

Mr. Roberts.— must thank myself on the count. I have a duty to perform, and the witness must answer the question himself.

By the Bench.—The men turned out on the 5th of May, and on the 7th they resumed work. We paid them for the number of days they worked.

Mr. Roberts.—If they only worked two or three days, you only paid them for it? Certainly.

By Mr. Kelsall.—Did the men ever lose two days? Yes, by their own neglect.

Mr. Roberts.—When work was slack, did you ever discharge the men? I never discharged the men, only at the end of the week.—Then on a Saturday you told them that you had no further need of them? Certainly.—And that was all the notice you gave

PRICE FIVEPENCE *each*

nothing was said about notice? No.—Not during the time he was with you? We do not require any notice, unless we give you any. If we do not want the men we discharge them on Saturday night.

By Mr. Roysds.—If he had worked till Saturday you would not have complained? No.

Mr. Chadwick.—You always pay the men on Saturday? Yes; nor did I pay Dawson till Saturday night.

By Mr. Roberts.—What day do you charge the defendant with absconding himself? On the 9th of June, you say.—Supposing he was on work on a Friday or Saturday, would you give him any? No; if we had none we could not, and he would be only entitled to the wages for the days he worked.—Supposing you discharged the man on a Tuesday, and you had no work for him? I should not discharge him.—Would you give him work? I should not employ him.—I gave him, if, in the middle of the week, you had no work, would the man be allowed to go and seek work elsewhere? Yes.—You are a good deal acquainted with this neighbourhood: do any of the master joiners give notice? I do not know.—You was a working man yourself? Yes.—Were you in the habit of giving notice? I have never given notice to any master's employment. What sort of work should the defendant work at? He should have been laying floors.—Have you a notice in the office, or did you say anything to Dawson before he left? Nothing to him.—Was there ever any agreement?

Mr. Hunt.—I object to that question.

Mr. Roberts.—Do you object? if you do, I will sit down and hear your argument.

Mr. Hunt.—No; you may go on.

Mr. Roberts.—The Joiners did not contract for a definite term from Saturday to Saturday; and I ask again, did you ever ask them to make any agreement? No answer.

By the Bench.—Is it a general custom at your shop and at others in this town, to make agreements? Not at ours.

By Mr. Roberts.—I do know a man of the name of Crabtree, and I believe that he has worked full of time.—Mr. Hunt, this is fishing for a witness.—Mr. Roberts: I am fishing, and I will find the lie, no matter how deep it may be hid.—Witness in answer to Mr. Roberts: When a man comes to our shop and starts for the week, we book his time. He may not agree to our wages. We tell him what we give; that is all the agreement.—I entered in and he acquiesces. I have his working time in the book, and he works.

By Mr. Roysds.—There is a combination amongst the men; and on the Monday, betwixt the hours of ten and eleven o'clock, two men came, to our yard and called upon me; I knew them well, as they had worked for me. One of them asked if I would discharge Knevill at noon? I replied so, and he said, I would not. They told me they would strike the shop, and the men would turn-out at dinner hour. I told them that I could not help it. Knevill was a good workman, and would not contribute to the union funds.

Mr. Roberts.—If it had not been for the turn-out you would not have brought the men here? I should not.

By Mr. Roysds.—I have not asked the men to come again; I have seen Dawson picketing the street, but never heard him speak to any person.

Mr. Roberts.—True, but the object of the union.—Is it not to protect their tools? I am not aware.—You have had a fire at your shop; did you ever say anything to one of the men that was a

Mr. Charles Holt, the partner of the previous witness, proved that the defendant left his work on Monday: no notice or request had been sent to him to re-

