them all, and without troubling the jury with a recapitulation of those several cases, he was bound to say that, in his judgment, and in the opinion of the Court, there was not one of them that supported the proposition for which they were cited—namely, that in order to substantiate a charge of conspiracy, either treachery or secrecy was necessary.

The Court then adjourned.

TWENTY-FOURTH DAY.—Feb. 11.

The Court sat this morning at ten o'clock.

The CHIEF JUSTICE, before he resumed his charge, said, it had occurred to him, that some of the remarks which he had made on the previous day touching the law of conspiracy, and especially in allusion to Mr. Fitzgibbon's exposition thereof, might be construed into expressions of personal disrespect to that gentleman: an idea which he utterly disclaimed, and he took the opportunity of saying, for Mr. Fitzgibbon himself, and for his public and private character, he entertained a very great esteem, if the learned counsel would give him leave to say so. As to his talents, his industry, and his acquirements he held them in very great respect.

Mr. Fitzgibbon did not make any remark.

The Lord Chief-Justice resumed his seat, and continued his charge. His Lordship said, as a further instance of the power and weight of the association, he would call attention to the circumstance of the large sums of money which were contributed from various places, both abroad and at home, swelling to a great magnitude the funds, or the exchequer, as he believed Mr. Duffy had called it, of the association. It was in proof that large sums had been contributed in Ireland, England, and other countries, and (said his lordship) we have for this the incontrovertible evidence of Mr. O'Connell himself; and, when Mr. O'Connell spoke of the force he had at his command, and of those who acted under his control, and which he did on more than one occasion, he takes the opportunity of recording the increasing amount of funds which he did receive, or which was received by the association, from the sympathy and support of America. The Chief Justice proceeded to read the "Plan" of the association "for the Renewed Action of the Irish Parliament," and put it to the jury whether the language was not rather that of demand than petition. I do not see, said he, how such a plan, essentially in opposition and violation of the coronation oath and to the Act of Union, as at present existing, could be carried out "according to recognized law and strict constitutional principle." It is utterly impossible to carry it out in the existing state of things. There is a way in which the Union may be altered, if the legislative wisdom of the country, together with the crown, should think fit to do it; there is a legitimate mode of doing it; but, as long as the law stands as at present, there is the Queen's coronation oath to be violated, if the thing be attempted to be done, and there must be the violation of the statute of the 40th George III. Now, there is no attempt made in the way of petitioning the Queen; nothing of the kind is attempted. But we have the demand of the people of Ireland, organized and disciplined, to have it carried into effect, according to their wishes, by whom or how I do not know, nor does the plan specify. However, gentlemen of the jury, that plan was laid before the association. There is no statement that that plan was rejected. He next adverted to the meetings. Those meetings are called by Mr. O'Connell "monster meetings;" and, though it is not admitted here that he or the association called more than a few of those monster meetings, yet, you will see, gentlemen of the jury, by the repeated declarations of Mr. O'Connell himself, that he or "we," that is, he or the association, did call those meetings. The Lord Chief Justice proceeded to remark on the character of the "monster meetings; the numbers who attended them; their array; and the bands of music and banners which accompanied them. He then adverted to the speeches, particularly those of Mr. O'Connell, and said, you will see, gentlemen of the jury, from the nature of the speeches, the traversers were acting in pursuance and promotion of a common design, and that design a criminal one. It will be for you to judge on this point. His lordship proceeded to select from the speeches proved passages, to which he directed the attention of the jury; and, in reference to the speech at Mullaghmast, on the 15th of May, it was printed, published, and commented upon in Mr. Barrett's paper, the Pilot. His lordship also read speeches from Dr. Gray's paper, the Freeman's Journal, which led to a slight altercation between his lordship and Mr. Fitzgibbon, who said he had not read a single passage from the Freeman.—His lordship, having the evidence of his notes, differed from Mr. Fitzgibbon, but remarked, that it was immaterial, as the Freeman was in evidence for the Crown. After reading numerous extracts from Mr. O'Connell's speech, and pointing out the frequent repetition of the story of the butchery of the Wexford insurgents, and the inflamatory effect of such a story, and the comments by which it was accompanied, his lordship read the following passage:—"I have made arrangements to ascertain what part of Ireland ought to return members to the Irish Parliament. I am getting returns of notices, and, whenever the Queen's writs may issue, it will only be necessary to put a bit of wax at the end of a piece of parchment, and we shall have a Parliament at once." Mr. O'Connell and the Queen, I suppose, are going in concert together, for the purpose of violating the coronation oath. His lordship read further extracts from the speech of Mr. O'Connell, and continued. There is the language used by this gentleman at that assembled meeting at Connemara; and it is for you to say, gentlemen, whether that is the language of rational discussion, or whether it is a show of defiance, the boldness of a man exulting in the giant power of the Irish people, which he said he had under his control, at his back. I wish to call your attention, as we pass along, to the evidence of Mr. Jackson, as to what took place at one of the meetings of the association, held on the 29th of August, 1843. You will see and judge whether this be consistent with and a combination of the same sort of threat and intimidation that had taken place before. Mr. Jackson's evidence of what Mr. O'Connell said is this:—"The people of Ireland were accused of being disaffected. He admitted they were disaffected, and they were now so circumstanced, that if the Union were not dissolved, he much feared that a sanguinary war would afterwards lead to perpetual separation." Is that a threat, or free discussion? There was no imputation on the correctness of Mr. Jackson, as it regards that sentence. Mr. O'Connell, said he (Mr. J.,) had made a mistake of a word in the next sentence, and therefore I won't read that. I will close what I have to say on the subject of meetings with the great meeting which took place shortly after the delivery of the Queen's speech at the close of Parliament. Parliament, I believe, was closed on the 25th of August. Some short time after, there was a great monster meeting held in the county of Kildare, at a place called Mullaghmast. This meeting was expressly got up under the direction of Mr. O'Connell and the association. His lordship then proceeded to read the placard, and when he came to this passage, "The province will declare for Repeal," he observed, they will declare for Repeal, not that they will petition for Repeal.—Having read the remainder of the placard, his lordship proceeded:—This document is not equivocal. There were assembled there on that day thousands upon thousands, equal, in point of numbers, to the vast scene of persons who assembled on the Hill of Tara. That overflowing multitude who came there were attended by bands and flags; and the cavalcade, I must presume, mustered at the place appointed. They began to assemble at an early hour; for the millions, the hundreds of thousands, at least, could not be brought together without notice. It was the most complete demonstration that took place—it was a demonstration of physical force. On the morning of the meeting there was circulated a document. It described that the two septs of O'Moore and O'Connor were invited to a friendly conference on the Rath of Mullaghmast, by the English, and that when they went, confiding in the olive branch of peace, they were treacherously murdered." His lordship read some further extracts, and then took up the case as regards the newspapers, beginning with Mr. Duffy, of the *Nation*, and, subsequently, referring to the case as affecting Mr. Barrett, of the *Pilot*. His lordship then called attention to the papers and addresses adopted by the association, took a brief review of the duties of the judges and of the jury, and then went shortly over the charges against the traversers, showing the jury what the Crown had undertaken to prove. The defence of the traversers was, that their designs were not criminal; that they had grievances, and had a right to lay them before the public, though it appeared that, in so doing, they had to attend multitudinous meetings. If the jury should be of opinion that such were the designs of the traversers; that they had no criminal intentions, and did not mean to resort to any criminal means for the furtherance of their objects, they were bound to acquit them. If, on the other hand, they should be of opinion these were not the real objects of the association, and of the persons charged as traversers, but that, whatever their apparent designs might be, if they had, in fact and in truth, the criminal intentions attributed to them by the Crown; and if the jury are satisfied that the traversers, or some of them, in furtherance of this design, acted in concert and concert, then, in such case, they would be bound conscientiously to find the guilty of the conspiracy with which they found them participators. The Lord Chief Justice alluded to the appeals that had been made on behalf of the traversers, sometimes to the College, at others to the aristocracy of the country, sometimes to the people, and at other times to the Queen's prerogative of pardon; but, he said, they were all addressed to persons, indifferent parties, and remembering only the evidence and the oath they have taken, give a true verdict. In drawing their conclusions, and finding their verdict, they could attend to the evidence before them, and let it be conformable to the dictates of their reason and their conscience, and he did trust that the Lord who rules over all would enlighten their direction.

