	681	15
230	—	—	—	—	684	30
231	—	—	—	—	687	45
232	—	—	—	—	690	00
233	—	—	—	—	693	15
234	—	—	—	—	696	30
235	—	—	—	—	699	45
236	—	—	—			

MR. EDITOR,

Mr. McLeann triumphantly asks "what now becomes of Mr. Brown's self called statement of facts?" I answer, let him and his friends read the testimony of Messrs. Wyer and Hayward, and they will perceive that this very "statement" which Mr. McLeann has the boldness to call "recklessly audacious, and gratuitously false," is by those most respectable and disinterested gentlemen, declared to be just and true. I wonder whether he will dare to tell those gentlemen that their statement is false also. Let him attempt this, and I promise him, in due time, an additional item or two. I defy him, or any other person, to point out any charge or attack made by me, upon any one connected with the Secretary's Office; I therefore view the language of Mr. McLeann with astonishment.

However complete he may be in his own opinion, of evidence, it affords no more than the sole fact that the paper in the Committee of Supply, did not contain the paragraph in question. His testimony is, from its very nature inconclusive; for by the manner in which he has exhibited the charges, he has shown his witnesses to be implicated with himself in the alleged transaction, and has thus, by his own act, rendered their incompetent; but even if this were not the case, their testimony only amounts to a denial of all knowledge of any alteration without their knowledge, or the exhibition of a paper purer in their possession, transfers the statements of the Hon. Secretary and his Clerks, to a matter of testimony, to a mere matter of opinion. Suppose

For instance, that during the ten days this paper was in my possession, I had effected an alteration in it, how were the Secretary and the Clerks to know this? and how do they know that the paper shews in the Committee of Supply was read in their possession at all? Does Mr. Maclean yet tell me, that "the passage was there in full and unaltered;" then let him prove this bold assertion by the testimony of some person who read the message when the paper was in the Committee of Supply, in the same manner that Col. Weyerbroges did *not* read the paper in the presence of the Select Committee.

before the Senate Committee, and that after leaving a paper in my possession for ten days, and reading it during that time more than twice ten times, comparing it carefully with the evidence, and in a fact committing to memory a great part of it, that I should, after repeated and minute examination, be unable to point out, not merely a sentence as Mr. McLean actually terms it, but a most conspicuous paragraph contained therein? How, I would ask, can I, by my knowledge of the manner in which the paper before the Senate Committee was drawn up, except by the extreme attention which I repeatedly paid to it while in my possession? And, if so deeply wound in my feelings, and so closely with my character, that I should be so long in coming to my principal business was to praise and exonerate him. There, Sir, were the four kinds of the "exculpatory evidence" and after the observations under the last head, there was "the value of the above exculpatory evidences;" and I never can forget this while I remember anything. How then could I pass over, after repeated examination, a paragraph so

insuspicious, in a paper with the arrangement of which I am even to this moment so fully acquainted? and how came it to pass, that neither Mr. Clinch, nor Mr. Buras, nor Mr. Taylor, nor any other member who perused this paper in the Commune of Supply, could see any thing of the offensive passage? I have even now in my possession, the certificate of Mr. Clinch made at the time and on the spot, that the passage alluded to was in the first paper, and that the second was a forgery. I need, I suppose, I may now have recourse to Lord's pleading of abuse. Special pleading I do not understand, and as for abuse, if I deem it necessary I have but to copy his dictum; and at present, I have not need of either. He has now, it seems, quit the field; I can only say, his retreat was as ill-timed and invidious as was his attack.

I must now, as I promised, take some notice of his fourth letter, and am sorry that neither my time, nor your limits; will permit more than a passing glance. His chief aim in this letter, is to destroy my character as a man of veracity. Let me ask him the following questions.—Did he not deny that Mr. McIntyre appeared as the accuser and manager of the cause against Miss Rogers? Did he not retract the statement that he had not expressed his objections against her in writing, *before* she was hired? Did he not, in quoting his "own sentence," omit the names of Thompson and Mr. Mitchell, two of the principal witnesses? Did he not, in appealing to Johnston's Dictionary, omit the principal and most obvious definition of the word which he pretended to explain? Did he not add the names of three persons to a list of five whom I had named twice over, in order to connect with them a reputed Deist, and a reputed Sceptic? Did he not make a false quotation from the petition of the people of the school district? Was it the viva

ties, and documentary evidence of Jacob Young, James Mullikin, John Corbett, Daniel Robinson, Alex. Clindinning, and John Canine, publicly given before I was called up at all? And did not the above evidence, according to his own showing, prove every thing that was proved against Miss Rogers? And does he not represent Mr. Bowen as a Trustee, and me as speaking of Webster's Spelling Book? I leave questions about my own conduct to the public, and leave Mr. Bowen to become of Mr. W. what he may see fit.

