

Accounts from Madonia of the 26th, state that the regiment waiting for orders for embarkation at Santander for Cuba, had revolted against its officers. The revolt which had not been joined in by any officers was, however, soon suppressed, the regiment consisted of 1,200 men.

LIVEPOOL GRAIN MARKET.

October 29.—Our largest arrival this week is of flour, having received 95619 bbls. from America, and 40,000 sacks from France, 1553 sacks from Ireland. The next important arrival is of wheat, 10731 quarters viz:—5818 from the United States, 2100 quarters from Canada; 815 quarters from Rotterdam, 1850 quarters from France. The week's import of Indian Corn is 5367 quarters, and the export 6337 quarters. Quotations, flour western canal Richmond 21s. a 21s. Philadelphia and Baltimore 23s. a 24s.; New Orleans and Ohio 23s. a 24s. Wheat—American white 6s. a 6s. 3d; red 5s. a 5s. 7d. Corn meal 14s. a 14s. 6d.

The Atlantic run into a schooner last night, about 50 miles south of Sandy Hook—could not ascertain the damage.

General Intelligence.

The Assizes.

SATURDAY, NOV. 9.

The first case worth noticing was Peol vs. Kingsmill.—This was an action brought to recover the balance of two promissory notes, endorsed by the defendant, and discounted by the plaintiff, from which the defendant's name had been erased by crossing with a pen. The case has been tried before but failed in consequence of want of evidence, and in a suit of chancery was filed to compel the defendant to state under what circumstances the crossing took place. On the evidence, thus obtained, from the defendant himself, the plaintiff now claimed. It appeared that Mr. Kingsmill having endorsed, for the accommodation of two persons, against whom executions were in his hands, two notes for £50 each, they were discounted by Mr. Peol [of the Post Office] at a usurious rate of interest £25 paid, and after the notes were due, an arrangement was proposed, by which the Sheriff agreed to give his bond for £100 in 12 months. The papers were all completed and the Sheriff's endorsement struck off the notes by Mr. Peol himself; who however, refused to give up the erased notes, thus preventing the Sheriff from recovering from them the bankrupt estates of the drawers. The Sheriff thereupon took the bond and carried it away with him.

The counsel for the defence contended that the Sheriff was still liable on the bond, although in his possession, and that therefore the suit could not be sustained. The Court being of a different opinion charged the jury in favor of the plaintiff, and the jury returned a verdict in accordance, but refused to allow interest.

Eccles for plaintiff—Van Koughnet for defendant.

There were two actions brought by Jennings against O'Donohoe, to recover damage for an Assault. The first resulted in a verdict of one shilling for plaintiff. In the second, the jury returned a verdict for Defendant.

Lymon Garrison was arraigned and pleaded not guilty, on the charge of passing a spurious five dollar bill.

It appeared in evidence, the prisoner went into the store of one Thomas Bolster, in the Township of Uxbridge, in August last. Bolster himself was in the shop, and prisoner, after remaining some time subsequently returned and finding only a young son of Bolster in the store, purchased a pair of prunella boots for two dollars, paying for the boots with a five dollar bill. The boy handed him three dollars change and he immediately left. On Bolster returning, his son gave him the bill which he instantly suspected was forged, and told the boy it was a bad one. Bolster succeeded in finding out Garrison's residence, and had him arrested. Before hearing the charge against him at the time of his arrest, Garrison made a statement saying, that the bill they came about was the only one he passed or had in his possession. On his way to Uxbridge (about 15 miles) to be examined by the magistrates, prisoner asked the constable in charge of him, if he was on the fastest horse. Being answered that he was on the slowest, he remarked that if he was on Brookes's (one of the constables) horse, he could easily give them the slip.

The defence was conducted by Mr. Shelton. The Jury after a short absence from Court returned with a verdict of "not guilty," and prisoner was accordingly discharged.

Monday, Nov. 11, 1850.

Stephen Moore was placed at the bar, on the charge of passing a forged five dollar bill, purporting to be of the Montreal Bank, and pleaded "Not Guilty."

Mr Solicitor-General McDonald conducted the case for the Crown; Mr Shelton for the prisoner.