Precisely at half-past five o'clock the issue paper was handed up to the jury, when

The Foreman said—My lord, the jury are very much fatigued, and they wish to know if it is necessary they should go into the case to-night.

CHIEF JUSTICE.—I am sorry to inform you, that, after the charge has been delivered, it will not be possible to allow you to separate. You may retire to your chamber; but, I am sorry to say, we have not the power of giving you the liberty you have hitherto enjoyed of going to your own homes. You must remain in court in custody of the Sheriff; and you cannot be allowed to have any communication with any other person.

It was intimated that the Sheriff had provided accommodation for the jury, and they retired from the court.

At ten minutes to eleven o'clock, Mr. Justice CRAMPTON returned to Court, and the jury were thereupon called to their box.

The Foreman: Mr lord, are we to give our verdict on each count of the indictment?

Judge CRAMPTON: If you please, gentlemen.

Foreman: Are we obliged to give our verdict on every count?

Judge CRAMPTON: Yes.

Foreman: Whether we agree or no?

Judge CRAMPTON: Yes; but you must understand me. If you are agreed upon each count, or upon all the counts, you are only to say not guilty or guilty—if you agree upon some, you will state those upon which you are agreed.

Foreman: and take no notice of the others?

Judge CRAMPTON: Oh, gentlemen, there ought to be a finding on the whole of them.

The Jury then withdrew.

At twenty minutes past eleven the Jury came into Court.

The Clerk of the Crown said: Gentlemen, have you all agreed upon your verdict?

The Foreman: Yes. (Great sensation in the Court.)