motion. Mr. Roberts then addressed the bench on the part of the defendant. The difficulty he felt arose from the circumstance, that he was totally unable to satisfy himself as to what the charge really was which he was called upon to reply to. He had watched the evidence most narrowly, but it afforded no clue whatever, and it was plain that the magistrates were in the same difficulty as himself: one had spoken of it as a case of intimidation—another had spoken of it as a charge of "leaving a man unfinished." The charge which he was there to answer was that stated in the information—that the defendant had absented himself unlawfully from his service, and therein neglected to perform his contract. Was there one particle of evidence of any contract at all? No. He had taken no oaths, and there was thus most important point—and what did it all amount to? That the defendant had worked for the prosecutors for the last six or seven years; that at the commencement of his work, and during the whole period of its continuance, not one word had been given by either party for any notice being given, or as to any specific period for working; throughout the whole period the men worked as many days and as few as they pleased; they pleased themselves as to the number of days they would work—and on each Saturday night they were paid for the number of days on which they had actually worked; such a system, if it could be called a contract at all, was not a contract. The privilege of such servitude as involved the heavy penalties of the Masters and Servants Act. Before these heavy penalties could be incurred the relation of master and servant must exist, plainly, fully, and completely; the master must have the right to all the labour of the servant, and the servant must have the right to wages for his support. The evidence of Ladyman proved the reverse of this. He had asked Ladyman why the defendant, absenting himself this week, was to be treated differently from his previous absences, and the answer was, that nothing would have been done, or thought respecting it if others had not objected; such a system is the same time here, then, was the real charge, the real subject of the prosecution—to put down the right of the men to combine together for the purpose of mutual protection. A magistrate had thought it not inconsistent with his duty to intimate from the bench that combinations were wrong, he had said so, and he (Mr. Roberts) at once admitted that they were most offensive to tyranny—awkward customers for despotism to cope with; but still they were perfectly legal. Working men had a right to combine and determine not to work in the same shop with an individual who was obnoxious to them; and he who sought to interfere with this with any open denial of its existence, or interfering with its progress, or even by advising against its exercise, was guilty both of fraud and of falsehood. Mr. Roberts then, after a long explanation of the power conferred upon the working classes by the Combination Act, recapitulated the whole of the evidence, showing that by the testimony of Mr. Ladyman himself all evidence both of master and servant had throughout recognised the right of each of them to give or withhold employment or labour; and he contended that such an engagement was altogether different from what was contemplated by the law with regard to the relation of master and servant. As soon as Mr. Roberts had concluded, the Mr. Roysds of the bench, and who had been very much excited from the commencement, gave his decision. He considered the case fully proved—it was a very strong case—the men had no right to combine—they shouldn't combine—he should go to the full extent of the law—three months—it was time to stop such proceedings. Mr. Roberts reminded the magistrates that his client was not charged with intimidation; but Mr. Roysds said, "he abused—not he—they had gone on too long—these things must be put a stop to." Here his brothers on the bench endeavoured to calm their leader, and even the prosecutors hinted that they did not desire to press the case "quite so far—all they wanted was for the men to return to work, and to give up their means of restraint. Mr. Roysds's companions could not hold him back. At last he shrieked out—"Well, prisoner, will you go back to your work?" Dawson, with a firm voice: No, I will not. Again the justice was frantic. "I will not, you won't you? Give him a month at the mill—see how he likes that." But we must desist from giving our readers any idea of the scene; even the prosecutors were so startled by it that they declined proceeding with the other cases, and at last they consented to withdraw the proceedings against Dawson. This, however, was no easy matter. Mr. Roysds for a long time refused: the matter was at last arranged by Dawson and the others consenting to return to their work. We have no reason to believe that immediate steps will be taken to relieve Mr. Roysds from the performance of his managerial duties. A criminal information would do him service, and would operate even more beneficially as a useful lesson to other Rochdale justices.

Imperial Parliament.

HOUSE OF LORDS, MONDAY, JUNE 23.

Their Lordships met at five o'clock.
The Right Hon. W. Nevill took the oath and his seat as the Earl of Abergavenny, on the demise of his brother, the late Earl.

The Marquis of NORMANBY moved, that the name of the Bishop of London be struck off the protest entered on the journals of the house against the third reading of the Maynooth Bill, as he had not been present on the occasion—a proposition to which the right rev. prelate immediately assented.

The amended Small Debt Bill was then read a second time, and the concluding orders having been suspended in its favour, passed through committee.

The Earl of KILMORE moved the second reading of the Scotch Banking Bill, and briefly explained the nature of the measure, which, in his opinion, would be of great advantage to the general banking operations of the empire, because it would bring about an assimilation between the systems pursued in different parts of the country.

The Earl of HAMPDEN moved, that the measure be postponed until the next day, on the ground that it was a most unnecessary interference with the Scotch system. In this instance the old maxim "let well alone," might be very aptly applied; besides, the bill would create a monopoly, for which reason he would move as an amendment that the bill be read again that day six months.

After a few words from Lord Kilmuir and Dalhousie, the bill was read a second time.

Several other orders were then forwarded a stage, and their lordships adjourned.

TUESDAY, JUNE 24.

A strong opposition was made to the third reading of the Oxford and Rugby Railway, but it was eventually carried by a majority of 121 to 58.

