LAW OF LIBEL.

The Queen vs. Thomson & Rice, for *Libel.*—This prosecution, as our readers are already aware, was instituted by Dr. Holmes, a Coroner of this District, for charging him with *packing* the Jury in the case of *Fraser* vs. *Dickson*. We were not a little surprised at seeing the matter urged to trial in the absence of the prosecutor, who thought it better not to risk a visit to Perth, especially during *Court time*. The Queen's Counsel stated the case pretty strongly against us, and called witnesses to prove publication. Mr. Radenhurst was our Counsel, and addressed the Jury in our behalf. Justas Richey, Esq., was called in the defence, to prove *home* the *truth* of our charge against the *immaculate* Coroner, and that the article was not conceived in *malice*, but *he would not be heard*—the law forbids justification, or proof of *no* malicious intention! What a miserable relic of a barbarous age is this! The Judge's charge to the Jury was in favour of *the* law, and the case was left to them to decide by their verdict, upon the issue of which depended whether the Press should be *gagged* or *free*. Their verdict was, that the Press SHOULD be FREE! We have no fear, in such cases as this, when we have an enlightened Jury to deal with—and it affords us pleasure to say that the Bathurst District is not wanting in many such. Supposing, for instance, that the Jury in this case had been one ignorant and unenlightened, blinded by prejudice and passion, their verdict might have been a different one.—We might have been found guilty—and for what? for informing the people (a duty which we owe to them) of the *corruption* of one of their public servants. In effect this would be saying, "it is true that we, the people, through our representatives, have the appointment of our own public servants—we have a Press to watch the doings of these men, and regularly to inform us of their conduct if they act *corruptly* or *dishonestly*; but we want no such guardians of our interests any longer—our *servants* may just do as they please, and the Press that speaks against them when they wrong us, we shall punish." The man, upon being told that his pocket was *picked*, and directed to where he would find the ruffian whom did so, who would turn round and treat his kind informant with *blows* instead of *thanks*, could not act less gratefully than the people who would *gag* their Press for fulfilling its duty to them. Such conduct, however, we are glad to be enabled to say, there is little fear of the people of the Bathurst District ever evincing. We know there are a few malicious spirits among us, who would both *gag* and *burk* us if it were in their power; but we are beyond their reach. When we *unjustly* and *maliciously* assail private character and slander it, then we would feel that our position was a wrong one, and deserving of the infliction of the libel law—but not till then. The very *intelligence* that now, on public grounds acquits us of crime, would in such a case condemn us.—*Bathurst Courier.*

Murder and Arson.—About 4 o'clock on the morning of Friday last, we were aroused from our slumbers by the ringing of the firebell. On arriving at the scene of the conflagration, we perceived a small house, or shanty, occupied by Mr. David Frew and family, completely enveloped in flames, which were communicated to an adjacent dwelling, the property of Mr. Duncan Mc Kecler, which was also completely consumed. When the shanty was burnt to the ground the horrifying spectacle of the mutilated and calcined remains of a human being were distinctly seen by the spectators. On enquiry, it began to be strongly suspected that the relics of another individual must be somewhere amongst the ruins, which unfortunately, proved but too true.—Upon examination, the corpse of Jane Norman and Hannah Frew were found, the latter being the wife of the said David Frew, the whole affair being the result of intemperance—certainly a loud warning to all who indulge in the use of intoxicating liquors.

From the circumstance of the drunken and riotous proceedings which had been witnessed there during the night, and from the fact that Frew had saved himself and two children from the fire, leaving his wife behind, suspicion began to point towards him as a murderer and incendiary.