The finding of the jury was then handed to the Clerk of the Crown, which that officer read aloud:

On the first count, no finding.

On the second count, no finding.

On the third count, that Daniel O'Connell, Richard Barrett, and Charles Gavin Duffy, are Guilty.

On the fourth count, that Daniel O'Connell, John O'Connell, Thomas Mathew Ray, John Gray, Thomas Steele, and Charles Gavin Duffy, are Guilty.

On the fifth count, that Daniel O'Connell, John O'Connell, Thomas Mathew Ray, John Gray, Thomas Steele, Charles Gavin Duffy, and Thomas Tierney, are Guilty.

On the sixth count, no finding.

On the seventh count, that Daniel O'Connell, John O'Connell, Thomas Mathew Ray, John Gray, Thomas Steele, and Charles Gavin Duffy, are Guilty.

On the eighth county, no finding.

On the ninth count, no finding.

On the tenth count, that Daniel O'Connell, John O'Connell, Thomas Mathew Ray, Thomas Steele, John Gray, and Charles Gavin Duffy, are Guilty.

On the eleventh count, no finding.

Mr. Justice CRAMPTON: You must take your verdict back, for in the present state it is imperfect, in some of the counts—in respect of which you have come to no conclusion as to the guilt or innocence of the traversers. It is your duty to find a verdict of guilty or not guilty; and if you cannot come to an agreement on any count or counts you ought to say so in your verdict. As to all those counts upon which you are agreed, you are to say some of the defendants are guilty and some not. You are to name those whom you find guilty and those whom you say are not. As to any count on which you are not agreed, you ought to state, 'we have not agreed on this count.' If you are able to arrive at the conclusion of guilty or not guilty on all the counts, it will be your duty so to do. With respect to the first count, if I understand you correctly, there are parts of it on which you are not agreed, and parts on which you are agreed.

A Juryman: No, my lord, we are agreed on the first count; there is no difference of opinion among the jury; it is merely the wording of the finding that we are at a loss for.

The jury having retired,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL said the jury were not bound to find. The first count embraces the severe branches of the conspiracy, which are split up afterwards in other words, and if they are of opinion that the several traversers, many of them are guilty, of course they will decide on such portion of the first count as they think they should find.

Mr. MOORE: I am not desirous of saying anything in the way of argument, but on the part of one of the traversers, I certainly object to the direction.

[During the observations that were passing between the bench and counsel, the crowds in the hall and in the immediate vicinity of the court were loudly cheering. As soon as the jury had given the verdict, some person communicated to the assemblage in the hall that Daniel O'Connell had been acquitted, and the people there immediately commenced cheering, and the shouts were taken up and reechoed by the crowd outside.]

When the jury had retired about half an hour, the Attorney-General suggested that, as it was just twelve o'clock, and the verdict could not well be given on Sunday, the court should adjourn until Monday morning.

The Jury were then called. On their appearing,

Mr. Justice CRAMPTON said—Gentlemen, have you now arranged your verdict?

The Foreman: Not yet, my lord.

Mr. Justice CRAMPTON: It is very near twelve o'clock, therefore you had better be quick (great laughter.) "This noise," observed his lordship, "is extremely indecent, and I must exercise the authority of the Court if I find any person committing a breach of order."

The jury then retired, and some minutes after it was observed by Mr. Henn that it was twelve o'clock. Some conversation then took place. The Attorney General was willing to stay, and take the verdict without detaining the jury, but the counsel for the traversers would not acquiesce in the arrangement. Finally, a quarter past twelve, the jury were called into Court, and informed that it was too late to receive their verdict, and the Court adjourned until nine o'clock on Monday,—orders being given that, in the meantime the jury should receive every possible accommodation.

TWENTY-FIFTH DAY.—Feb 12.

The Chief Justice, Mr. Justice Burton, and Mr. Justice Crampton took their seats on the bench this morning, a few minutes after nine o'clock, at which the Court was crowded, but not inconveniently so, as a very large force of police was stationed at the main entrance to keep off the crowd, to clear the various passages leading to the Queen's Bench, and to prevent the admission of persons not duly authorized.

The Traversers arrived at an early hour.

Mr. O'Connell, who was accompanied by his son Daniel and Mr. W. S. O'Brien, took his seat at the table of the Queen's Counsel.

Mr. J. O'Connell appeared in his professional robes amongst the juniors, while the rest sat at the traversers' bar.

Mr. Justice CRAMPTON minutely detailed to his brother judges what took place on Saturday evening, subsequent to their leaving the Court, at half-past five o'clock, and accounted for the difficulty which the jury had experienced respecting the first and second counts by observing, that they contained five distinct issues, upon which there should be five distinct findings, and did not, therefore, admit of a general finding. Having briefly described the nature of the issues, involved in the several counts, and pointed out in what respects they differed one from the other, his Lordship suggested that the proper course to adopt would be to put these issues before the jury, in the distinct form in which he had now explained them.

THE VERDICT.