If Mr. McLean would take the whole of my evidence together, question and answer, he could neither show contradiction in testimony, nor inconsistency in my conduct; but as all in order of questions were put, and the answers only taken down, generally unexplained and unconnected with the place of the question, and the answers, and as I was allowed to insert contradictions, and to make myself disagreeable, and to misrepresent, into daylight, anything.

for a living day is better than a dead day." I touched the character of Mr. McIntyre rather than it was connected with the proceedings of the Select Committee, and here Mr. McLean only makes a stepping stone to the dead, whereas, to stand and traduce a living man, I made no attack on the character of Mr. McIntyre in the House; he, on the contrary, made a violent attack on my character. I had but to say the word, and nothing but speedy escape could have saved him from incarceration in a gaol: but I have no desire to "draw his frailties from their dread abodes," and stern necessity forces me to say what I have said, or may further say, respecting him.

What Mr. McLean says about Miss Rogers being hired contrary to law, is unmeaning nonsense. The law did and still does empower the people to hire any teacher—their bounty alone being then affected by the concurrence of the Trustees. All the teachers that I know of under the Act of 1833 were hired so. The people of the district in question had hired a school-master who proved such a beastly drunkard, that they had to discharge him. He engaged again in the same parish, and obtained his bounty through the same Trustees. Miss Rogers was then hired, and the Trustees refused to

ance the School. She was re-engaged, but in this day of the Trustees' d d counsel, and expelled the school. Mr. McLeary knows all this, and yet he daringly accuses Mr. Moore with "heading the people of the district, to set the laws at defiance." The laws indeed were set at defiance, but not by Mr. Moore. Did not Mr. McLeary take a solemn oath to do the duty of a teacher, and to obey the laws of the State? In case of a criminal cause and self proper enquiry, to inform to dispel *any* teacher? "Was he not required to report the cause of such dismissal to the Justices for their consideration and were not the Justices required to represent such case to the Governor? Was any man charged with a criminal offence by the district and legal course was pursued by Mr. McLeary? no sir, are not only disregarded the law, which he was bound to enforce, but he also reported his two colleagues as not lawfully disposed to investigate the subject. Is he questioned whether the girl was Greek or Jew, guilty or not guilty, is no excuse for his conduct was contrary to the laws upon which the principle of "no dissent teacher" — the principle of "no dissent afterwards" —

and sure enough there was a trial afterwards and pray Sir who were the judges? Was not one of them a member of the same family with the accused? Was not the honour of the whole brotherhood to be affected by the issue? And then wonders that the Commissioners did not argue in their report that they were *totally disinterested*, and the others connected to one of the parties by a bond of union not to be severed by death itself? Who would be surprised to find the disinterested party, as was actually the case, making a fair report resting upon the evidence, "nothing extenuate, nor ought set down in malice," and if the other Commissioner had made a report affecting the *rarity* of the "times, places, and otherwise exceptional, who should be surprised?

When Mr. McLean wonders why the report was not acted upon, he should remember that the Petition of Miss Rogers was corroborated by Dr. Thompson and his two Church Wardens, and by two Trustees, all of whom had visited the School several times. Let me tell him, sir, that this brief and simple certificate, had far more weight in the Legislature than all that he has written, as it contains the most pointed testimony, that is very end for which the bounty was offered, had been fully realized: viz: that a large number of children had made considerable progress in religious moral and literary improvement, under the gentle and kind Patronage. It is therefore most to appear by the unanimous testimony of competent Judges, that as an instructor she has seldom been excelled, and that her deportment has been strictly moral and unblameable, and while she has continued to discharge her duty, she is by every principle of Humanity and Christianity entitled to protection and encouragement, and she will receive it.

