our of an uniform tariff of 17½ ent fancy goods included in a certain

commissioned officers of the Prince Own Rifles, Montreal, will visit Invincibles, on the 25th May, to the presentation of a stand of the Foot Guards.

telegram from Halifax states that Dorth has made a serious charge Speaker of the House of Assemappears that a warrant for the arrest official as been issued. The ssma has been prolific of sensations n past few days.

Tom Paxton, a veteran of 1812, residence at Amherstburg on Monday. He was supposed to have served in the Provincial Artillery at the Queenston Heights and Landy's

evening about six o'clock a man ahaf of Whitehouse was found in bed-rooms of the American Hotel, with his throat cut from below his ly around the neck. A large pool was on the floor where the unfortunate lay, and a large jack-knife with evidently cut his own throat. He about noon in apparently good and was talking with some of the the house.

Serial Stone Works at Montreal ased by fire on Monday night to the $3,000.

took place in Cobourg at an early day morning, causing damage to ut of $10,000.

in Livingstone, of Listowel, has ed to remark on the subject, and travelling

Alexander Mackenzie, Premier was one of the guests at the Sir Archibishop Tache, given by the of the House of Commons last

er of locked-out agricultural labourer at Quebec by the Sarmatian, and brought to Ontario under the of the Government of this Pro-

ighthouse keeper at Owen Sound had escape Tuesday of being lost by ing of his boat in the ice. Fortuproperller within hail got up steam ended to his rescue.

ARTHUR ORTON.

AND SENTENCE OF LUIE AND BROWN.

Saturday, April 11, the trial of Jane before Mr. Justice Brett came to n past before the close the Judge said

ar tell your own story. The principal against you is that you swore you board the Osprey, and that whilst ere in that vessel you picked up the the Bella, and that I am sure is the claimant. If this is untrue you must shown it at the time you made the nt. The prosecution have proved ls in nature, because that you have that you were in England at the time these circumstances occurred. You either that you were not in England tously before the trial in the Court of Bench, but they prove that this is e case and that you were in the country before the period when you say you

oner: Well, my lord, during my nmination in the Court of Queen's

I objected to answer the questions awkins relating to my past life and the ssues I had met with, but the Lord ustice ordered me to answer them.

As to the answers I gave were those first came into my mind at the time. number of witnesses have been called to speak to having known me in 1853 54, and one of them even says that in ebellion of nine. Well, how is it for me to contradict this man, when entirely without assistance. I could if I chose bring forward persons who would that these witnesses are entirely mistaken, but I have never had a wonderful ty to recollect a person or distinguish ses from another when he has not for a period of two years at especially to recollect him, and seeing him in a place like this ot been able to be defended I could have ed witnesses who would certainly sub my story to a searching enquiry. Regarding these later periods of 1867 and ese misfortunes fell upon my head. ey say of me is true. But respecting periods 1852, '53, and '54, I have ot a shadow of a shadow to fear. I don't ent witnesses have perjured themselves, be if they did in the estate. Now, therefore, sides must have done so in a similar , but I have to say that, among hundred witnesses—was no single witnesses—I have been selected as the sole ost serious charge. I say that I should suffer the inconvenience of I am placed. It can be proved, and ent as a fact, that the Osprey ly which I joined at New Orleans 1854, was the same with the Bella, existed. It would have been sufficient to the jury had had an opportunity of calling me. Had it not been for the misfortune you foreboded, by the Judge, upon me, I certainly should not have given the ns I have given, because I stood in an ent position whichever way I turned. very sorry that I have taken up the your Lordship and the jury in prejudice me, and in keeping all the witnesses him I am not able to bring company ence, but I trust the time will come n the fact of the existence of the Osprey ll will be proved. At the same time your Lordship will be as lenient in your ements towards me as possible. I hope ind that I have still eighteen months' of servitude to serve.

prisoner, who throughout his examination and cross-examination in the Court of Bench, his examination at Sorel, and the present trial up to this point, preserved a calm demeanour, and exhibited considerable firmness of character, ntage of the proceedings completely n down. His face was frequently hidden from behind his pocket-handkerief, and were almost inaudible.

he learned judge resumed his summing until next morning.