On the inquest which was held on the bodies by John R. Benson, Esq., Coroner, sufficient evidence was produced to induce the Jury to return a Verdict of *Wilful Murder and Arson* against David Frew, in the case of Jane Norman. With respect to the death of his wife, though it was strongly suspected that she had been deprived of life to cover the murder of Norman, still no evidence was produced to prove such a diabolical act, and the Jury could do no more than to state that her death was the result of his riotous conduct and drunkenness. He was committed to take his trial at the present Assizes.—*Peterborough Gazette.*

"A Poser for the Abolition of Capital Punishment.—In the State of Maine the laws do not permit a man to be hanged until one year after the sentence has been pronounced. At this present moment there is an unhappy wretch cooped up in a cell, eight feet by four, in the prison of Augusta, waiting to be hanged! In his cell there is no window—the only light and ventilation being afforded by a small hole over the door. We are coolly told that he is not expected to survive the winter! We should think not. Now we should like to know whether it is not better to hang a man at once than thus deliberately torture him to death? We like not this 'quality of mercy,' and think it rather over *strained.*"

We are unable to perceive the "poser" for the Abolitionists of Capital Punishment, contained in the above paragraph, which we copy from the *Morning Courier* of Saturday. By what rule of logic does it follow that because in the State of Maine they once shut up a prisoner in a rather minute dungeon for the space of twelve calendar months, and *hanged him* at the end of that period, that therefore it would not be advisable, on grounds of policy and morality, to do away with hanging altogether? or when have the Abolitionists of Capital Punishment said anything in favour of cooping up unhappy wretches in cells eight feet by four? With regard to the law delaying the execution of prisoners for a year, or longer, which obtains in the State of Maine and in many other parts of the Union, we are not at all sure that it is not a very wise and humane one. So long as human beings are fallable, jurors will sometimes err in their verdicts, and innocent men must therefore often suffer crimes of which they are in reality guiltless. This is perhaps one of the strongest of the many conclusive arguments in favour of the abolition of a punishment which is irrevocable, and when it so frequently happens that the innocence of supposed criminals is conclusively established after their conviction, it is well that even so short a period as one year should be permitted to elapse before the sentence of the law is put into execution in cases where the extreme penalty is to be inflicted—a sentence which once put into execution can *never* be revoked.

If we are not mistaken the particular case alluded to by the *Courier* is that of a Dr. Cooledge, recently convicted of an atrocious murder at Augusta, and sentenced—not to be hanged—but to imprisonment for life in the State Prison. We have no doubt that the dimensions of his cell have been somewhat exaggerated, or rather diminished, until they reached our contemporary in their present contracted form.—Every one remembers the story of the three black crows. As the prisoner was in an extremely delicate state of health at the time of his trial, we do not see anything very extraordinary in his not being "expected to survive the winter." Altogether we must say we think the *Courier* has failed to *pose* the Abolitionists of Capital Punishment this time, for even granting the whole truth of his story; supposing that the prisoner in Maine is lodged in rather an inconveniently small cell, and deprived of those two indispensables, light and air, and allowing that it is more inhuman to subject a man to such a confinement than to choke him to death in the presence of hundreds of his fellowmen, a question which we will not stop to discuss now, what then? We have yet to learn that inhumanity towards the criminal is the only or chief argument to be urged in favour of the repeal of the hanging law, there are other and higher considerations which have been so often repeated that we need not go over them now, but which will, we are convinced, triumph in the end, and in spite of the opposition offered by a certain class to every reform, in the end achieve the final overthrow of the gibbet in this and in every Christian country—*Pilot.*

Another Melancholy Occurence from bringing loaded Fire-arms into a house.—On the evening of Tuesday the 24th ult. a person who had been hunting, arrived at the house of Mr. John Clifford, in the 8th Concession of Augusta, who is by trade a cooper, and as it was then raining very heavy, and the night dark, Clifford invited the stanger to come in and have his clothes dried and take some refreshments, which invitation he accepted, leaving his fowling piece in the outer room, which was used as a work-shop. There was a person of the name of William Sheaham, who had been working with Clifford during the day, remaining also in the house in consequence of the rain and darkness of the day, and who offered to chop some wood which had been brought into the outer room or workshop, where the gun had been leaning against the partition near the door leading into the inner room, with the muzzle down. After chopping a couple of sticks it is supposed the shaking of the floor caused the gun to fall, and the lock striking the floor produced an explosion of the barrel, the whole contents of which (pigeon shot) entered poor Sheaham's thigh near the groin, lacerating the Femoral artery so that he bled to death before assistance could be procured. Neither the deceased nor Clifford knew of the gun having been brought into the house.—*Prescott Telegraph.*