Mr. HURV moved the following resolution—"That the course pursued by Great Britain since 1814, for the suppression of the slave trade, has been attended with large expenditure of the public money, and by serious loss of life to the naval forces of this country, and that it has not mitigated the horrors of the middle passage, nor diminished the extent of the traffic in slaves." The hon. gentleman contended, in accordance with the spirit of his motion, that all the exertions of this country had been productive of much greater mischief to the natives of Africa than they were before exposed to, and that the proper course would be to cease all further interference, and withdraw our cruisers from the coast of that quarter of the globe.

Sir G. COCKBURN thought such a course would be very unwise at the very moment when the first chance presented itself of effectually crushing this odious traffic.

Lord HOWICK agreed in most of the observations of Mr. Hunt, but thought he would not with discretion in not pressing his motion to a division. If they withdrew all interference with the trade, the authorities of Cuba would themselves be compelled in self-defence to check the traffic. They were, in fact, already terrified in Cuba lest too many slaves should be imported. Still, as the treaty with France had been concluded, he saw no immediate use in pressing the resolution before the house.

Sir R. PEEL admitted that the efforts of this country had not been hitherto successful in abolishing the slave trade, and that it still existed with much of its usual horrors. He had no doubt, however, that if this country were to withdraw its cruisers and to relax its efforts, they would have a renewal of all the horrors which enabled Mr. Wilberforce to make his noble and successful exertion which was made for the extinction of slavery in our colonies. He was of opinion that it would be most unwise of us to withdraw from the convention just concluded with France for watching the coast of Africa, more particularly as at the present time America and Portugal were, as well as France, cordially acting with us to attain the great object which this country has always held in view.

After some observations from Sir G. Napier, an Hon. MEMBER moved that the house be counted, and on 29 members being present, an adjournment necessarily took place.

THURSDAY, JUNE 26.

Lord STANLEY moved the nomination of twenty-one peers as a select committee to which the Tenants (Ireland) Compensation Bill should be referred. After some discussion the committee was appointed.

Lord FORTMANN moved the second reading of the English Landlord and Tenant Bill, which was opposed by Lord Beaumont, and after some discussion was negatived on a division by a majority of 10 to 7.

The remaining business was then disposed of, and the house adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, FRIDAY, JUNE 20.

After a lengthy discussion on Railway matters, the house went into committee on the Customs Act, and Mr. E. BULLER moved the repeal of the duty on tallow.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER opposed the motion, as the whole disposable surplus revenue at the command of the Government had been already applied to the reduction of the import duties on various articles of general consumption.

After some discussion the motion was withdrawn, the resolutions were agreed to, and the house resumed.

On the motion for going into committee of supply, Mr. WILLIAMS rose to call the attention of the house to the conduct of Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in refusing bail for Mr. Meyer, who was recently committed at Bow-street for an assault on his brother-in-law for sedition, had any other hon. member went on to say that the instance to which he had called the attention of the house was by no means a solitary instance of misconduct. Scarcely a week passed but that something occurred to bring the conduct of magistrates in question, and this was mainly attributable to the laxity with which instances of misconduct were dealt with. The hon. member, after some further observations, concluded by moving for a copy of the correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Home Department and Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in reference to his commitment of Mr. Meyer, an inhabitant of St. Marylebone, to Newgate, for an assault, under circumstances of gross provocation, after his refusal to accept bail for him, although tendered to any amount.

Sir J. GRAHAM repeated his former explanation, and refused to produce the correspondence, and the motion was then negatived without a division.

After some further discussion, the house went into committee pro forma, and immediately afterwards adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MONDAY, JUNE 23.

The house met at four o'clock.
THE IRISH COLLEGES BILL.

In moving that the SPEAKER leave the chair, in order that the house might resolve itself into a committee on the Colleges (Ireland) Bill.