Friday, April 10, Mr. Justice Brett ned up. He said the prisoner at the bar charged with wilful and corrupt perjury his trial when Arthur Orton was charged ith perjury. In order to prove that, the ecution must prove that the person ich he (the learned judge) held to be ent, was answered falsely by the prisoner. Orton said he was taken on board Bella at Rio, was shipwrecked and ed by the Osprey, and taken to Mahere. He swore that he embarked at Rio, shipwrecked and rescued by the Osprey, takes to Melbourne. He swore that he embarked at Rio, but it was an almost fatal ent in his case that if sailors had been ard the Bella, they would have come forward. So that it was almost inconceivable that no one on board the Osprey should have said, "We did up a boat's crew." Nobody did so—it is a great blot on his case. It was in sequence of that blot, and some hundreds of others, that the jury had to weigh the Sir Roger Tichborne. The case was ed by the plaintiff sleeping in the ment; but for all practical purposes he ly had decided he was not the man. He then put upon his trial for perjury. His memory of what took place on board the ella was another blot on his case. He ew nothing whilst he was being tried for perjury. A likely mode of serving him was ne man one to come and say that seen him put on board the Bella. The safety of family and the interests of public justice ade it most important that perjury committed should not be brought forward to interrupt the case. It was under those circumstances that the prisoner came forward in his period of the trial, that he was prepared to give evidence he gave was that he had seen ad man who was being tried for perjury on board the Bella, that he was not put ll the lazarette, and that the Claimant was drunk. Captain Oates and Captain Hankins were also examined for the prosecution, and he said that they were both drunk. Oates was, in his opinion, of a colour to the Claimant's statement that he was so drunk that he did not know what had taken place on board the Bella. It was undoubted that he swore these things, and the question for the jury was whether it swayed the witness falsely. They were not asked to say that it was the Claimant who was put on board the ship, but to say whether the prisoner in what he had sworn had sworn that which he knew to be untrue. Then, again, he swore that he knew Jean Luie as one of the barque Osprey. Upon this he spoke with the utmost particularity and certainty—not only that he knew a Jean Luie, but that he knew the identical Jean Luie who has been tried. They had heard evidence to show that Jean Luie was in this country during the whole of 1853 and 1854. The statement of the prisoner as to this was false in fact, but the prisoner said, in answer to that, that he made a mistake in his man. He did make a mistake, it would not be perjury; but at the same time it would not do to pass it lightly over. Then he had further sworn that the Luie of whom he spoke was the mate of the Osprey; he swore to the absolute drunkenness of the captain and the whole crew, and he swore that the man was not put in the lazarette, but in the after cabin. They had had Captain Oates and Captain Hankins examined, both of whom had sworn that the whole of the story was untrue, and the whole question before them was, did they believe in Captain Hankins and Captain Oates's statements, or did they believe the statements of the prisoner? Now, it was for them to remember that Captain Oates was a master of the merchant service for twenty-five years. That was an evidence of respectability. He said in his evidence that he knew the Bella and Captain Birkett. If his story was true, Captain Birkett lost his honour as a sailor, and by his misconduct lost his ship. The suggestion amounted to that. Captain Oates said he was on board on the morning the ship sailed, to assist to get young gentleman away who had some pecuniary difficulty. Roger Tichborne was short of money at Rio. It was not strictly correct, but it could not do much harm. Captain Oates said he went to his own ship from the Bella, and did not go on shore. He said Captain Birkett, the steward, and himself arranged that the young man would be stowed in the lazarette, in some place below the after cabin, where there was plenty of room, and where a man could easily be stowed away. Captain Oates referred to the Claimant's visit to the ship, and the inquiries made by him then he said that the officer told him he must leave the ship, and he did so. He swore positively that neither himself, Captain Hankins, Captain Birkett, or the young man was drunk. If that evidence were true, the prisoner had sworn that which was false. His account was wholly inconsistent with that of Captain Oates. He stated that the carpenter was so drunk that he could not take out a panel to stow away the young man, and therefore he (prisoner) had to do so. There was nothing against the character of Captain Hankins, and he had drunk the same things as Captain Oates. The prisoner had shown a knowledge of the Rio, with one exception, that he was at Rio when another had sold on. Now these captains said that water was not laid on, neither was gas, at Rio. That would look as if he had been at Rio. But it did not go to the point. If he had been in Rio afterwards it would account for his knowledge of the place, and they knew from the certificates that he was there in 1863. The only point which he had made was about that French ship which capsized, but the jury must consider whether that was sufficient to upset the other evidence. If they believed Captain Oates and Captain Hankins, it seemed to him that there could be but one result. With regard to prisoner's knowing Luie, it was obvious that he was not there in 1853. So that in swearing that, he has sworn to that which was untrue, but at the same time they would have to consider whether it so swerved as to make a mistake. The only thing he cared about was that the jury should give a faithful and honest verdict, and say, after taking the materiality of the case into account, whether they believed it to be wrongly stated on oath that which was not true—that which he knew to be untrue. The document produced before the examiner, in which he gave an account of his past services, if true, would go to show that he was not at Rio at the time that he said he was.