The Late Execution at Niagara.—The Halifax *Novascotian*, in noticing the horrible circumstances attending the execution of Brennan in the town of Niagara a few weeks back, says:—

"Who can describe the effects of witnessing such an awful scene as the one thus briefly described? Could it have had a salutary effect? Or is it not rather a libel upon mercy, humanity, and even *justice*, to take life for life, and blood for blood? Even were it a *just* principle, how disgraceful *such* an execution. Oh, that men could see with our eyes, and feel the injustice and criminality of a law which demands "a tooth for a tooth, and an eye for an eye." Thank Heaven! this law was centuries since superseded by one of gracious forbearance—of God-like mercy!—Why then should man persist in enactments which are contrary to the requirements of justice? Why should he not attempt to remove the evil by Heaven's plan? by acting on the economy of the Gospel, instead of the economy of Moses?"

Thrilling Incipent at the Menagrie—Noble Gallantry of the Lion.—On Thursday of last week, during the heavy storm of wind and rain, while the extensive collection of wild beasts in the menagerie of Messrs. Raymond & Waring was in the village of Norwalk, a feature was introduced in the exhibition not previously announced in the bills. About 4 o'clock in the afternoon a violent gust of wind blew down the canvas which forms the large pavilion, completely enveloping the spectators and cages of animals in one common mass of confusion.

The accident happened at the time when Miss Adelina, the Lion Queen as she is styled, was performing in the den of wild beasts, and as the fright of the animals rendered them seemingly uncontrolable, great fears were entertained for the safety of that interesting young lady.

At this moment a scene of indescribable terror and confusion presented itself. The roaring of the terrified beasts, the screams of women and children, and the "peltings of the pittiless storm" without, rendered the scene truly appalling. The panic, however, was but momentary, as the prompt and energetic measures taken by the managers soon cleared the wreck, no person having received the slightest injury. But the intensely interesting incident remains to be told. The uproar among the lions, tigers and leopards in the performing cage, gave rise to a report that they were devouring Miss Adelina. In the next instant the canvas was stripped from the cage, when a tableaux presented itself such as would defy either poet, painter, or sculptor to portray with accuracy. In the centre of the den a young and beautiful lion, (the same recently presented to Gen. Cass by the Emperor of Morocco,) in a rampant position, formed the strong feature of the picture; beneath one of his hind feet lay stretched the dead body of a leopard, and struggling within the invincible grasp of the fore paws were the tigor and surviving leopard. In the opposite end of the cage, transfixed as a statute of marble, with dauntless eye and majestic attitude, the same as when she commands the wild beats to crouch at her feet, stood the Lion Queen, Miss Adelina. The young lady states that the two leopards and the tiger made a simultaneous spring for her at the moment the canvass was blown down, and were repulsed by the noble gallantry of the lion, who bounded between them and protected her in the manner described. The presence of the keeper, Mr. Pierce, soon reduced the savage group to subjection, and the Lion Queen was happily relieved from a farther participation in this extra performance.—*N. Y. True Sun.*

ONE WEEK LATER NEWS.

From Liverpool, 28th Oct.

Toronto, November 9, 4½ P. M.