Sir JAMES GRAHAM called himself of the opportunity to answer the questions which had been put to him on the subject of this bill. Mr. Vernon Smith had asked for whose benefit this bill was intended. Considering the spread of useful education among the humbler classes of the people of Ireland, as evinced by the fact that 500,000 children were now obtaining an excellent education in the public and private schools of that country, and considering the small number of students who were sent to the children of the higher classes in the University of Dublin, he had no hesitation in replying that these new colleges were intended for the benefit of the large class of children belonging to the middle classes. The education given at them would be such as would be eminently useful to the manufacturing, commercial, and trading classes in Ireland, and also to the sons of the gentry in different counties of that country. Lord J. Russell had also asked him a question as to the appropriation of the money to be voted to these colleges. With regard to the capital sum of £20,000 for their erection, he did not expect that Lord J. Russell wished him to enter into any details; but, with regard to the appropriation of £2000 a year to each of these colleges, he would tell the noble lord that in each of them he proposed to place a president and vice-president, and to make £2000 a year for each of them, and the first, and £1000 a year for the latter. He calculated upon placing twelve or fourteen professors in each of these colleges. The salaries of each would not be less than £200, or more than £300 a year. The librarian would have a salary of £300 a year, the bursar of £100 a year; and the college servants would divide among them £200 a year. In this manner £2,900 a year would be expended. Out of the surplus of £4000 a year which would remain, the library, astronomical and scientific apparatus, and at first a large expenditure for indispensable purposes must be provided. By the charter of incorporation to be granted to these colleges, Government intended to provide for the annual examination of the students. To the first twenty among the students of the first year it was proposed to give exhibitions varying from £25 to £200 a year each. The same regulation would apply to the students of the second year, and to the first twenty among the students of the third year, exhibitions of £200 a year each would be awarded. In this way from £1,000 to £1,500 a year would be expended in exhibitions. This brought him to the consideration of another question of great importance, which had been put to him by Mr. Shell. Consistently with the principles of the present bill, he would not propose the admission of any religious test either to the students or to the professors in these new colleges. But when they intended to adhere to that. But that they consented to the exclusion of all religious tests, Ministers thought that securities ought to be taken that the professors did not in their lectures attempt to sap and undermine the faith of the students. He knew of no security that would be efficient for such a purpose except the vesting of the salaries of the professors in the Crown, whose Ministers would be responsible in different degrees for each appointment. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the amendments which he had proposed and printed for the purpose of giving a more effectual moral control over the students, considerable alterations had been made of the original draft of the bill, for the purpose of meeting the views of the house. Where students resided with their parents or guardians, no further control could be provided. But if they did not reside with their parents or guardians, then, as those parties would be at a distance, it was necessary that some precautions should be taken. An annual license would therefore be required for all persons who took boarders. With respect to the foundation of halls, every encouragement would be given to the governing body, after state sanction, to found halls of works in aid of their erection. He had also been asked who were to be the visitors of these halls. At that point he could not pledge either the present or the future Government, considering how much the success of the present scheme depended upon it; but it appeared to him that the heads of the religious establishments in those quarters ought to have the power of visiting them, and that the questions which had been put to him by Mr. Shell except one; and that was, "Were the Government prepared to appoint a Roman Catholic chaplain, to be paid by the State, to officiate in these halls?" Having given their best consideration to this question, Ministers were of opinion that any such arrangement would be adverse to the principle of the bill, and could not consent to make any concession upon that point.

Lord MAHON then rose to move his amendment, that "It is the opinion of this house that in the establishment of colleges in Ireland provision should be made for the religious instruction of the pupils by means of lectures fees, till such time as private benefactors for that object may have taken effect." That amendment asserted a principle, without which no system of education could be carried on in the country, and which was religious with secular instruction. He was justified in bringing it forward, not only by the 15th clause of the bill, but also by the amendment on it contained in clause G. What security could be given that the benefactions contemplated in those clauses would be made at all, or would be made in time to enable the State to depend upon them? Education, therefore, was made contingent on private charity. But even if it were certain that this contingency would be at once supplied, he should object to establishing such a precedent as was contemplated in this bill. It took away all parental care from the pupils, and did not substitute for it any academic rule. He showed that the importance of joining religious with state education had been recognized as a principle by Pascal and Fenelon, as well as by Hooker and Wesley; and contended that there was nothing in the condition of Ireland to forbid the application of that principle to that country. In order to carry it out, he proposed that there should be in each of these new colleges professors of theology—one for the students of the Established Church, another for those of the Roman Catholic religion, and a third for the Protestant dissenting professors. He proposed that the professor for the Presbyterian pupils. These professors should not be named by any act of the Crown. The professor for the Established Church should be appointed by the bishops of that Church; the professor for the Roman Catholic students by the Roman Catholic bishops; and the Presbyterian professor by the Synod of Ulster. The freest choice should be permitted to the students of each religion, and they should be free to choose their own professors, and to demand from them a certificate of their attendance on the lectures of one of these professors as a necessary condition to their taking of a degree, or even to their continuance in the institution. A power of giving special exemption from such instruction should be lodged in the board of visitors, and that exemption should be granted to every class of students who were asked for it. The noble lord then proceeded to the minor details of his scheme, of which the most material was that he would leave the amount of the lecture fees under these theological professors to be fixed by the board of visitors of each college.