The jury were then called into Court; the suggestion of his Lordship was acted on; they retired, and returned at ten o'clock with their verdict, to the reception of which

Mr. MOORE, Q. C., objected, on the ground that one of the jurors was described on the panel as "John Rigby," though he himself had declared that his name was "John James Rigby."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL observed, that Mr. Rigby had been sworn as "John Rigby," and that particular notice was made of the fact at the time by the Court.

A note having been taken of the objection,

Mr. Bourke, the Clerk of the Crown, read the verdict of GUILTY generally against all the traversers, excepting the Rev. Mr. Tierney, who was found Guilty upon two counts only.

The following are the several counts of the indictment, with the verdict of the jury, as affecting each traverser upon each count:—

FIRST AND SECOND COUNT.

For unlawfully and seditiously conspiring to raise and create discontent and disaffection amongst the Queen's subjects, and to excite such subjects to hatred and contempt of, and to unlawful and seditious opposition to, the Government and Constitution, and to stir up jealousies, hatred, and ill-will between different classes of Her Majesty's subjects; and especially to promote amongst Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland, feelings of ill-will and hostility against Her Majesty's subjects in other parts of the United Kingdom, especially in England, and to excite discontent and disaffection amongst divers of Her Majesty's subjects serving in the army; and to cause, and aid in causing, divers subjects to meet and assemble together in large numbers, at various times and at different places within Ireland, for the unlawful and seditious purpose of obtaining, by means of the exhibition and demonstration of great physical force at such meetings, changes and alterations in the Government, Laws, and Constitution, as by law established, and to bring into hatred and disrepute the courts by law established in Ireland for the administration of justice, and to diminish the confidence of her Majesty's subjects in the administration of the law therein, with intent to induce her Majesty's subjects to withdraw the adjudication of their differences with and claims upon each other from the cognizances of the courts of law, and subject the same to the judgment and determination of other tribunals to be constituted and contrived for that purpose.

GUILTY—D. O'Connell, R. Barrett, and C. G. Duffy, omitting the words "unlawfully and seditiously" before the words "to meet and assemble."

NOT GUILTY as to the words omitted.

GUILTY—J. O'Connell, T. Steele, T. M. Ray, and J. Gray, omitting the words "unlawfully and seditiously" before the words "to meet and assemble," and omitting the words "and to excite discontent and dissatisfaction amongst divers of her Majesty's subjects serving in the army."

NOT GUILTY as to the words omitted.

GUILTY—Rev. Thomas Tierney, from the commencement, and including the words "especially in England;" and NOT GUILTY of the remainder of the first and second counts.

THIRD COUNT.

For unlawfully and seditiously conspiring to raise and create discontent and disaffection among the Queen's subjects, and to excite such subjects to hatred and contempt of, and to unlawful and seditious opposition to, the Government and constitution, and to stir up jealousies, hatred, and ill-will between different classes of Her Majesty's subjects; and especially to promote amongst Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland, feelings of ill-will and hostility against Her Majesty's subjects in other parts of the United Kingdom, especially in England, and to excite discontent and disaffection amongst divers of Her Majesty's subjects serving in the army; and to cause, and aid in causing, divers subjects to meet and assemble together in large numbers, at various times and at different places within Ireland, for the unlawful and seditious purpose of obtaining, by means of the exhibition and demonstration of great physical force at such meetings, changes and alterations in the Government, Laws, and Constitution, as by law established, and to bring into hatred and disrepute the courts by law established in Ireland for the administration of justice, and to diminish the confidence of her Majesty's subjects in the administration of the law therein, with intent to induce her Majesty's subjects to withdraw the adjudication of their differences with, and claim upon, each other, from the cognizance of the courts of law, and subject the same to the judgment and determination of other tribunals to be constituted and contrived for that purpose.

GUILTY—D. O'Connell, R. Barrett, and C. G. Duffy.

GUILTY—J. O'Connell, T. Steele, T. M. Ray, and J. Gray, omitting the words, "and to excite discontent and disaffection amongst divers of her Majesty's subjects serving in the army."

NOT GUILTY as to the words omitted.

GUILTY—The Rev. T. Tierney, from the commencement so far as, and including the words, "especially in England."

NOT GUILTY of the remainder of this count.

FOURTH COUNT.

For conspiring to raise and create discontent and disaffection amongst the Queen's subjects, and to excite such subjects to hatred and contempt of, and to unlawful and seditious opposition to, the Government and Constitution; and also to stir up jealousy hatred, and ill-will between different classes of the subjects, and especially to promote amongst the subjects, in Ireland, feelings of ill-will and hostility towards the subjects in other parts of the United Kingdom, and especially in England, and to cause and aid in causing divers subjects to meet and assemble in large numbers, at various times and different places in Ireland, for the unlawful and seditious purposes of obtaining by means of the intimidation to be thereby caused, and by means of the exhibition and demonstration of great physical force at such meetings, changes in the Government and Constitution as by law established.

