

seys, and sky-lights were torn from their houses.

MEETING OF COMMISSIONERS OF POLICE.—At a recent meeting of this board, a committee was appointed to investigate farther into the conduct of the town-officers. This committee has had several meetings. At the one held on Monday week, we are informed that Mr Thomas Morrison spoke of the town-officers as a public nuisance, and an unnecessary expense to the town, and that it would be better to dispense altogether with their services. Mr Kirk of the Tron Inn said, that before he would give his consent to dismiss the officers, he would like to know if the town was to be anything quiet; and would ask Mr Morrison if there were to be any burnings this winter? Mr Morrison wished to know if Mr Kirk meant to insinuate, by such question, that he (Mr Morrison) was any way connected with the ~~riots~~ and burning in August last year. Mr Kirk said—"I know I have had fifteen shillings to pay for your d---d nonsense." Mr Morrison gave moral force to his part in the colloquy, by giving vent to some rare Billingsgate phrases, in which he ascribed to Mr Kirk the ignoble appellation of an "auld, grey-headed, swearing, lying, cheating, -----."—Mr Morrison has since served Mr Kirk with a summons to appear before the Sheriff next Friday on a charge of defamation—damages, £8, 8s. 6d. Mr Kirk has also served Mr Morrison with a summons to appear before the Sheriff the same day, on a similar charge—damages stated at the same amount.

CARNOCK.

Fifeshire Journal – Thursday 19 October 1843

MEETING OF COMMISSIONERS OF POLICE.—At a recent meeting of this board, a committee was appointed to investigate farther into the conduct of town-officers. This committee has had several meetings. At this one held on Monday week, we are informed that Mr. Thomas Morrison spoke of the town-officers as a public nuisance, and an unnecessary expense to the town, and that it would be better to dispense altogether with

their services. Mr. Kirk of the Tron Inn said, that before he would give his consent to dismiss the officers, he would like to know if the town was to be anything quiet; and would ask Mr. Morrison if there were to be any burnings this winter? Mr. Morrison wished to know if Mr. Kirk meant to insinuate by such question, that he (Mr. Morrison) was any way connected with the riots and burning in August last year. Mr. Kirk said - "I know I have fifteen shillings to pay for your d---d nonsense." Mr. Morrison gave moral force to his part in the colloquy, by giving vent to some rare Billingsgate phrases, in which he ascribed to Mr. Kirk the ignoble appellation of an "auld grey-headed, swearing, lying, cheating, -----." – Mr. Morrison has since served Mr. Kirk with a summons to appear before the Sheriff next Friday on a charge of defamation – damages £8, 8s. 6d. Mr. Kirk has also served Mr. Morrison with a summons to appear before the Sheriff the same day, on a similar charge – damages stated at the same amount.

which the vocabulary of the Free Church affords in such abundance, by one of the principal leaders and managers of the Free Church, and a plain individual who, however, is one of the most respectable of the select few who constitute that body there. We will not pollute your columns with the disgraceful terms he thought fit to apply to the peaceful clergymen and people quietly going home from the religious services of the evening. There is little reason to doubt that there wanted but the prevalence of numbers to have produced a sense of riot and personal assault.

Truly the Free Church progresses, and is not a failure. As surely as the war cry of "Death to all his followers" was the Free Church's and the truism, has the war cry of the Free Church roused her faithful sons and daughters to long and earnestly for the destruction of all institutions; and this is evidenced by their every-day conduct, in keeping upon all who will not enlist under their banner all manner of slander and abuse.

MARKINCH.

Mr Rose.—On Thursday the 5th inst., the Presbytery of Kirkaldy met for the purpose of moderating in a call to the Rev. James Landale Rose, presbyter to Markinch. The call was immediately signed by about 1200 communicants male heads of families, including two of the principalitors—John Halford, Esq., of Birbirkle, and also by him as proxy for his uncle, James Halford, Esq., of Balgonie. After the business of the day, the Presbytery dined with Lord Kerr's trustees, the joint patrons with Lady Baird of the parish.