This afternoon, the arrival of the steamship *America*, at New-York, was unexpectedly announced by telegraph having sailed from Liverpool on saturday, 28th ultimo, making the passage across in twelve days and a few hours including the stoppage at Halifax. The *America* arrived at New-York on Wednesday at midnight. The report which we have received, at the time of our writing, is confined to the state of the Markets, and conveys information of a decline of prices, and an advance in the rate of duties on foreign produce. Cotton has fallen ¼d.; and corn is reported firm at last week's quotations. Flour—Western Canal, 30s; Sour, 27s 6d. Wheat, 7s 3d to 8s 6d; being a decline of 1s 6d on flour, and 3d on wheat. The arrivals have been large, and the market depressed.

Corn 34s a 36s 6d; Meal 17s. The duty on Wheat has advanced to 5s per quarter, and on Flour to 3s per barrel. The London Money Market is firm; Consols 85¾.

The following additional particulars have just been received by Telegraph from Buffalo, the other line by Troy being out of order, and the present is therefore a special report:—

IRELAD.

We have intelligence that O'Brian and his associates have had their sentence commuted to transportation for life.

The trial of C. J. Duffy, at the Commission before Justice Torrens, had concluded, but the Jury, we learn, had not returned their verdict at the last accounts. This special commission, which is perhaps the most protracted ever held in Ireland, has at length been adjourned to the 5th December, after occupying no less a period of time than twenty three days. In answer to the Lord Chief Justice's usual formal questions, "what they had to say in objection to the sentence."

Messrs. M'Manus and Meagher replied in a strain of eloquence that would compare well with that of Emmett.

At the commission on the 25th, Michael Morgan one of the three clubbists, who, in July last, stabbed the constable Byrne, in George street, was convicted of wounding with intent to do grievous bodily harm.

The sentence will be transportation for life. The Lord Lieutenant and family have returned to England on a visit. Mr. Whiteside's retaining fee in the case of O'Brien was £500. Positive information has been received, with great pleasure by the friends of Dillon, of his escape to America. He escaped in the disguise of a fisherman. The law being considered vindicated by the conviction of the leaders of the late insurrection, Lord Clarendon admitted to bail 11 persons arrested under the Habeas Corpus Suspencion Act. The trial of Duffy, &c., was to take place the week after sailing of the steamer. The Irish papers give a deplorable picture of the state of the country, through the state of the potatoe crop, the want of employment, and the disposition of the people to make off with the produce of the land without regard to the payment of any rents or taxes. The spirit of emigration was rife. Multitudes were flocking to the seaports to escape the country.

FRAFCE.

The discussion of the constitntion was terminated by the Assembly on the 23rd. Before it is finally proclaimed it will have to undergo a division. On the 27 the French Assembly divided—587 to 232—fixed upon the 10th Decr., as the day on which the Presidential election should take place. Nothing further of interest in the Assembly.

TAVERN LICENSES IN TORONTO.

We published in our last the presentment of the Graud Jury at the late Assizes, in which the following paragraph occurs:—

"The Grand Jury have noticed with deep concern that the greater part of offences which engaged the attention of the Court during the present Assizes, have occured when the parties were in a state of intoxication. (*Almost every case of murder, burglary, larceny, and assault has been traced to, and found connected with some one of the numerous small taverns and grog-shops with which the city of Toronto is infested,*) a number of which are known not to possess the qualification required by the law. And as the Mayor and Common Council of the City may be considered as the principle cause of such nuisances, the Grand Jury feel themselves called upon to bring the subject under the consideration of the public, in the hope that the city authorities will see the necessity of curtailing the number of such places for the future; or should the system of indiscriminately granting licenses within the limits of the city still prevail, that the interference of the Legislature may be invoked to remedy an evil so subversive to morality and good order."