GUILTY—D. O'Connell, J. O'Connell, J. M. Ray, J. Gray, T. Steele, C. G. Duffy, and R. Barrett.

GUILTY—Rev. Mr. Tierney from the commencement so far as, and including, the words, "especially in England."

FIFTH COUNT.

For conspiring to raise and create discontent and disaffection amongst the Queen's subjects, and to excite them to hatred and contempt of, and unlawful and seditious opposition to, the Government and Constitution. And also to stir up jealousies, hatred, and ill-will between different classes of the Queen's subjects, and especially feelings of ill-will and hostility against her Majesty's subjects in England.

GUILTY—D. O'Connell, J. O'Connell, T. M Ray, J. Gray, T. Steele, C. G. Duffy, R. Barrett, Rev. T. Tierney.

SIXTH COUNT.

For conspiring to cause, and aid in causing, divers subjects to meet and assemble in large numbers, at various times, and at different places, in Ireland, for the unlawful and seditious purpose of obtaining, by the exhibition of great physical force at such meetings, changes and alterations in the Government, laws, and constitution as by law established.

GUILTY—D O'Connell, J. O'Connell, T. Steele, T. M. Ray, C. G. Duffy, J. Ray, R. Barrett.

NOT GUILTY—Rev. Mr. Tierney.

The seventh count charges the procurement of large numbers of the people to meet together at various places, with intent, by the display of numbers, to procure changes in the law.

The 8th and 9th counts charge conspiracy to bring into disrepute the tribunals established by law, and to induce Her Majesty's subjects to submit their differences to other tribunals, thereby assuming the prerogative of the Crown.

The tenth count charges the establishment of courts to bring into disrepute the legal tribunals of the country.

The eleventh charges seditious publications and speeches, and the delivery of unlawful speeches.

GUILTY—D. O'Connell, J. O'Connell, T. Steele, T. M. Ray, C. G. Duffy, J. Ray, R. Barrett.

NOT GUILTY—Rev. Mr. Tierney.

The verdict having been recorded—

The CHIEF JUSTICE thanked the Jury for the patient attention they had bestowed for nearly a month upon this unprecedented case, admitted the loss and injury it must have been to them, regretted that the Court did not possess the power of granting them compensation, (which the Foreman, in delivering the verdict, applied for,) and dismissed them.

Mr. MOORE, on the part of the traversers, demanded a copy of the verdict.

The CHIEF JUSTICE directed that it should be furnished, and the Clerk of the Crown immediately adjourned the Court to the first day of next term, when it will be in the power of the Crown to call for judgment upon the traversers.

The Court stands adjourned till the 15th of April, and the traversers remain out as usual on their own recognizances. On that day a four-day rule for judgment will be served on the traversers, and on its expiration the Attorney General will pray the judgment on them. It is understood, however, that before the expiration of the four-day rule, a motion on the part of the traversers will be made in arrest of judgment.—Should the Court decide against the motion, judgment will be passed, and then a writ of error will be sued on the part of the traversers, which will be argued before the twelve judges; and should their decision be adverse, an appeal will lie to the House of Lords.

The Great Valley.—The Mississippi Valley has no parallel on earth—its length may be estimated at not less than 2,500 miles; and its main breadth is from 1,200 to 1,500. There are many facts to prove that it was once covered with a vast ocean, and that the great change was brought about by repeated and long continued volcanic convulsions.—This valley is the most delightful, the richest and the fairest portion of the earth, and capable of sustaining a population of 100,000,000.

A Hint to Legislators.—During the discussion of a ministerial measure in the House of Commons lately, Sir Robert Peel made some pungent allusions to those who, without having the power actually to defeat his policy, were yet very successful in causing *delay*. Referring to the leaders in this sort of work, he reminded the House that "when travellers in the East do not want to go on, they put a pipe in Court!"

From the N. Y. Con. Advertiser.

CONGRESS.

Some of the proceedings in the House of Representatives on Monday, were deserving of more particular notice than they could receive in the necessarily hurried letter of our correspondent. There was significance in the vote to lay on the table the Resolutions offered by Mr. Hughes and Mr. Black, on the subjects of Texas and Oregon—the vote indicating, as we hope, at least, that the majority of the House will no be lured or driven into hurried action on these momentous topics.

The resolutions, as modified on the suggestion of Mr. Black, were in these words:

1. *Resolved*, That, in the opinion of this House, the United States has a clear and indisputable title to all the country on the northwest coast of America, commonly called the Oregon, from the 42nd parallel of North latitude to 54 degree 40 minutes north latitude.

2. That it is the imperious duty of the Government of the United States to take possession of all the country owned by it on the Northwest coast of America, and to organize such a Territorial Government as will give ample and complete protection to our citizens in that quarter.

3. That it is expedient and conducive to the best interests of the country that Texas should be annexed to the United States, as soon as the annexation can be accomplished upon fair and legitimate principles.