The jury, after a moment's consultation in the box, found the prisoner guilty.

Mr. Poland, at this point, proposed to proceed with the charge of bigamy against Luie.

Mr. Justice Brett said the prosecution must exercise their own discretion as to whether it should be proceeded with or not; but he would not make it a case of commutation of punishment.

Mr. Leblanc de St. Aubyn said the second reading of the Criminal Justice Act Amendment Bill, for the Province of New Brunswick Amendment Bill. Carried.

The House adjourned at 5 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Dr. Schultz, in moving a resolution for a Royal Commission to enquire into the North-west disturbance, said the recent discussions of this House, as well as the indications of interest shown by the country generally through the press, proved the importance of the subject of which his motion treated. He explained at some length the reason for the motion, and was replied to by Mr. Mackenzie, a short debate ensuing, after which the motion was withdrawn.

Dr. Rabbidge moved for a Select Committee to inquire as to the best and most direct route for the construction of a railway or railways between the Dominion of Canada and Europe, the possibility of navigating the Gulf of St. Lawrence during the winter months, and of finding on the shores of the Dominion a harbour accessible both in winter and summer, to be the terminus of such shortest route.

Messrs. Tupper, Mackay, and Laird having spoken in favour of the motion, it was adopted.

M. Tremblay moved for any correspondence between the Government of the Rt. Lawrence Tow-boat Company, or any of the directors or agents thereof, on the subject of hauling the "wharves below Quebec. 2. A statement showing the sums collected as wharfage dues, payable to the Department of Public Works, and the sum paid to the Government for each of the said wharves. 3. A statement showing the number of wharves held by the ex-Minister of Public Works, the Hon. Jean Langevin, C.B., in the stock of the said Tow-boat Company at the time when the lease of such wharves was granted to the Government, 4. Whether no his motion he charged the late Minister of Public Works with having, in his official capacity, shown an unusually favourable contract with the St. Lawrence Tow-boat Company, whereby toll stations, therefore public were out of all proportion to the accommodation afforded.

Dr. Rabbidge read a communication from M. Langevin, denying that at the time of the contract with the St. Lawrence Tow-boat Company he had been a stock-holder in the said company.

Sir John Macdonald said that, inasmuch as this was an attack upon one of his colleagues, who was absent, it was his duty to say something in his defence. He denied that at the time of the giving of the contract M. Langevin was a stockholder in the St. Lawrence Tow-boat Company, and produced an affidavit from the present Secretary of the Tow-boat Company, to that effect, adding that the contract was not with the Department of Public Works, but with the late Minister of Public Works.

Mr. Scott replied, in reference to section four, that $438,000 had been claimed. The Commissioner had reported that $50,000 had paid, but the engineer in charge objected. With regard to section seven, the contract price, $557,000, had become due and had been paid, a small sum in excess was claimed, in which the commissioner had not approved, but they had not sufficient evidence as yet to justify further payment.

The motion was carried.

M. Letellier de St. Just moved the second reading of a bill to amend the Railway Construction Amendment Bill from the Commons.

A long discussion followed, in which the Government denied having written or inspired a certain editorial in the Ottawa Times with regard to the subject, and the bill was subsequently read a second time.

M. Letellier de St. Just moved the second reading of the Criminal Justice Act