We have often drawn attention to the evils arising from the number of small drinking-houses in Toronto, and the public are indebted to the Grand Jury for bringing them prominently forward in this manner. But we consider that too much blame is laid by them on the shoulders of the Corporation. The truth is, that a defect in our license law renders it impossible to prevent these houses being opened. The act was passed in 1837; by it two classes of taverns were to be licensed, inns with a large license fee, and shops for selling beer with a small fee. But no penalty was imposed for the infraction of the latter arrangement, so that beer has been sold throughout the province without any license whatever.—It is a very extraordinary circumstance, that the late Ministry, although they were well informed on the matter, did not attempt to remedy this defect when they introduced their amended License Law in 1846. We know they were well informed on the matter because the blank Beer-shop Licenses were, and still are regularly sent up from Montreal, although they were never used, and the government was informed by the inspectors that such was the case. Probably Mr. Sherwood did not wish to be too rigid with so large a body of his *respectable* constituents as the beer sellers. It is evident that the law requires amendment, and we would most earnestly recommend that the beer-shops as a class be done away with altogether. We cannot see why beer should be sold on a different footing from other intoxicating liquors. It is quite certain, that if you license a house for the sale of beer, that any other liquor may be sold in it, with very little chance of detection. It is evident that if all taverns were placed on the same footing the number would be greatly reduced; the number of regularly licensed Inns at present being about 150, while the beer shops have been estimated as high as 300.—*The Globe.*

Fatal Accident.—A man named James Carrall, employed in Leavitt's axe factory, Dundas, was instantaniously killed on Tuesday last, by the bursting of a grindstone, impelled by water power. The unfortunate man was crushed in a dreadful manner, and the stone, in flying from its place, was forced through the walls of the building a considerable distance.—*Hamilton Spectator.*

The weather.—Within the last few days we have had all sorts of weather—wind, rain, sunshine, frost, and snow. The roads are now pretty well frozen, and a little more snow would make tolerable sleighing. However desirable this may be for travellers, we dare say the farmers would prefer a little more soft weather to enable them to complete their Fall ploughing. If the winter sets in now, fodder will be very scarce before Spring.—*Bathurst Courier.*

HURON SIGNAL.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1848.

A LIFE-LIKENESS OF TORYISM.

The short discussion which took place at the meeting of School Teachers and School Trustees on Saturday last, suggested a few thoughts which may be useful to the public in the future management of their District affairs. And as we believe that the chief duty of a public Journalist is to write for the benefit of the public, and for the protection of the public interests, irrespective of fear or favour from particular individuals, we will lay these thoughts honestly before our readers. The Teachers of Common Schools are the worst paid and the poorest, while at the same time, they are the most useful class in society; and when by either fraud or negligence they are deprived of the wretched pittance which law and the conventional arrangment of the people have awarded them, the man must be heartless indeed who cannot feel for them;—but as sympathy alone will not supply the necessities of themselves and families, it is necessary that something more tangible than pity should be extended towards them.

John Stewart, Esq., Barrister, informed the meeting that the Warden proposed to make up so much of the deficiency occasioned through Bignall's scoundrelism, by appropriating to that purpose a certain considerable sum that is expected to be paid over by the London District to the authorities of Huron. Now although the Warden and Council have no more right to appropriate this sum to the liquidation of Bignall's debts, than they have to appropriate any equal sum of the local taxes for such a purpose; yet we believe that most men in the District would submit to such an appropriation rather than allow the School Teachers to suffer. But this sum from the London District is not available at present. It is *ours* only prospectively, and before we could lay our hands tangibly upon it, the Schoolmasters might be dead for want of the necessaries of life; therefore this generous proposal of the Warden is entitled to a place among those innumerable impracticable propositions which come under the head of "good intentions."

We think a more generous and certainly a more common sense method of relieving the immediate necessities of the School Teachers, would be for the Warden of the District and Bignall's securities to obtain from the Bank, on their joint note, a sum equivalent to the amount of Bignall's fraud. The note could be drawn at six months, and before that period elapsed, the matter would be so investigated as to shew the legal means of meeting the exigency; and at the very worst, the District, if no other redress can be obtained, will tolerate a special tax to the amount of £454 13 4 rather than have the poor Teachers insulted and robbed by a useless mass of sottish indolence like John Bignall. In the meantime, it is necessary that the people should endeavour to understand the nature of the whole transaction, and ascertain if possible, who are the really responsible parties in this gross fraud and imposition that has been practised upon them.