Mr. Hughes had no mind that there should be argument upon them, for he moved the previous question; and Mr. J. R. Ingersoll was so far of the same mind with Mr. Hughes, that he moved to lay them on the table, which motion prevailed by a vote of 106 to 66. Messrs. Fish, Leonard and Maclay from this city, voted in the majority. Mr. Phœnix was not present.

Mr. Lewis offered the next resolution of importance, as follows:—

Resolved,—That the Committee of ways and means be authorized to inquire into the expediency of authorizing the President of the United States, when he shall be officially notified that any one of certain foreign Governments, to be designated by law, has reduced the duties on American pork, beef, grain and breadstuffs, or either of these articles, to an ad valorem standard of less than twenty per cent, he shall at once, by proclamation, admit articles of equivalent commercial importance and magnitude, the product of said foreign Government, to be introduced in other United States at a corresponding rate of duty, the said articles of equivalent commercial importance to be designated by law.

He also moved the previous question, and there was a motion to lay the resolution on the table. It was lost, 54 to 93, and then the resolution was adopted, under the previous question, by a vote of 88 to 56.

Soon after, Mr. Kennedy, of Maryland, threw a little botheration into the Democratic free-trade ranks by offering a resolution in these words:

Resolved, That this House approve and adopt the following opinions, as expressed by General Jackson, in his letter to Dr. L. H. Coleman, of Warrington, North Carolina, dated April 26, 1842, to wit:—"That lead, iron, copper, hemp and wool, being the great materials of our national defence, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection, that our manufacturers and laborers may be placed in a fair competition with those of Europe, and that the leading and important articles so essential to us, "That we have been too long subjected to the policy of British merchants, and that it is time that we should become a little more Americanized, and instead of feeding the laborers and paupers of England, feed our own." That "a careful and judicious tariff" is necessary "to pay our national debt, and afford us the means of that defence within ourselves on which the safety of our country and liberty depends; and last, though not least, give a proper distribution to our labor, which must prove beneficial to the happiness, independence and wealth of the community."

This was obviously a poser. Its protective doctrine was unpalatable to many, but what good Democrat would dare to rebel against the mandate of Andrew Jackson, or treat one of his edicts with disrespect? Mr. Kennedy had moved the previous question; Mr. Winthrop, shrewdly judging that the motion would not be seconded, and for the sake of getting the yeas and nays, moved to lay the resolution on the table.—He bold men who had courage enough to vote "aye" were Messrs. Edward J. Black, Burke, Bull, Boulton, Chapman, Coles, Daniel, Hale, Haralson, Henley, Hopkins, Preston, King, Lucas, Lyon McClernand, Payne, David S. Reid, Rhett, Saunders, Simpson—18.

Against laying on the table 119, including of course a goodly number of Whigs. The previous question was not seconded.

Mr. Brown of Indiana, by way of offsett, and to make a diversion in aid of his embarrassed Democratic brethren, moved an amendment as follows:

That this House approve of the sentiments of Henry Clay, expressed in his speech at the extra session of Congress, 1841, as follows: "Carry out the principles of the compromise act, look to revenue alone for the support of Government. Do not raise the question of protection, which I hoped had been not to rest. There is no necessity for protection."

The consequent proceedings we give verbatim, as reported in the National Intelligencer:—

Mr. Hale moved that the whole subject be laid on the table.

The motion was *rejected*.

And the question recurring on the demand for the previous question, the ayes were: Ayes 100, noes not counted.

So there was a second.

And the main question was ordered to be now taken, (being first on the amendment.)

Mr. Winthrop desired to know whether the question now, was on striking out the sentiments of Gen. Jackson, and inserting those of Mr. Clay.

The Speaker (pro tem. Mr. Hopkins,) answered in the affirmative.

Mr. Hardin supposed, then, that all who were opposed to Gen. Jackson's views would vote to strike out.

Mr. Payne asked the yeas and nays on the amendment, which were ordered and the result was announced as follows:

Yeas 82; nays 84.

So the amendment was *rejected*.

When the name of—

Mr. Morris was called that gentleman rose and said that, before he voted, he should like to inquire of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. Brown,) *whether this was a correct copy of Mr. Clay's remarks.*

Loud cries to order. No answer given.

Mr. Hamlin moved a reconsideration of the vote, and inquired if that motion was debatable; because if so, he desired to submit a few remarks.

The Speaker said not, the previous question having been ordered.

Mr. Hamlin then moved that the House adjourn; which motion (by yeas and nays) was rejected.

Mr. Thompson moved that the whole subject be laid on the table.

A motion to adjourn (taken by yeas and nays) was agreed to.

And the House adjourned.

From an Occasional Correspondent.

Washington, March 26, 1844.

There is another piece of trickery whispered about by the knowing ones in this quarter, no less a one than this. President Tyler's Cabinet, of or secretly negotiating with Texas a treaty for the annexation of it—and after, by every means possible, endeavoring to influence Senators to vote for it, when it comes before them, is, at the same time, negotiating for the consent of Mexico, by a special messenger dispatched to our Minister, Mr. Thompson—thus holding forth an argument against the justice of the annexation while endeavoring to force it upon the country.

