LOUIS NAPOLEON IN AMERICA.

A Mr. Tinelli recently published in the *Courier des Etats Unis*, a letter, defending the French Emperor against the charges of rowdyism and immorality brought against him, whilst in this country nineteen years ago. The Rev. Charles Stewart, Chaplain in the Navy, also publishes a letter in the *National Intelligencer*, from which we cull the following extracts:

He was winning in the invariableness of his amiability, often playful in spirit and manner, and warm in his affections. He was a most fondly attached son, and seemed to idolize his mother. When speaking of her, the intonations of his voice and his whole manner were often as gentle and feminine, as those of a woman. It had been his purpose to spend a year in making the tour of the United States, that he might have a better knowledge of our institutions, and observe for himself the practical workings of our political system.

His plans were suddenly changed by intelligence of the serious illness of Queen Hortense, or, as then styled, the Duchess of St. Leu, in her castle in Switzerland. I was dining with him, the day the letter conveying this information was received. Recognizing the writing on the envelope, as it was handed to him at table, he hastily broke the seal, and had scarce glanced over half a page before he exclaimed, "My mother is ill; I must see her. Instead of a tour of the States, I shall take the next packet for England. I will apply for passports for the continent at every embassy in London, and, if unsuccessful, will make my way to her without them." This he did, and reached Aremenberg in time to console by his presence the dying hours of the ex-Queen, and to receive in his bosom her last sigh.

In both eating and drinking, he was, so far as I observed, abstemious, rather than self-indulgent. I repeatedly breakfasted, dined, and supped in his company, and never knew him to partake of any thing stronger in drink, than the light wines of France and Germany, and of these in great moderation. I have been with him early and late, unexpectedly, as well as by appointment, and never saw reason for the slightest suspicion of any irregularity in his habits

After such opportunities of knowing much of the mind and heart and general character of Louis Napoleon, it was with great surprise, that I for the first time read, in a distant part of the world, when he had become an Emperor, representations in the public journals of his life in New York, (and in New Orleans, too, though he was never there,) which would induce a belief that he had been a vagabond of a character better than a vagabond—low in his associations, intemperate in his indulgences, and dissipated in his habits.

It has been said, that his character was so notorious, that he was not received in society, and made no respectable acquaintances. If, during his brief stay in the city, at a period of the year when general entertainments are not usual, he was not met in the self-constituted *beau-monde* of the metropolis, it was from his own choice. Within his means, every attention, cards and invitations were left for him at his hotel.

As a reason for declining to accept the last, he told me he had no wish to appear in what is called society, but added:—"There are, however individuals resident in New York, whose acquaintance I should be happy to make. Mr. Washington Irving is one. I have read his works, and admire him both as a writer and a man, and would take great pleasure in meeting him. Chancellor Kent is another. I have studied his Commentaries, think highly of them, and regard him as the first of your jurists. I would be happy to know him personally."

He did make the acquaintance both of Mr. Irving and the Chancellor, and enjoyed the hospitality of the one at Sunnyside, and of the other at his residence in town. He saw some of the best French society of the city, and familiar with the historic names of New York, availed himself of the proffered civilities of such families as the Hamiltons, the Clintons, the Livingstons, and others of like position. It is not true, therefore, that he was not received in society, and had no acquaintances of respectability.

It is said, that he was without means, and lived on the loans which he never repaid. This is simply absurd. I am under the impression, that his private fortune was then unimpaired, and beyond the reach of the French Government; but, if this were not the case, his mother's wealth was ample, and his drafts upon her for any amount would have been promptly honoured. I doubt not, that funds were waiting his arrival, or, if not, were readily at his command.

Louis Napoleon may have had some associations in New York of which I was ignorant; and he, like Dickens and other distinguished foreigners, may have carried his observations, under the protection of the police, to scenes in which I would not have accompanied him. If he did, I never heard of it, and have no reason to suppose such was the fact. But that he was an *habitue*, as has been publicly reported, of drinking saloons and oyster cellars, gambling houses and places of worse repute, I do not believe.

There was no secret in New York at the same time and for about the same period, of Prince Bonaparte who was, I have reason to think, of a very different character. His antecedents in Europe had not been favourable, and his reputation here was not good. He too was in exile, but not for a political offence. He may not have been received in society, and may have had low associations. I met him, but from this impression formed no acquaintance with him. For the same reason, the intercourse between him and his cousin was infrequent, and formal. All that has been said and published of the one may be true of the other; and, in the search for reminiscences of the sojourn in New York of Louis Napoleon, on his elevation to a throne fifteen years afterwards, it is not difficult to believe, that those ignorant of the presence here at the same time of two persons of the same name and same title, may have confounded the acts and character of the one with those of the other.

HUGH MILLER AS A LECTURER.