It was suggested at the meeting on Saturday, that the District Council should be held responsible for Bignall's villany. Morally we think they are responsible, but *legally* we believe they are not. There are members of the Council who did not vote for the appointment of Bignall, and who did not vote for the acceptance of the sham security tendered for him; and therefore had we been at liberty to propose an amendment to Mr. Dixie Watson's motion for a vote of censure on the District Council, which we believe was carried unanimously,—we would have proposed a "vote of censure for those *Tory* Councillors who, in reckless defiance of common decency and the public interests, and under the influence of the trampling spirit of faction, appointed John Bignall as Superintendent of Common Schools, and connived at, and concealed, and winked at his villianous embezzlement of the school monies till they enabled him to decamp with a large sum for which the people held a mere nominal security." This would have been doing justice to those Councillors who would scorn the idea of insulting the inhabitants of the District, or of playing *fast and loose* with the public funds; besides it would have placed the matter in its true light,—the light of a heartless *Tory Job.* In order to shew to them that we are neither magnifying, nor misrepresenting the matter, let us enquire if the Warden of the District, or any other of the influential friends of John Bignall, would have entrusted him with twelve or fourteen hundred pounds' worth of their private business, upon the same security that was accepted for his faithful fulfilment of his duties to the District? It was asserted at the meeting on Saturday that one of the bonds of security which had been accepted for him was not value for the piece of paper upon which it was written! This may or may not be the case, but judging from *appearances* and *pretensions* we should think it is not the case. But supposing the bonds to be all good and available, would any of the parties, or any other party, or any banker have given John Bignall the sum of twelve—of seven—of six hundred pounds upon a security of three several bonds of one hundred pounds each? Would the Agent of the Bank in Goderich, who was intimately acquainted with all the parties, have advanced five hundred pounds, nay, even *three* hundred pounds, upon the same three bonds? He would not. We understand that one of his best friends and one who was instrumental in thursting him into the good graces of the Council, actually refused to become a party to a bond of security drawn out *jointly and severally* for the amount of *two* hundred pounds! and that it was with the utmost difficulty that two solvent bailsmen, even to the amount of one hundred pounds each, could be obtained among his whole friends! Why was it, then, that John Bignall's honesty was scarcely worth one hundred pounds in the estimation of his own friends; and that yet these same friends considered this same John Bignall a "*fit and proper person*" to superintend the moral training and education of the District, and to be entrusted with twelve or fourteen hundred pounds of the people's money? The answer to this question is as visible as sunlight, and no shuffling nor sophistry can obscure it from the perception of thinking men. John Bignall was a Tory of the first water, and all his friends in the Council and out of the Council were Tories of the same cast. The first article in the creed of every Tory is, "Man mind thyself,"—"take good care of number one." Hence no Tory would run the risk of John Bignall in the sum of two hundred pounds.

The second article in the creed of Toryism, is to *gouge* that uncultivated animal called the "people." John Bignall was therefore the very "fit and proper person" to be pushed into an office of public trust, because Toryism has no sympathy with anything belonging to the people except their purse, and for that it entertains a thirst as strong as any of the chemical affinities: This, then, was the reason the great secret of John Bignall's appointment to a public office, for which his moral and intellectual deficiencies disqualified him as much as his physical structure disqualified him from performing the exercises of the butterfly. And we must fearlessly tell the inhabitants of Huron that so long as they are pleased to elect a Tory Council, just so long will the freaks of John Bignall be played upon them whenever a fitting opportunity occurs. We wish them to bear this warning fully in mind at the coming elections for Councillors. We assure them that at this moment there is as much Tory jobbing and Tory corruption in the management of our District affairs, as would have disgraced a parliament of the "Family Compact." The people possess the power of making the District Council and the District Officers what they ought to be: and if either through fear or favour of Squire Something, or Squire Nothing, or any other Squire, they are deterred from the honest exercise of this power, then few good men will in future sympathise with such calamities as have resulted from the villiany of John Bignall and his Tory supporters.