Robert Young gave evidence as follows:—I am in the employ of Mr Foster, shoemaker, of this city. Last summer, one day at the time the Menagerie was here, the prisoner came into the shop and asked for a pair of half boots; he refused at first to give the price asked (\$2.50) but afterwards came back and took them, tendering for payment a five dollar bill. Being very much enraged at the time, I carelessly throw the note into the till, and gave him the change. About two hours after, I discovered the bill was bad; I gave information and had the prisoner arrested. The constable asked prisoner if he had bought any boots from me; he replied that he had; and on hearing that he was charged with passing a bad note, stated that if it was bad, he was willing to make it all right.

Some dispute arising between the counsel as to the identity of the note produced, Alderman Dempsey, before whom the first information was sworn, was called, and fully indemnified it.

Mr Hall, connected with the Branch Bank of Montreal in Toronto, proved that the note was spu-

rious, and the signatures, though good imitations, were forgeries.

Donald Mar in was called by the defence, to prove prisoner's good character. From his evidence it appears, that Moore resides in Darlington, and has some property there; now and then he used to peddle goods about the country.—When the Menagerie was in that neighbourhood, he thought it would be a profitable way of disposing of his wares by following it with a horse and cart. In this way he became in a sort of manner attached to it, and no doubt obtained the note from some person more immediately connected with it. At the time of his arrest, his lodgings as well as his person, were searched; and though other money was found upon him, none of a spurious character was discovered.

The Jury without leaving the box, returned a verdict of acquittal; and the prisoner was at once discharged.

The Grand Jury came into the Court, having represented that their Foreman J. Eastwood Esq. was unable to attend from illness, and chose Amos Thorne, Esq. Foreman in his stead.

The Grand Jury found "True Bills" against Jane Morris, for murder; John Smith, Larceny; Catharine Hannan, receiving stolen goods; John Donahise, and Daniel Hutchinson Larceny; James McMartin Arson; Wm. Henderson, Larceny; Ann Endicott, Larceny and "No Bill" against Richard Javais for Larceny.

John Smith was arraigned for stealing goods from A. V. Brown and pleaded "not guilty." On evidence it was proved that Mr Brown had for some time been missing things from his store, and at length suspected the prisoner. Mr B. obtained a warrant to search the premises of Catharine Hannan, where the prisoner resided. At Mrs. Hannan's they discovered some tea, sugar, rice, &c. and a box of blacking which Mr. Brown identified as belonging to him. The prisoner denied knowing anything about the goods except the blacking, which he said was given to him by Mr. Brown's porter. On enquiry his statement was found to be incorrect, and he was apprehended to answer the charge of Larceny.

The prisoner made no defence, and the Jury returned a verdict of "guilty."

Catharine Hannan, the woman mentioned above, was arraigned for receiving the goods stolen from Mr. Brown. On being questioned about the goods, she first stated that she had got them from the States; subsequently she said they were purchased at Mr. Davis' store. A clerk of Mr. Davis proved that the rice produced was of a different quality to any Mr. Davis had. Prisoner afterward said she made the second statement because Smith had asked her to say so.

The Jury retired and in a few minutes returned with a verdict of Acquittal.

Jane Morris was put on her trial for the murder of Catharine Morris, her daughter, a child of 19 months old.

The prisoner is an old woman with a family of young children, residing in the Township of Albion and was considered by all who knew her to be perfectly insane at times. In the month of July last, she was observed to have left the house early one morning taking the baby with her. Her eldest daughter immediately procured some of the neighbors to look for her. They soon found her standing over a well, about 5 feet deep, into which she had thrown her child. When asked about what she had done, prisoner replied that she had long intended to do it, and would now be hanged and get rid of this troublesome world. All the witnesses testified that she had been an affectionate mother up to the time of her derangement, about 18 months before.

The Solicitor general explained to the Jury, that he was perfectly satisfied as to her insanity at the time of committing the act, and on that ground they acquitted her.