Mr. McLean has certainly acted a strange part, and the impropriety of his exceedingly boisterous and unwarrantable attack, is only equalled by his sudden and unlooked retreat. As I am just leaving the County, I may not be able to give more attention to this matter at present; meantime I beg to remind you and your readers, that I have acted purely on the defensive, sternly urged onward by self preservation motives first and strongest law.

In haste,  
Yours,  
JAMES BROWN, Jr.  
Digdeguash, 15th June, 1837

FOR THE STANDARD.

I have paid some attention to the controversy pending between Mr. James Brown Jr. and the Rev. Mr. MacLean. I believe there is now very little difference of opinion respecting the affair of H. Rogers. I was in St. Stephens at the time of the investigation, and, (though your readers would not regard this from Mr. Brown's letters) I heard her distinctly *proved* to be an infidel and a forswearer—the testimony of Mr. John Cole herself regarding her made me shudder. He swore that he heard her, himself, call "Jesus Christ a bastard and his mother a—"

This then, is the woman who was recommended to the Governor as fit to be entrusted with training the female friends of our children. And who recommended her to the Government for a School Licence? Mr. James Brown, a Legislator, and Mr. Thomas Moore, a Magistrate, did so—knowing her to be an infidel, in common report. Does any person believe that there was not a strong possibility of agreement between these men and the woman—or that, if there was not, they would thus recommend her? Mr. McLean clearly proves, from the mouths of her own witnesses, that she was engaged in St. James contrary to the will of the Trustees—and that is contrary to law.—And if Mr. Brown does not now leave off vague and unsupported assertion; and disprove, in the most particular manner, from the same source from which Mr. McLean argues, that is, the recorded evidence—what has been shown concerning his testimony—he will find that his credibility stands deeply compromised. Dr. Alley's testimony (as quoted by the select Committee) is founded upon the same source, supposed restoration. But of this there is no need of restoration. She was proved an infidel long before she was admitted to the office. It was almost certain of her adherence to *Dispraise* that last uniformly failed in the cross examinations. I paid particular attention to this point. I saw—She said she was ready to express her belief in Christianity, but this is all as when Dr. Skeffington Thomson told her she could not otherwise hope for the \$10 a

But the controversy has *now* taken a singular turn—Mr. Brown having charged Mr. McKim with procuring a Report of the case to be presented in Committee of supply, differing *essentially* from that filed before select Committee. This charge Mr. M. has denied in the most solemn manner, and he has corroborated his denial by the certificates of all those persons whom Mr. B's imputable charge might be supposed to implicate. This being the case, the Public executive Mr. B.—either to confess his error, or to *prove* his charge, has the alternative of either admitting the existence of a conspiracy, and thus show Mr. M. to be no dishonest merely, but a perjured man. But, in his last communication he has done neither. He merely reiterates the charge, and produces certificates from Messrs. Wyer and Hayward, which put one in mind of his own quotation in your paper of 23d April—"A tale told by an idiot, signifying nothing." In his letter dated 16th April, he says "My sentiments shall be such as shall stand the test before God, and, as to my confidence, and *whether* I can be *able to prove* by my own testimony, I will take it for granted

and then, that these certificates constitute this pre-eminently clear testimony touching the existence of the two reports, especially as Mr. Brown says, "I apprehends they will bear out my assertions, and shall give his character for honesty," not totally gone. Instead of this, however, the sole circumstance which they refer to in the Report before the Committee is that "Mr. B. acknowledged that the objections presented was not in it." Now I must say that this is worse than trifling with the subject, your columns—and the public—had Messrs. Wyler and Hayward certified that the alleged *second* report was delivered in the House—and that the so called *first* report was instantly sent for from Mr. Brown's office, and to his aid side on (so to say), Hayward stable—and indeed something *else* everything would have been proved. Mr. Brown has distinctly staked his entire reputation on his ability to prove this charge. But really, if he has nothing better to bring forth than these certificates, he is illen informed. No one disputes that Mr. Brown said the passage in question was not in the said report. Why? This assertion constitutes a grand charge against Mr. McLean—that that charge is surely not to *prove*. Verily, we have here a most notable logician—and admirably qualified to assist in framing laws for the liages of New Brunswick. He advances a charge which is distinctly denied and con-