Now, let us ask, Was a plain statement of Bignall's fraudulent embezzlement of certain portions of the school monies laid before the Council in February last when John Bignall was proposed for re-election? Were the whole members of Council made aware of this fact before he was re-elected? Did the Warden, or the Clerk, or the "learned Solicitor" ever suggest to the Council the propriety of cancelling or renewing the bonds of security on his re-election? Verily we are a docile kind of animals.

☞ We seldom notice these little things called floating rumours; but we are bound to state that when speaking of Bignall's "*associates*" on a former occasion, we did not mean George Brown, Esq. We meant those who pushed him upon the attention of the Council, and who have coolly urged his re-election repeatedly without even hinting at the insufficiency of his security, or alluding to the necessity of renewing the bonds. We think Mr. Brown was not one of this party. Even when speaking of the fraudulent conveyance of Bignall's property to Mr. Brown, we have not the slightest desire to implicate Mr. Brown in the fraud. Our opinion of Mr. Brown's share in the Bignall affair is simply this: we think he has been duped;—we think he ought not to have offered himself as Bignall's security, and we think the Council should not have accepted him when he did offer. He holds a very important office of trust in the District; and we maintain that no District officer, however honest or wealthy, should be taken as security for another District officer. Such conduct exhibits far too much of the principle of "*claw me and I'll claw you.*" We regret the prevalence of the rumor which suggested these remarks, for two reasons. First, it charges us with guilt which we never dreamed of committing; and second, it charges Mr. Brown with saying that if the Signal was not so far beneath his notice, he would come and talk to us. We hope Mr. Brown did not say so, because we cannot reciprocate the compliment; for we have always spoken of him as one of the very few Tory office-holders who attend faithfully to the duties of their offices. Besides we are sorry that Mr. Brown should entertain such a contemptible opinion of us, lest some circumstance might occur when we would consider it a duty to convince him that the *Huron Signal* could exert some little influence, even on the office of District Treasurer.

☞ On Wednesday, an inquest was held before George Frazer, Esq., Coroner, Goderich, on the body of Mr. Robert Gillies, who died suddenly on the preceding evening. Verdict, "Died from the effects of an over dose of Laudanum taken as medicine."—The deceased was a native of Brechin in Forfarshire, Scotland. He has left a wife and family to lament his death.

"A LAYMAN."