Mr. WYSE seconded the amendment; but in doing so expressed the insuperable objections which he entertained against placing religious professors in state education, and he declared that he would not support the bill.

Lord MAHON then moved for a division on the amendment, and after some discussion was negatived on a division by a majority of 10 to 7.

The remaining business was then disposed of, and the house adjourned.

On the motion for going into committee of supply, Mr. WILLIAMS rose to call the attention of the house to the conduct of Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in refusing bail for Mr. Meyer, who was recently committed at Bow-street for an assault on his brother-in-law for sedition, had any other hon. member went on to say that the instance to which he had called the attention of the house was by no means a solitary instance of misconduct. Scarcely a week passed but that something occurred to bring the conduct of magistrates in question, and this was mainly attributable to the laxity with which instances of misconduct were dealt with. The hon. member, after some further observations, concluded by moving for a copy of the correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Home Department and Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in reference to his commitment of Mr. Meyer, an inhabitant of St. Marylebone, to Newgate, for an assault, under circumstances of gross provocation, after his refusal to accept bail for him, although tendered to any amount.

Sir J. GRAHAM repeated his former explanation, and refused to produce the correspondence, and the motion was then negatived without a division.

After some further discussion, the house went into committee pro forma, and immediately afterwards adjourned.

On the motion for going into committee of supply, Mr. WILLIAMS rose to call the attention of the house to the conduct of Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in refusing bail for Mr. Meyer, who was recently committed at Bow-street for an assault on his brother-in-law for sedition, had any other hon. member went on to say that the instance to which he had called the attention of the house was by no means a solitary instance of misconduct. Scarcely a week passed but that something occurred to bring the conduct of magistrates in question, and this was mainly attributable to the laxity with which instances of misconduct were dealt with. The hon. member, after some further observations, concluded by moving for a copy of the correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Home Department and Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in reference to his commitment of Mr. Meyer, an inhabitant of St. Marylebone, to Newgate, for an assault, under circumstances of gross provocation, after his refusal to accept bail for him, although tendered to any amount.

Sir J. GRAHAM repeated his former explanation, and refused to produce the correspondence, and the motion was then negatived without a division.

After some further discussion, the house went into committee pro forma, and immediately afterwards adjourned.

On the motion for going into committee of supply, Mr. WILLIAMS rose to call the attention of the house to the conduct of Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in refusing bail for Mr. Meyer, who was recently committed at Bow-street for an assault on his brother-in-law for sedition, had any other hon. member went on to say that the instance to which he had called the attention of the house was by no means a solitary instance of misconduct. Scarcely a week passed but that something occurred to bring the conduct of magistrates in question, and this was mainly attributable to the laxity with which instances of misconduct were dealt with. The hon. member, after some further observations, concluded by moving for a copy of the correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Home Department and Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in reference to his commitment of Mr. Meyer, an inhabitant of St. Marylebone, to Newgate, for an assault, under circumstances of gross provocation, after his refusal to accept bail for him, although tendered to any amount.

Sir J. GRAHAM repeated his former explanation, and refused to produce the correspondence, and the motion was then negatived without a division.

After some further discussion, the house went into committee pro forma, and immediately afterwards adjourned.

On the motion for going into committee of supply, Mr. WILLIAMS rose to call the attention of the house to the conduct of Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in refusing bail for Mr. Meyer, who was recently committed at Bow-street for an assault on his brother-in-law for sedition, had any other hon. member went on to say that the instance to which he had called the attention of the house was by no means a solitary instance of misconduct. Scarcely a week passed but that something occurred to bring the conduct of magistrates in question, and this was mainly attributable to the laxity with which instances of misconduct were dealt with. The hon. member, after some further observations, concluded by moving for a copy of the correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Home Department and Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in reference to his commitment of Mr. Meyer, an inhabitant of St. Marylebone, to Newgate, for an assault, under circumstances of gross provocation, after his refusal to accept bail for him, although tendered to any amount.

Sir J. GRAHAM repeated his former explanation, and refused to produce the correspondence, and the motion was then negatived without a division.

After some further discussion, the house went into committee pro forma, and immediately afterwards adjourned.