piously disproved. But all this disproof goes for nothing with "Sir Oracle." He proves his statement by bringing two people, *one* to *con-*  
*firm the charge*, and *the other* to *turn*  
*round and deny it.* Now, have I not  
proved it? I kneed Mr. Brown to be a prett-  
y large egotist—but I was not prepared for the  
enlarged specimen of pre-occupies absurd-  
ity now before us—viz; that because James  
Brown Jr. thinks proper to *charge* a clergy-  
man with falsification, *therefore*, the charge  
is proved.—Mr. Wyer has testified as to the  
correctness of Mr. Brown's statement of what  
took place in Committee of supply. Be it  
so,—just let the following fact be also noted.  
Some gentlemen asked Mr. Wyer (immedi-  
ately after his arrival from the House) what  
did take place, or what did Mr. Brown charge  
Mr. Menzies with. Appeared to Mr. W. him-  
self whether his answer was not to the effect  
that *he was dull of hearing, and therefore*  
*could give no satisfactory account of what took*  
*place?* Yet here we have his certificate and  
his public judge of his "weight." We all  
know what kind of substance the Proverb  
represents drowning men as catching at. Mr.  
Brown must surely be at the last gasp when  
he thus convulsively catches at a couple of  
straws.

These notable certificates having thus completely broken down under the slight pressure now made upon them—We conclude this paper by asking: "What supposable motive could Mr. McLean have had for substituting a second Report? Was it fear of the withering effects of Mr. Brown's wrath? But had this been so, the obnoxious passage would never have been inserted. Has Mr. M. ever denied, any—Has he not always avowed and defended the passage, that so entirely tore off his mask? Was it fear of breach of privilege? But the thing is absurd—the Report was not addressed to the House or any of its members and it was transmitted in November, a full month before the Legislature met.

Supposing Mr. McLean to be bent on injuring himself thus gratuitously and without motive—still, How could he possibly efface this bad design? He must evidently have got some floor member to conspire with him in carrying on the alleged chest. Who then was this member that thus disgraced himself and the house; if Mr. B's charge is true—and that must undoubtedly be expelled with shame, whenever the floor meets in July?—Mr. B. says he saw the report in Mr. Burns' hands. Mr. Burns says "Received from Mr. Taylor," Mr. Taylor says "I obtained this report from the *Journal of the Provincial Secretary*," which report remained in the House of Assembly until returned in the battle, then, for the present, has passed away from Mr. McLean's grasp, and remains between Mr. Brown and Mr. Taylor. They must settle accounts before the charge of two Reports can be substantiated.

Mr. Brown may rest assured that increasing loudness of assertion, unfounded imputation, and vehement abuse, do not strengthen, but, on the contrary, greatly weaken the defensible position he has now assumed. We will find that all he can ever and reiterate short of the most conclusive proof of the existence of two Reprints will be, much worse than nothing—that his last communication is clearly of this deteriorating stamp—that even similar ones will have not the smallest favorable effect upon any persons in the County whose good opinion he ought to value—and that, in fact, his downward path in his affair has been already so rapid—even the estimation of hundreds of his supporters hitherto—that he will now find it extremely difficult to prevent himself from (I use his own quotation) "falling like Lucifer, never to hope again."

I am, Sir,  
Your Obedt. Serv't.  
CATO.

THIS ROSE.—Our fair friends may not all think we are aware, that the beautiful flower which they have so long regarded as the emblem of beauty and love, is the habitation of a variety of gay and happy creatures, which sport upon its velvet leaves; nor that it is the soil on which other plants germinate and grow; they need not however, be alarmed on beholding that such is the fact, for the former have ever lost to vision by being enveloped in a flood of rays, which emanate from the brilliant eyes that beam upon them. By a little comparison of the size of the shrubs that germinate and flourish upon the leaves of the rose, it will be perceived that no great fear should be apprehended from them. They are minute, that it would require more than a thousand of them to equal in bulk a single atom of moss; and if we compare a stem of rose, which is but one sixteenth of an inch in diameter, with some of the trees of South America, which are 200 feet high, we shall find that of the other, 2,885,344,000,000 times; and one of those trees would exceed the rose of a plant in size one thousand times that enormous size! But little do we think when we are lingering the soft-soft petals of the rose, and snuffing its atoms, that we enshroud a thousand plants, and indeed, perhaps, a thousand of the tiny inhabitants of that beautiful world.