Hugh Miller of Edinburgh, Scotland, recently lectured before the Young Men's Christian Association, in Exeter Hall, London. His subject was, "Labour lightened, not lost." The *Northern Ensign* says: "Lord Panmure, who occupied the chair, introduced him as a countryman of his own; and certainly no Scotchman was ashamed of his countryman on that evening. His lecture was a masterpiece of oratory. There ran quite a vein of humour through the whole, and his sonorous voice made the immense hall ring again. Now he would have his audience in roars of laughter, then almost on the verge of weeping. The numerous stories with which he diversified his lecture were told with such an air of *naiveté*, mixed with perfect humanity, that he at once riveted the attention of his audience, and maintained it without flagging for two hours. The burden of his lecture was the advocacy of the half-holiday movement, and the sacred observance of the Sabbath. He spoke of the value of early ablutions and attention to personal cleanliness; and in denouncing intemperance, he paid a graceful tribute to the good effects which have resulted to Scotland from Forbes McKenzie's Act, and called upon Englishmen to demand such an act for England. He described the Saturday half-holiday as the key to the proper observance of the Sabbath. At the present time, when the half-holiday movement is being agitated, this lecture will do immense good."—*London paper.*

GREAT LOSS ON PRODUCE.—It is now stated, that the immense quantities of wheat purchased at Chicago, Milwaukie, and other points at the West, last fall, said at the time to be on account of the French Government, were in reality bought for parties in Boston, New York, &c., who will "realize" a loss of something near a million of dollars! Millions of bushels were purchased, and the prices paid were considered as high at the time, the purchasers expecting to realize an immense profit-

CORRESPONDENCE.

Correspondents must forward us with their names, not necessarily for publication but as a guarantee, that good faith, is on the part of both ourselves responsible for the opinions of such contributors.

TO THE EDITOR OF HASZARD'S GAZETTE.

Sir:

In the *Examiner* of the 5th May, Capt. Swabey says, that no *Lawyer* in the Island would *advise a tenant to inform the Judge* in the Supreme Court *that the Township land is forfeited and that impostors had usurped an ownership over it and were demanding and obtaining money from the people by false pretences*. I had no doubt before Mr. Swabey said so, that the Lawyers in general, had taken fees from the impostors, to uphold the fraud, and consequently could not advise a tenant against them. But I thought the Attorney General, who is appointed and paid, to guard the public rights, would take up such a case, in the public Court, where the honor of the Crown is so deeply involved. I did not think it would be necessary, for the tenant to commence such an action at his own cost. But if the Attorney General refuse to take up the case, as a public wrong, at the suit of the Crown, the Tenant should inform the Judge in open court, either by word or writing; and the Judge will direct the way the case should be conducted.

In the same *Examiner*, Mr. Whelan says, that my opposition to the address to the Queen in relation to the Proprietors of the Landlords sent home against the Rent Roll and Compensation Bills, is a proof of my going over to the proprietary or Tory side. Now I intend to show, that address is as complete a piece of *humbug* as ever issued from a Legislative body and is against the people's interests.

Mr. Whelan and the Government insist, that the forfeiture declared in the Grants is no forfeiture, but the proprietors had a just and lawful title to the Land. Now if this were so as he and his Bills, Compensation Commission Bill would be an act of gross injustice, to interfere with the rights of property, to make new conditions between the Landlords and their Tenants, and compelled to make new leases themselves, or to tax their Rent Roll without taxing every other Rent Roll in the colony. The people understood, that those Bills were passed in haste, because the proprietors and Ministers would not allow their titles to be tried. But it is inconsistent with Law and justice for the *Government to retaliate*, and do injustice to the Landlords because they have done injustice to the inhabitants. A person who had stolen property, might as well plead, that he did right to steal it, because he knew the person he had stolen from, was a thief, and had stolen far more than he had done. The Government declare the proprietors are good title, and yet they pass the Tenants compensation and Rent Roll Bills, to deprive them of the Land, because they know they have a bad title.

And in that address to the Queen, it is allowed, that *any* subject may petition the Sovereign, to disallow an Act which would be an injury to them. But the address does not allow the Landlords to petition. And the reasons assigned, why the proprietors must not interfere with our colonial Acts, is not because they have a bad title, the only feasible reason they could offer, which would decide in their favour and the rest are unpopular in the Island.

And after such a jumble of inconsistencies, the address ends up with a prayer to her Majesty, which if it were granted, very tyrannical Government might deprive us of all our rights. *Perhaps that is the main object of the address.* The Colonial Acts and Colonial Acts should become Law without the Royal assent, or in other words, that we shall submit to be governed by the colonial authorities, without any protection from the Sovereign. There is nothing said of the forfeiture of the Grants. And such is the principles of the address which I could not support.