Joseph Donahise John Donahise and Daniel Hutchinson, three little urchins, with heads closely shaved, and fitted out in jail livery, who had to be stuck upon a bench, in order that the Court might see them, were brought up for stealing a quantity of keys and the works of a clock, the property of Mr. Martin J. O'Beirne. The accused had not taken any trouble about Counsel, but Mr. James Boulton manfully came forward to aid the cause of the helpless and rescue from the iron grip of the law, three such specimens as have rarely been seen in a court of justice. Poor Johnny was convicted and sentenced to one month in Common jail at which the tears of contrition, we hope, routed down his cheeks; but the cause of humanity has reason to be thankful to Mr. Boulton, inasmuch as success crowned his efforts for the liberation of Daniel and Joe.

Besides the criminal cases reported above there were several civil cases disposed of in; Jones vs. Dunn, an action for malicious arrest, the Jury, at a late hour, last night, being unable to agree, the Judge ordered them to be locked up for the night.

TUESDAY, NOV. 12, 1850.

The jury in the case of Jones vs. Dunn, for malicious arrest, having been locked up all night, and stating their inability to agree, were discharged at half past 10 o'clock this morning.

HAMILTON vs. MONROE.—Chetwood Hamilton, Esq., for Plaintiff; J. H. Cameron, Esq., for Defendant. This was an action for damages for seduction of plaintiff's daughter by defendant. The case was specially set apart for to-day, and excited much interest, from the position in society of the parties concerned, as well as their relative position in the same regiment. The counsel for plaintiff, in conducting his case, dwelt strongly upon the evils to society from the repeated occurrence of the offence imputed to the defendant, and the misery for ever afterwards inflicted upon the victims in such cases. In aggravation of them in this instance, he depleted in glowing colors the relative position of the parties—the defendant, being the subaltern of the plaintiff, and stationed along with him with a detachment of their regiment; under which circumstances a strong intimacy grew up with the defendant and the plaintiff's family, particularly the younger daughter, who was unfortunately the sole evidence of her own unhappy position. The Counsel stated to the jury, that the value of the defendant's commission in the army—the sale of which would be the only means for paying the penalty that would be inflicted by the jury upon him for his conduct—

would realize from £750 to £1000. The counsel for the defence very feelingly abstained from offering any evidence in the case, or causing embarrassment to the young lady, by putting any questions to her while giving her evidence. In his speech, he described himself as not desiring to appear as in defence of a seducer, but to set the jury right on points which might be erroneously stated by the plaintiff's counsel. He said that nothing should be stated by him against the propriety of conduct of the young lady. He, however, could not avoid alluding to the duty that was incumbent on the fathers of children, in watching over them. Mr Cameron argued, that the claim of damages for the full amount that could be realised by the sacrifice of the defendant's position in the army, savored rather of the desire to gratify revenge, than to aim at obtaining compensation for the wrongs inflicted.

The circumstances of the case appear to have been briefly these. Lieutenant Monroe was attached to Captain Hamilton's Company, and naturally became on intimate terms with the family. In April, 1849, the Company was stationed at a small island opposite Montreal. Here it was that Monroe first paid any marked attention to Miss Hamilton, third daughter of Capt. H., then about the age of nineteen. He avowed his love for her, she acknowledged his love; and not content with this, poisoned her mind against her family by telling her, that she no longer enjoyed their affection, that her father thought harshly of her in consequence of his attentions being paid to her, and not to enter of her elder sisters, and that he Monroe, was the only one in the world who cared for, or loved her. He finally declared his intention of marrying her so soon as he had obtained his Lieutenant's Commission.

Having thus gained her confidence, and won her affection, he played the base part of a betrayer and seducer, and accomplished her ruin. He continued his attentions, until about three months after, when he coolly told the young lady that he could not think of marrying a girl who had not money.

The parties at this time removed to Niagara—on learning from the young lady that she was likely to become a mother, Monroe exclaimed, "Good God! then I must clear out of this." About three weeks after, he left Niagara, and had no communication with the family since, Miss Hamilton, broken-hearted and wretched, was taken ill, and for months confined to bed, under the continual care of medical attendants. The Doctor attending her, discovered the cause of her complaint, and at her request, communicated it to her parents.

The Jury after a short deliberation, found a Verdict for £700 damages.

There were no other cases to-day, of any public interest.

WEDNESDAY, NOV. 13.

ADAMSON vs. JARVIS.—Action against the Sheriff for trespass.