Newport, N. H. Spectator.

P o e t r y .

From the New York Star.  
TO PAGANINI.  
So, thou art coming o'er the sea at last,  
Great earnest scraper!  
I wonder if, while plunging the vast deep,  
When winds are hush'd, and waves in calmness  
sleep,  
Your "tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee"  
Arouse the monsters of the 'Deep, deep sea?'  
And make them caper.

Your notes, great Pag, a premium will command,  
Which in these times are wonderful you know;  
Tis paradoxical that notes of hand  
Should sell so high, when they are all sold.

When you arrive such a sensation,  
Throughout the nation,  
You will doubtless cause,  
That Brokers will forget their cent per cent—  
Merchants upon the times no more intent,  
Will think then of no other notes, but yours.

By all accounts, Old Orpheus, that fellow,  
Who made stones dance, and rocks with transport  
bellow

Was not a tough to you, my Paganini  
For who has heard, *he* ever made a guinea—  
Or with a *single string*, like you, could tie  
Thousands of people up—in ecstasy?

They say, indeed, that you are no Adonis.  
But what of that? your minstrelsy alone is  
Enough to win bright woman's adoration;  
And we do know it once caused a sensation  
That lur'd a little singing bird from home,  
To share your fate wherever you might roam.

We never knew you were at all inclined  
To break the peace or kick up any riot ;  
Yet 'tis a fact which all the world may know,  
Your scrapes do gather crowds around you so,  
It will be well for our city's quiet  
If our Mayor some means preventive find  
To keep the people within proper bound,  
As soon as place foot on Yankee ground.

Well, Heaven speed the ship across the ocean,  
That's freighted with so wonderful a treasure ;  
Your coming will create no slight commotion ;  
And nothing, I am sure, exceeds the pleasure  
With which—if all we hear of you be true—  
The Dilettanti here will welcome you.

**LOWER CANADA.**—The inhabitants of this Province have been thrown into a dreadful state of excitement by the Resolutions which the Imperial Parliament are about adopting. Great County Meetings have been held, at which Resolutions have been passed, declaring their determination to resist coercion—that they will use no commodity which pays Crown duties—and that it shall be deemed no crime to smuggle and use such articles as they cannot want.

**PRESBYTERY OF EDINBURGH.**  
The Presbytery held their ordinary meeting on Friday.  
Dr Muir called the attention of the Presbytery to the lamented death of the late Robert Wardlaw Ramsay, Esq. of Whitehill, mourned by the Presbytery as one of their representatives to the Assembly, and one of the elders of St Stephen's parish. Dr Muir passed a high eulogium on him as a Christian, as an officer of the Church, and as a private gentleman.

**CONTRAST BETWEEN THE MODERATORSHIP.**  
 Explanations having taken place, it is now  
 ored, that the Presbytery do not consider  
 necessary to institute any judicial inquiry  
 to this matter, but only to enjoin upon these  
 who have engaged in this controversy the  
 cultivation of a spirit of meekness, of forgive-  
 ness, of brotherly kindness, and of charity.

The general assembly of the Presbyterian Philadelphia, have resolved to cite before them at the next session, all such interior judges as "by common fame are charged with the toleration of gross errors in doctrine and disorder in practice."

It will at once be seen that the advice by the St Andrews is only corroborative of the opinions we have already expressed, and that the pressure will be confined to the American bankers in London, and such as may be brought collaterally to their attention, such as the marine and mercantile banks, who have been accustomed to taking their paper, and will not have otherwise an important bearing on the Bank of England and the monied interest of the country. They will experience no such revolution as sweeping over and desolating this country, and will not be the cause of a suspension of specie payments in England;—and we will have no doubt fully sustain the positions we have taken. The principal cause of our disasters will be, and will be in the derangement of our currency, and the general want of confidence among ourselves. Our currency will be replaced on a sound foundation, it is vain to look for our former debt and prosperity.

Cotton, it will be seen, was again, dull, and a small improvement advised by the last part, was as we supposed, fallacious. When they receive our advices to 16th May, we hope that cotton has seen its minimum price; and any advance after that period, may in some degree be depended on.

Original issues in *Poor Condition*  
Best copy available