If it is just to annex (and he so proclaimed it,) without the consent of Mexico, it must necessarily be no more than truckling to ask her consent, after, without it, negotiating the treaty; if it be not worse, a miserable effort to practice on the fears of Mexico, thinking she will adopt the proposition to escape the consequence she is pledged to abide by, if annexation take place without it. Truly our Executive will heap abundance of glory upon our beloved country.

The circles of enjoyments here are creeping out of the gloom consequent upon the disaster on board the Princeton. I hope to be able to give you the earliest notice when the treaty comes before the Senate.

TRUTH TELLER.

LOOK HERE!

THOSE Subscribers to the Mechanics' Institution who are withholding their books from the Library, are solicited to return them on the evenings of Mondays or Thursdays without further delay.

THOMAS SHAND,
Librarian.

March 14, 1844.

From the Montreal Pilot.

THE CUSTOMS' BILL.

The *Toronto Patriot* has followed suit to the *British Colonist* in attacking the writer of these remarks for his conduct with reference to the Customs' Bill. Among other extraordinary assertions it has been said, that the country would have gained £10,000 per annum by the bill, and the *Colonist* actually introduced into his article some calculations about green and roasted coffee. It is quite evident that our contemporaries have but a very superficial knowledge of the subject which they have made their ground of attack.

We shall take the present opportunity of offering a few *statements of facts*, promising that our contemporaries may make all the political capital they please out of the loss of this and other Bills during last session. Those who entertain sound Constitutional views with regard to Responsible Government, will hardly blame the late Ministry for taking the only course by which they could make the country aware of the "antagonism" which existed in the Government, and which, if there be any truth in the proverb, "a house divided against itself cannot stand," it was absolutely necessary to remove in some way.

We must first inform the *Colonist* that the Bill in question had nothing whatever to do with the duties—it was simply a Bill for the *management of Customs*. The object was to introduce the English system of management into Canada by providing a Board to be called the Commissioners of the Revenue, to superintend the department. The only saving to the public which could have arisen, would have been from the greater efficiency of the officers.

Already, however, much has been done to secure a more faithful collection of the public revenue. The Customs' Bill, introduced by Mr. Hincks, formed one of a series of bills, eight or nine in number, which had been prepared with a great deal of care, and which were intimately connected with one another. There were many *practical difficulties* to its being passed alone, into all of which it would be impossible for us to enter at present, but we shall state a very sufficient one. The Bill contained no repealing clause whatever. In accordance with the late English practice, a separate bill had been introduced repealing some forty or fifty Acts of Lower and Upper Canada, with a view to consolidate. This Bill had passed the House of Assembly, but *with the understanding* that it was not to be taken to the Council until accompanied by the other bills. Had it been proceeded with all the revenue acts would have been repealed without any substitute. Had it been allowed *to drop*, and the Customs' Bill *to pass*, then all the old laws for the management of the Customs would have remained in force. Now all *candid and impartial* men will see how unfairly the writer has been dealt with in this matter. On the very day before the resignation, but at a time when it was expected, the Bill was ready to be taken to the Upper House, a few days were allowed to elapse under the very natural expectation that a new Ministry would be formed, and that they would take their own course with regard to all the revenue measures, and act upon their own responsibility. So soon as ever it became evident that there was no immediate prospect of a new Ministry being formed, Mr. Hincks applied to the House to rescind their order that the Bill should be taken to the Council. He most unquestionably did not desire to incur any share of the responsibility of this bill, unless accompanied by the others which he had prepared, and no one will have the hardihood to assert that it would have been decorous or even possible to have carried through such measures as the various revenue bills without a Ministry. But why, we ask, was no opposition made to the rescinding of the order by the House on the score of the Governor being deprived of patronage? [illegible] a division, although one or two of the opposition members complained that Mr. Hincks had not taken the proper course. There were members in the House notoriously in communication with the Head of the Government, and they offered no opposition to Mr. Hincks' motion. It was left for Mr. Johnson, the facetious member for Carleton, on the last day of the session to propose a motion of censure, which was seconded by Mr. E. G. Wakefield, but on a division the latter individual voted against it, and Mr. Johnson was left alone in his glory. And such are the facts on which the Tory journals are now endeavouring to make political capital. It may be observed that an important feature in this bill was to provide that every officer of the revenue should give up his entire time to his duties. This was opposed by the Tories, who were most anxious that the provision should only have a prospective operation. They were then afraid that their friends would have to give up office, and that their political opponents would have a chance of getting it. But mark the change! They are now quite mortified that the bill did not pass at once, as the patronage would have been given to the right sort. We beg to remind them that the *prerogative* is sufficient even now to carry the most important provisions of the Customs' Bill into operation.—The Governor can dismiss all the practising Lawyers and Doctors that are employed in collecting the revenue, and he can require the collectors to appoint proper subordinate officers, such as he points out.—Our contemporaries must, therefore, acknowledge that the *patronage* may be at their disposal if the Government please. We may further observe, that a main object in the Bill which the late *very corrupt patronage seeking administration* introduced, was to secure a system of promotion according to merit, in the Customs' department, instead of having the situations as they are now, the prizes of party politicians in the several localities. *We are convinced* [illegible] be tried with unfairness, that we do not expect that our contemporaries will correct their mis-statements. We have not forgotten the "Rebellion Losses," about which so much was said *in party papers* before the meeting of Parliament, and yet when our opponents met us face to face in the House, *they had to admit* that the Government had it not in their power to act differently from what they did. And yet not one of those journals ever had the candour to make us the least reparation.