J. H. Cameron and C. Jones, for plaintiff—Van Koughnet and S. M. Jarvis for defendant.

The circumstances under which this action was brought are these. About ten years ago, a gentleman named Alexander Proudfoot, obtained a judgment against Charles Mitchell, son-in-law to Col. Adamson, the plaintiff in this suit. Mitchell and his father-in-law lived near each other on separate farms. Last summer Proudfoot took out execution against Mitchell, and placed it in the Sheriff's hands under which the Sheriff seized several things, cattle, crops, &c., on the farm where Mitchell was living. The things seized were not removed or sold at that time, but left on the premises. About three months afterwards, the Sheriff, at Proudfoot's direction, proceeded to sell the property seized, Colonel Adamson, having in the interval, left the country and gone to England. The plaintiff claimed the property seized as belonging to him. The Sheriff being indemnified, sold the goods, and on this ground the action was brought. On the part of the defence it was held, that the goods seized were bona fide the property of Mitchell and not as alleged, belonging to Col. Adamson.

The case occupied the Court almost the whole day. At half-past four o'clock P. M., the Jury retired, and after a short absence returned with a verdict for plaintiff £140 16s. 6d. damages.

The Grand Jury brought in the following bills:—Jane McIntyre, murder, "true bill."—William Walker, larceny, "true bill."—Simon Foley, larceny, "true bill."—Altha Mitchell, Avis Bennett, and Anna M. Bell, larceny, "true bill." They also found four bills against George Lay for burglary.

George Lay was arraigned on four indictments. 1st. For robbing the residence of Dr. McCaul. 2nd. For robbing Mr Strange. 3rd. For robbing Mr Crickmore. 4th. For robbing Colonel Antrobus—and pleaded not guilty to all.

Jane McIntyre was brought up on charge of murdering her husband. The prisoner is an old woman, perfectly insane. On being asked if she was guilty or not, she commenced a crazy speech to the bench, stating that she was Lady Jane Grey, that she ought to have killed her husband long ago, and willing to leave it to the "arbitration of redemption." She was immediately removed.

Altha Mitchell, Anna Mitchell, and Avis Bennett, were arraigned for larceny—but owing to their being wrongly named in the indictments had to be remanded until fresh ones could be made out.

EARNEST vs. PALMER, et al.—Action for trespass and assault. The circumstances of this case were of a very trivial character, arising out of a disputed boundary. It took the Court a length of time to try it, and resulted in a Verdict for Defendants.

THURSDAY NOV. 14.

The trial of George Lay, on the first indictment, viz:—for robbing Mr Strange's residence, which took place to-day, occupied the Court about eleven hours, and resulted at ten o'clock in a Verdict of GUILTY.

FRIDAY, NOV. 15.

John McGuire was brought up for stealing a Coat. The person stated to the party who lost the coat when he was asked about it, that he had taken it in the dark thinking it was his own, but having found out his mistake was ashamed to return it—Verdict "not guilty."

James Murphy was arraigned on two indictments for assault. On the first he was convicted, on the second, pleaded "guilty."

The Court was occupied for the rest of the day, with the trial of George Lay, for robbing the resi-

dence of Dr. McCaul. The Jury retired at about nine o'clock, and returned in an hour's time with a verdict of Guilty, stating that they formed their verdict irrespective of Talbot's evidence, and expressing also, their opinion, that Talbot ought to be put upon trial.—Patriot.

UNITED STATES.

Anti-Slavery Excitement.

The following spicy remarks, are from the New York Herald of Saturday. Hard names, happily, are not argument, or the Herald might be able to prop a sinking cause, by hurling a volley of invectives at the electors of the Tower Hamlets. But George Thompson's character in his own country, stands high in the estimation of all that knew him:

"ANOTHER ANTI-SLAVERY EXCITEMENT BREWING.—George Thompson, the first Englishman who started in this country, the anti-slavery agitation, has again visited these shores, after worming himself in the British Parliament, through the votes of the Socialists of London "Tower Hamlets."—the most corrupt district of small politicians in this mundane sphere. After being a firebrand in this country, he returned to England to abuse our institutions, and to take part in the anti-com-law agitation, that led to his subsequent seat in the House of Commons. We shall not, at present stop to arry against him, the evidences of his notorious conduct in his own country. It is enough that he has been an agitator, unscrupulously bent on hurling ridicule upon the American character, and upon our institutions. He is the representative of the mind of the lowest class of Englishmen, besetted with ignorance and very bad beer.