On the motion for going into committee of supply, Mr. WILLIAMS rose to call the attention of the house to the conduct of Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in refusing bail for Mr. Meyer, who was recently committed at Bow-street for an assault on his brother-in-law for sedition, had any other hon. member went on to say that the instance to which he had called the attention of the house was by no means a solitary instance of misconduct. Scarcely a week passed but that something occurred to bring the conduct of magistrates in question, and this was mainly attributable to the laxity with which instances of misconduct were dealt with. The hon. member, after some further observations, concluded by moving for a copy of the correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Home Department and Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in reference to his commitment of Mr. Meyer, an inhabitant of St. Marylebone, to Newgate, for an assault, under circumstances of gross provocation, after his refusal to accept bail for him, although tendered to any amount.

Sir J. GRAHAM repeated his former explanation, and refused to produce the correspondence, and the motion was then negatived without a division.

After some further discussion, the house went into committee pro forma, and immediately afterwards adjourned.

On the motion for going into committee of supply, Mr. WILLIAMS rose to call the attention of the house to the conduct of Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in refusing bail for Mr. Meyer, who was recently committed at Bow-street for an assault on his brother-in-law for sedition, had any other hon. member went on to say that the instance to which he had called the attention of the house was by no means a solitary instance of misconduct. Scarcely a week passed but that something occurred to bring the conduct of magistrates in question, and this was mainly attributable to the laxity with which instances of misconduct were dealt with. The hon. member, after some further observations, concluded by moving for a copy of the correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Home Department and Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in reference to his commitment of Mr. Meyer, an inhabitant of St. Marylebone, to Newgate, for an assault, under circumstances of gross provocation, after his refusal to accept bail for him, although tendered to any amount.

Sir J. GRAHAM repeated his former explanation, and refused to produce the correspondence, and the motion was then negatived without a division.

After some further discussion, the house went into committee pro forma, and immediately afterwards adjourned.

On the motion for going into committee of supply, Mr. WILLIAMS rose to call the attention of the house to the conduct of Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in refusing bail for Mr. Meyer, who was recently committed at Bow-street for an assault on his brother-in-law for sedition, had any other hon. member went on to say that the instance to which he had called the attention of the house was by no means a solitary instance of misconduct. Scarcely a week passed but that something occurred to bring the conduct of magistrates in question, and this was mainly attributable to the laxity with which instances of misconduct were dealt with. The hon. member, after some further observations, concluded by moving for a copy of the correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Home Department and Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in reference to his commitment of Mr. Meyer, an inhabitant of St. Marylebone, to Newgate, for an assault, under circumstances of gross provocation, after his refusal to accept bail for him, although tendered to any amount.

Sir J. GRAHAM repeated his former explanation, and refused to produce the correspondence, and the motion was then negatived without a division.

After some further discussion, the house went into committee pro forma, and immediately afterwards adjourned.

On the motion for going into committee of supply, Mr. WILLIAMS rose to call the attention of the house to the conduct of Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in refusing bail for Mr. Meyer, who was recently committed at Bow-street for an assault on his brother-in-law for sedition, had any other hon. member went on to say that the instance to which he had called the attention of the house was by no means a solitary instance of misconduct. Scarcely a week passed but that something occurred to bring the conduct of magistrates in question, and this was mainly attributable to the laxity with which instances of misconduct were dealt with. The hon. member, after some further observations, concluded by moving for a copy of the correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Home Department and Mr. Twyford, the police magistrate, in reference to his commitment of Mr. Meyer, an inhabitant of St. Marylebone, to Newgate, for an assault, under circumstances of gross provocation, after his refusal to accept bail for him, although tendered to any amount.

Sir J. GRAHAM repeated his former explanation, and refused to produce the correspondence, and the motion was then negatived without a division.

liament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 1848 it should be open to Parliament to consider in what way the future professors should be appointed. He thought that this measure would be incomplete if these colleges were not hereafter incorporated into one university. Such an incorporation was a necessary supplement to it. Leaving the arrangement of a university under the control of Parliament, he thought that after an university was founded, it ought to be left to the governing body, after state sanction, to determine whether to recommend the Crown the professors to be appointed, leaving a veto upon them in the Crown. In the colleges of England and Scotland, wherever the State endowed, the Crown had the appointment to the professorship. He was not prepared to relinquish that power in the appointment of either the presidents or the vice-presidents of these new colleges. With respect to the first nomination of the professors, he thought that it was advisable that the Crown should have the power of making it. But he was not willing to relinquish the object of the Dissenters from the Establishment of the house, he was not willing to meet the bill that after the year 18