As there is a famine of political subjects at present, and as our time hangs heavy on our hands, we will take an hour's amusement in reviewing the various, curious, learned and lengthened productions of our Reverend friend "A Layman," and as he has very politely compared us to a Polar Bear, we promise that we will neither bite nor scratch him; but at the same time we will endeavor to make him feel that his *assumed sanctity* would, at least, have been safer in the keeping of the Polar Bear than in the columns of his friend the *Gazette*. We deem it necessary to take some little notice of him not for our own sake (for it must be admitted that a man's character can never be injured in the estimation of honest men by the cowardly insinuation of the "clouded assasin,") but for the sake of the inhabitants of Goderich *who have much to fear* from "A Layman." And as we were instrumental in bringing him before the public, and in unintentionally giving some importance to his anonymous scribblings; we are, in some measure, bound to furnish an antidote to the evil. When noticing him on a former occassion, we happened to say that he "belongs to an order of intellect," somewhat different from that of the trio with whom he was so zealous to make common cause. Now we always supposed a man might assert that an Oyster was not a Zoophyte, nor a pumpkin a turnip, without being guilty of panegyrising the intellect of the one or the organization of the other. But the vanity of "A Layman" seems to have taken fire at the compliment, and his lucubrations have since been more bold and voluminous, evidently resulting from the false idea that we had acknowledged him as an intellectual writer. We never libel any man's character, and we shall briefly shew that this would be a libel of the grossest description. As "A Layman" has not endeavoured to conceal the fact that his intention in writing was not to establish any great practical principle in morality, nor to expose and combat any of the prevailing vices of society, nor to instruct and edify mankind; but to traduce the character of Mr. Macqueen without exposing himself to the odium which justly attatches to traducers; in other words, he adopts the cowardly expedient of *murdering in a mask.* He is, therefore, not entitled to notice. And had we no other object in view than the vindication of our own character, we certainly would not notice him. In one of his communications he is pleased to insinuate that it is a matter of indifference to the public whether he writes over his own name, or over an assumed or fictitious one—we think differently. When a man writes a novel, or a tale, or any piece of miscelleaneous composition it is a mere matter of choice whether he accompanies it with name or not. But none other than a *heartless dastardly villian* will *anonymously* attact and vilify the reputation of a fellow-man. And whatever may be the criminality of such conduct in ordinary circumstances, it is fearfully aggravated when done under the garb of religious sanctity; the individual is then guilty of the most daring sacrilige in using religion as an instrument of wickedness. When "A Layman" piously came forward to expose the heresy, infidelity and socialism of the Temperance Lecture which we delivered in the United Presbyterian Church, on 4th September, he ought, as a good faithful Christian, to have thrown aside his cowardice, and given the full weight and benefit of his name to his evangelical exposure, in order that those who did not hear the Lecture might have had some reliable authority for dreading the pernicious tendency of our writings and lecturings. But "A Layman" was conscious that he was about to give publicity not only to wilful and malicious misrepresentations and perversions of our sentiments, but also to some of the most base and unqualified falsehoods, which would be recognised and denounced as falsehoods by nine-tenths of those who attended the meeting, and hence, to escape the reprobation of those who did attend, and to impose upon those who did not attend, he wrapped himself in the cloud of the anonymous calumniator.

In his communication to his friend the Gazette of the 15th September, "A Layman" says he attended the Lecture "with the most charitable feelings toward him (Mr. Macqueen), and with a desire to obtain both pleasure and information." Now what are the public to expect from an anonymous writer who under a feigned regard for religious truth, commences a series of soulless, insinuating calumnies, with a barefaced lie? He has proven that he did not attend the Lecture with any such motives or intentions. It is asserted that *he did not attend the lecture at all.* That he was not within the walls of the Church that evening. That his strictures—or rather his perversions of our sentiments, were framed from notes taken by a gentleman who was employed or requested to do so, and who afterwards acknowledged that the notes would bear no such construction as had been put upon them. And in order to avoid detection the manuscript, we are informed, came to the Compositor in the fair handwriting of a Lady; but certainly no man who has ever known anything of the benignity of woman, could, for one moment, suppose, that even the most abandoned of the sex, could be guilty of such perfidy and insidious torturings of truth as have disgraced the productions of "A Layman!" In fact we would this moment, rather submit to the greatest personal indignity that could be offered to us, than be compelled to believe that Goderich contained *one* woman capable of displaying such an utter worthlessness and want of principle. We are, however, satisfied that the deception was practised from terror, lest the real author should be exposed to the scorn of the public, and the position which he occupies in society is, to say the least of it, altogether incompatible with the spirit and genius of such productions. In fact such has been the anxiety to conceal the real name of "A Layman," that every shape and shade of character, in the party, from the "Prize Essayist" (we cannot say *down*, but) *over* to the *bar-room spunge*, has been given as the author! And we were credibly informed that on a certain occasion the poor *spendthrift*, "Peel Guelfe," when swaggering drunk through a certain Bar-room in town, actually gratified his vanity by swearing lustily that he was the "Layman," and sealed his declaration emphatically by falling headforemost against the barr!! Such is the thirst for literary fame! And we shall now give a few specimens of "A Layman's" productions, in order to ascertain how far his fame is enviable in the estimation of the virtuous and in-