The honesty of George Thompson's political career is to be discovered in no act of his life; and it is not unlikely, if he is not an agent of Palmerston that he comes out here under the auspices of the East India Company. He has been elevated into place by the Socialist politicians, who, midst the fumes of tobacco and ale, go through fire and smoke on a small scale, for any loud talker who can appeal to their passions and prejudices. We have watched him closely ever since he left this country—have been on his track in Scotland, in Birmingham, Leeds, Manchester, ad even down as low as the dark streets of the Tower Hamlets—the rendezvous of coal heavers and coal whippers, by whose black hands he was lifted into parliament. We know his course on the Brazil and the West India sugar question—and the whole train of his ambitious designs for the overthrow of this country's peace, by the constant correspondence he has kept up with the abolition party of the Northern States; and under all circumstances, we are persuaded to advise him if he values not the peace of this country, to value his own, and to be exceedingly careful to restrain his tongue in this country. The difficulties which beset us are quite sufficient, without the presence of any foreign agitator, bent on the disunion and dissolution of these States, with the fancied belief of aiding British manufactures, George Thomson be careful!

STEAMER SEIZED—ANOTHER EXPEDITION AFLOAT.

—We learn that some fortnight since that steamer Apure, Captain Wakefield, built at Philadelphia, and was designed as was supposed for Venezuela left Philadelphia secretly in the night without clearing at the Custom House, and without papers. Accordingly orders were despatched by telegraph to all the southern ports to seize her in case she should enter any one of them. Finally, on the 13th inst., a gale of weather compelled the Captain to put into Wilmington, N. C., in a very badly damaged condition. There the steamer was seized and prosecution commenced against her commander for violating the revenue laws. We understand that she did not belong to Venezuela and was not destined for that country. From the best information we can obtain (and this is by no means precise) she was on her way to St. Domingo; and is supposed to have been intended for an expedition against Cuba, of which that or some other West Indian island to be the rallying place. When she was seized there were no arms or military stores on board of her.—N. Y. Tribune.

CRIMINAL TRIAL.—John Choulerton or Charlton,

was charged with manslaughter for killing his wife at Sorel. There were several witnesses; but the result of their evidence may be stated in a very concise manner. The occurrence in question took place on Sunday morning, when an altercation occurred between the deceased and the prisoner, in the course of which the wife slapped her husband's face. Prisoner then ran after her and struck her, upon which deceased said, "You old thief, if I could get a stick, I would serve you out." She afterwards seized a knife and threatened prisoner. He then seized her by the neck, and struck her once or twice, saying he would teach her to take a knife to him again. Deceased then leaned her head on the bed, and a short time after was seen to foam at the mouth, by the witnesses, who had previously regarded the blows as entirely insignificant. A doctor was afterwards sent for, but the woman died. Prisoner was described to be a man of general good character though somewhat too much addicted to drink, very kind of his wife, and excessively afflicted, when she complained of the pain caused by the blows he had given her. Prisoner was defended by Mr Carter, Mr Justice Aylwin summoned up, and the Jury, after retiring for some time, brought in a verdict of not Guilty.—Guilty.

D. D. CONFERRED ON A COLORED CLERGYMAN.—

Rev. J. W. Henington, a colored clergyman of New York, lately received the title of Doctor of Divinity from the University of Heidelberg, of Germany. During the late session of the Peace Congress, Mr Henington visited Heidelberg to receive the Doctorate. The ceremony of presenting the diploma was accompanied with the following words;—"You are the first African who has received dignity from a European University, and it is the University of Heidelberg that thus pronounces the universal brotherhood of humanity." The new Doctor returned thanks in the name of his brethren of Africa and America. He expressed a hope that the time is not far distant when slavery will every-where cease, and all races be united in fraternal bonds. He then pronounced a short address in Latin, instead of the usual Latin dispute, and the ceremony ended."