The Landlords would have just cause to complain of any *new* Law, which would alter their condition, or compel them to sell the Land. But they can have no *cause to complain* of their titles being tried by *tribunals which they themselves agreed to* by their *own* acceptance or purchase of the grants, nor is there any injustice in punishing them for an act of fraud for obtaining money by false pretences. Now the people may see that the sovereign could not allow acts to pass which would place the landholders in a worse condition, than they were before, and by the same rule of justice, the sovereign could not allow any indulgence to *favor* landholders an *enable them to deprive others of their birthright*, a share of the public land, as the Indian inhabitants have a far better right, to insist upon a trials of titles, than the landholders had to petition against the rent roll and compensation Bills, the people must see that that is the *correct*; the landlords have set the example. But in seeking those rights, avoid the blackguard language of the landlord's petitions, such language is only fit for impostors.

A Court of Escheat is a Court of justice; and is the only Court wherein a forfeiture can be tried. Those persons accepted or purchased a grant, knew that the grants were forfeited, when the conditions for settlement were not performed. And both landlords and governments should have known, that taking sums of from the people, for forfeited land, by sham purchases, and other fraudulent deceptions—*is obtaining money by false pretences* which is punishable by our colonial statute. See Vol. 1 page 516; the following words "That if any shall by false pretence, obtain from any other person, any chattel, money or other valuable security with intent to cheat or defraud any person of such same, every such offender shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and being convicted shall suffer punishment by fine or imprisonment or both, as the court shall award."

Messrs. Whelan and Swabey have made objections to my letter of the 28th April, and to show what I think of *them*, I am ready and willing to prove in a Court of Justice, that Mr. Whelan has by his proceedings in the Debtor matter deceived the people on the Land question, and made them an easy prey to be swindled out of their property by Landlords and Government. And I am as ready and willing to prove in like manner, that it was illegal in Mr. Swabey to purchase the Worrell Estate, until the forfeiture of the Grants was investigated in a court of Escheat. Consequently Mr. Swabey is obtaining money from the people on that estate, by false pretences. The people should understand, that Proprietors have *forfeited* their Grants, had no right to the land whatever. Any other subject had a better right to a share of the land than them, and all their demands, and the money they have taken from the people, is by false pretences. But the attornment demanded, and obtained by an imposture, is an imposition of a more gross and heinous nature, because the attornment not only intended to continue the frauds, but also by a rule of court to deprive the persons defrauded of their remedy at Law. The attornment and the purpose for which it was intended, is of the same nature, as if robbers were to bind the persons they had robbed under their authority, and to keep them in such fear, that they should never divulge the robbery, but that their children submit quietly to be robbed in future.

It is the duty of the Government to suppress such impositions. They are invested with power and authority by the Sovereign, and paid by the public to do so. But they have betrayed their trust, and instead of suppressing the impositions, have given it fresh encouragement, by their example. They have no lawful authority over the Worrell Estate, and the money and attornment they demand of the people are obtained by false pretences.

WM. COOPER.

Sailor's Hope, May 13th, 1856.

HASZARD'S GAZETTE.

Saturday, May 17, 1856.

THINGS are we understand, several notes purporting to be one-dollar notes of the Canadian branch of the Bank of British North America in circulation; we would therefore guard the public against being imposed upon. The history of these notes is rather singular. It would appear, that about twelve years since, a vessel from England was wrecked somewhere about Miramichi, on the St. Lawrence; among the articles thrown on shore, was a box which contained a brass-bound box, which on being opened, was found to contain blank copper-plate for the notes of the Bank of Canada branch of the Bank. A gentleman from Prince Edward Island happened to be at Miramichi when a man was detected in offering one, and a great number were taken from different parts of his person, where they were found secreted. Our informant thinks, that the parties into whose hands they fell, taking advantage of the lapse of time, are of opinion, that there is less fear of detection now, and have accordingly added number and signatures to them. The copperplate being so well executed, they are well calculated to take in the unwary or the ignorant; a little care and attention will show that they are spurious.

The *Examiner* has given us nothing more concerning the conveyance of the Rails than we knew before. The reason, it seems, that we are deprived of the services of the Steamer is, that Mr. Des Brisay wanted £1500 and the Government offered to pay him £1300 could not venture to draw the difference from the Treasury. Mr. Des Brisay offered, we understand to take the £1300, if the Government would recommend the Legislature at its session to give the additional £200, but this was refused. We are told by the organ of Government, that Government is about to go into the English market and purchase a steamer. By what authority! we would ask. If the Government cannot venture to take £200, how are they to take ten or twenty times as much for the purchase of a vessel? It is said by some persons that one reason why the Government did not agree with Mr. Des Brisay, was because he wanted the steamer to go to Richibucto. We will make some inquiries into the truth of the matter, and lay the same before our readers at an early day.