

displayed; at last a turn prevailed, and he assumed a fresh confidence: he won—only for a moment, then lost—lost—lost—and finally was penniless!

To be concluded in our next.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

In the House of Assembly, on Thursday last, in answer to some observations from Mr Kent, Mr Cozens, we understand, spoke as follows:—

Mr SPEAKER.—With much reluctance I rise to reply to the observations that have just fallen from the hon. members for St. John's, the learned Doctor and his colleague Mr Kent.

My hon. friend the member for St. Mary's (Mr Martin) had said that he was unaccustomed to public speaking, and that I am similarly situated is well known to this House; but I cannot longer sit to hear such misrepresentations and falsehoods uttered by those who are termed *Honourable Gentlemen* (but in reality, are demagogues), who instead of applying themselves and their talents to such measures as may conduce to the improvement of the colony, or the amelioration of the condition of its inhabitants, are endeavouring to vilify the character of those members who may happen to differ from them in opinion, or do not fall in with their views, and applying to them the most opprobrious epithets (such as minions, nominees, sycophants, Government slaves! &c. &c.) and, further, what I do not consider to be Parliamentary, (for the usage of which, by the bye, they contend so strongly) instead of addressing themselves to the hon. House, address the galleries, and work on the passions of the people by their constant attempts to hoodwink and mislead them, and who they say are not capable of acting or thinking for themselves, but of whom, however, I hold a very different opinion, having, during the course of my business, employed some thousands, and therefore may be allowed to be a competent judge. In the days of my prosperity, I was by those gentlemen considered both liberal and independent in my principles, and they may now probably consider that a change has taken place, but I can tell them that *adversity* has not, nor shall, deter me from doing my duty as independently as any other hon. member in this House, as long as I have the honor of holding a seat in it. As the House has so often divided on the address to his Excellency, it may be expected that I should state my reason for voting as I had. It is my belief his Excellency had cause—[for calling out the military on the evening in question.] His Excellency would, no doubt, rely on and believe the statements of the magistracy, and not those contained in the newspaper. It had been stated by an hon. member (Mr Brown) that he (Mr Brown) was not in St. John's at the time, but from what he could learn at his lodgings, there did not exist a cause for the military being called out. I was in the town at the time, and at the same lodgings to which the hon. member alluded, and heard a very different statement by gentlemen who were eye-witnesses to what occurred, and who asserted that the magistrate was pushed about, intimidated, and put in

bodily fear, on Christmas evening, in the performance of his duty, and not having sufficient support and assistance, he (the magistrate, exclaimed, "What have I done to you? Was I not always your friend?"

In reply he received abusive language, and was taunted with, "How civil you are now, you were not so civil the summer in killing our dogs, and taking our pigs," &c.

Now, this hon. House made those laws, and the hon. member (Mr Kent) took a prominent part in their formation, and now, instead of supporting the magistracy in their enforcement of them, as was his duty, he was heaping on them abuse upon abuse, and thereby endeavouring to bring both their persons and authority into contempt.

It was stated the magistrates proclaimed the Riot Act. It might be asked why did not they read it? Because it was dark. An hon. member had asked, why they (the magistrates) had not called to their assistance respectable persons? I heard they did so, and that many refused and others went away.

No person could deprecate coercive measures more than myself, neither do I wish to see the necessity of a militia, especially when we get a well-regulated police.

But if hon. members so strongly reprobate coercive measures and the appointment of a militia, will they not support the magistracy and police? Or what is to be our condition? Why is the hon. member, Mr Kent, so lavish in low abuse on those gentlemen, before a fair and impartial investigation had been taken of their conduct and laid before the House? In reply to the vile insinuations of the learned Doctor, I am neither a government man nor a sycophant, neither am I a slave to his party—I am independent of any party. I shall state, not for his (the Doctor's) information, (for in his conscience—query, if he has any?) that I have held for a number of years, the situation of honorary magistrate for Conception Bay without any remuneration whatever, either from the government or the people; but that I had often very considerable labour to perform, which interfered greatly with my accustomed duties. It is really amusing to hear the hon. and learned Doctor, boast of consistency, sincerity and morality, abusing the hon. members for being minions of government and under pay, whilst he (the Doctor) the great reformer of abuses, has been and was still receiving a sinecure of £200; and what has he or what does he perform to deserve so rich a reward? He (the Doctor) is also going to purify the House, as he terms it—he is going to make the attempt to deprive me of my seat, because after I was returned member for Conception Bay I became insolvent. My hon. friend Mr Martin, and myself must be ousted, forsooth, for the sake of consistency Oh! the consistent Doctor!!! who is to purify the hon. House from insolvents. But was the Doctor solvent himself when he took his seat? I ask the Doctor if he had paid his last year's debts? No, but he must make room for demagogues; the various intrigues are not unknown to us. Had my hon. friend taken the bait given him in the shape of good dinners last winter—and had he given a vote to place the Doctor in the Speaker's chair, his seat in this House had not been questioned. Witness

the political cup of tea given me, and the designed misrepresentations and falsehoods (as it regarded a bill for the improvement of roads, &c., which I introduced last session) in that print called the "PATRIOT," and which was transplanted to the "CARBONAR STAR," which falsehoods might have been contradicted by my hon. colleagues if they had felt such an inclination.

When the hon. member, Mr Power, rose and said he called on the editor of the Star, Mr Gilmour, I contradicted the statement put forth. I feel much obliged to the hon. member, Mr Power, for his kindness. The two hon. members for St. John's had most insultingly called my independence in question (alluding to my religious principles); I can tell them I am as independent from principle; the same disability once existed with Protestant Dissenters as with Catholics, but now they are removed (indeed some of them never existed in this country). Have we not equal rights? has not the Test and Corporation Act long been removed—the Catholics emancipated? We have no establishment to support, no tithes, no church rates, no Easter dues, and might we not be a happy people but for those brawlers and disturbers of the public peace?—The people cannot be much longer blinded by their sophistry—they are in quest of popularity, and seeking to immortalize their names by throwing others into the shade; but by what means are they endeavouring to obtain it? it surely cannot be otherwise than "*honorable*."

Mr KENT rose, and among other matters observed, with the prefix "Oh, ah!" that the hon. member, Mr Cozens had at length found his tongue.

Mr COZENS.—To the hon. gentleman "*Oh, ah!*" who had made the notable discovery that I have found my tongue, I have only to observe that it is not a false and lying one. He has said, "*Oh, ah!*" I had been closeted with my political friends and received my instructions; but I will state for his information that when I left the House yesterday, I retired to my lodgings, and have seen no company, nor any honorable member until I returned to the House again. I am not in the habit of attending private and mischievous meetings. The hon. member had been pleased to state that I am a tyrant; but those who best know me, know best the truth or falsehood of the assertion. He, (the hon. member) having for his constant object the intimidation of those who would honestly and faithfully discharge their duty, wore infinitely more the appearance of a tyrant, than any other man could do.—*Ledger.*

MARRIED.—At Port-de-Grave, on the 23d ult., by the Rev. J. Pickavant, Wesleyan Missionary. Mr William Freeman, of St. John's, to Miss Amelia F. Furneaux, of the former place.

At Broad Cove, on the 27th ult., by the Rev. R. Shepperd, Wesleyan Missionary, Mr J. S. Teulon, Surgeon, to Miss Butt, both of that place.

On Shrove-Tuesday, by the Very Rev. Mr Dalton, V.G. Mr Patrick Quigly, to Mrs Mary Doyle, both of this place.