From the Toronto Banner, March 29.

GREAT MEETING OF THE REFORM ASSOCIATION AT TORONTO.

On Monday last, the 25th instant, the first General Meeting of the Reform Association took place at Toronto. The meeting was held in the large public room of the North American Hotel, connected with a suit of apartments which the Association has taken in lease for the transmission of their business.

The Hon. Robert Baldwin was called to the Chair at half past 6 o'clock. For five hours addresses were delivered, and eagerly listened to, by an attentive and enthusiastic audience. Seventeen Resolutions were brought forward and supported by speeches in which much eloquence and talent were displayed. Every sentiment uttered, showed the most ardent attachment to the British Constitution, with a deep-rooted determination to resist, by every lawful means, the attempts now being made to take away the enjoyment of Responsible Government from the people of Canada. We are sure that the circulation of the proceedings of this Meeting, which are fully reported in the *Globe*, will do much to forward the great cause for which this Association alone exists, viz., to procure for this country, the full benefits of the British Constitution.

The following are the Resolutions:—

Moved by the Hon. H. J. Boulton, seconded by John Boyd, Esq.

1. That this Association, devotedly attached to the principles of the British Constitution, are determined to use every constitutional means within their power, to secure the practical application of the principles of that Constitution to the management of all the local affairs of the colony, convinced that in so doing, they are at once performing the duty which they owe to themselves and their posterity, and strengthening in the best manner possible the connection with the Mother Country, which they desire to perpetuate.

Moved by William Hume Blake, Esq., seconded by W. L. Perrin, Esq.

2. That Ministerial Responsibility to the people of this country for every act of the Executive connected with our local affairs, is an essential ingredient of our Constitution. It is a privilege to which we have as undoubted a right as England herself. And without it the responsibility of the head of the Executive to the people of England is no guarantee for our liberties.

Moved by J. H. Price, Esq., M. P. P., seconded by Jesse Ketchum, Esq.

3. That the full establishment of such responsibility as recommended by Lord Durham, introduced by Lord Sydenham, recognized by the Resolutions of the Commons of the Province of 3d September, 1841, and acted upon by the late lamented Sir Charles Bagot in the change of the Ministry in September, 1842, requires that the business of the country should be conducted under the Representative of the Sovereign, by means of Heads of Departments, having seats in the Executive Council of the Province, and in the Provincial Parliament forming the Cabinet of the Head of the Government, and prepared to defend in their places in Parliament, the measures of their several Department, and politically responsible, individually and collectively, to the Provincial Parliament for every act of the Provincial Government.

Moved by the Hon. R. B. Sullivan, seconded by W. A. Baldwin, Esq.

4. That such Heads of Departments, forming the Provincial Administration under the Representative of the Sovereign, [illegible] only so long as they possess the confidence of Parliament.

Moved by R. Cathcart, Esq., seconded by S. Conner, Esq.

5. That the power of the Representative of the Sovereign in the exercise of the Royal Prerogative, with which he is entrusted, to make appointments to office, is admitted to the extent to which the same prerogative is exercised by Her Majesty in England, but that nevertheless as the Provincial Administration are responsible to Parliament here, for all acts of the Provincial Executive, in the administration of our local affairs, this association maintains the undoubted right of the Provincial ministers to be consulted upon the administration of all the affairs of the country, in order that if in disregard of their advice, any measure should be adopted, or appointments made, which they would not feel themselves prepared to defend, they may have the opportunity of resigning their offices before the consummation of the act against which they have thus advised.

Moved by George Brown, Esq., seconded by M. J. O'Brien, Esq.

6. That this Association cannot understand the existence of any separate interest between the Governor General and his Cabinet, and when the advisers of the Crown recommend appointments, it must be for the benefit of the Governor General's own Government, and the acting on such advice cannot be viewed in the light of a favor to the Ministry.

Moved by Thomas Ewart, Esq., seconded by John Doel, Esq.

7. That the fact of 'appointments and proposals to make appointments' having been made by the Governor General, without communicating with his ministers, is distinctly admitted in the correspondence transmitted to Parliament by the Governor General and of itself disproves the assertion contained in the reply, which His Excellency was advised to make to the Warden and Councillors of the District of Brock, 'that Responsible Government in all its essentials has been in full operation throughout His Excellency's administration.'

Moved by Jos. C. Morrison, Esq., seconded by Alexander Grant, Esq.

8. That the manner in which the Government of the Country has