The meeting was held on the 1st November. The settlement of this talented minister gave the highest satisfaction.

ST. ANDREWS.

SUMMARY COURT.—A man who had hold on Wednesday night at Sheriff Jameson's, the only case described as a claim for harbour dues on the town's property, was a claim for harbour dues on the West Sands. Mr. Rose said that, as the holder had never been in the harbour, the collector had no case. The collector answered that the timber was landed on the town's property. The Sheriff ordered the case to proceed.

JURICY OF PEACE COURT.—A court was held here on the 11th instant before Robert Paullo, Esq., and Captain James Wemyss. William Hunter, son of Kirkenny chisel toll-bar, brought up by the county police, was charged with having on Sunday the 5th instant, been guilty of damage or destruction into the cause of Dunino, using threats towards the inmates, and otherwise behaving himself in a very disorderly manner. He was fined in the sum of £5, and failing payment, sixty days' imprisonment. The fine was immediately paid.—Honesty is strongly suspected of being the person who broke the windows of Austruther chisel toll-bar, which was done the same night.

DIAMOND-CUT DIAMONDS.—David Hutchison, mentioned in the paper last week, was taken before the Magistrate on Monday, and sentenced to forty days' confinement in jail on the charge.

THE MARTINS' MONUMENT.—This building was finished on Monday last, and, as far as we can judge, realises the expectations of its promoters. The site is well chosen—Metivier Tower, at the west end of the Scores Walk; and were the scaffolding once removed, it will be a great ornament to the place.

THE STORM.—The weather, which had been gloomy and louring for some days before, broke out with much violence on Wednesday last, and after mid day the wind blew, the rain beat, and the sea rose and the tempestuous waves were seen to sweep over the fallen chimneys of houses. Various trees were uprooted, and many branches were strewn along the roads. The atmosphere, however, was cleared by next morning, and much grain was led in good order on Friday and Saturday.

CRAIL.

On the morning of Thursday last, during the violent gale from the north, the brigantine *Mary* of this port, William Martin, was cast ashore at Ravensburgh, a bold rock on the Tyninge shore, two miles from Crail. When the ship struck, she took to the boat, and got all safe to land. The vessel, after striking, was floated up high on the beach; she was in ballast, being on her passage from Dordt to Grangemouth for iron. It is feared she will not get off. She is a new vessel, strongly built, and only partially insured. The keel is considerably injured amidships, but otherwise the damage is trifling.

EAST ANSTRUTHER.

The Free Church was opened here on Sunday last by the Rev. Mr. William Ferrie, who preached in the forenoon and evening to his congregation.

WEST ANSTRUTHER.

Baillie James Young, the ruling baillie here, having taken the law into his own hands, stopped the ringing of the church steeple, and the number of alms-boxes were removed from the door of the fallen churchman. Various trees were uprooted, and many branches were strewn along the roads. The atmosphere, however, was cleared by next morning, and much grain was led in good order on Friday and Saturday.

TORYBURN.

On Thursday last the presbytery met at Toryburn, when he pronounced the following interlocutor:—*"Perth, 12th October, 1843.—In respect that no avenger has been provided to execute judgment on the complaint was tendered by the applicant, and the respondent refused to do so.—Repaired the reasons of appeal, finds the respondent entitled to expenses, modifies the same to £3, 10s. for which, and the dues of appeal, deems.—(Signed) J. H. FORRESTER."*

The other case under the above act was brought by Mr. Robertson against Alexander Skinner, mill-sinker, residing at Newmill, or in the employment of the above James Skinner, in respect of the loss of his vessel, and was decided in his favour. The case was heard before Robert Stocks, George Anderson, and Patrick Don Swan, Esqrs. The defendant, who appeared in court with his agent, Mr. Pearson, denied the complaint. Two witnesses were produced in court. The Justices, after hearing the complaint, found the charge not proven, as by the sixth section of the act founded on, the loss of said vessel is authorized or permitted by the act, and accordingly rejected the same. Mr. Robertson, as in the former case, refused to sign the petition of his respondents, and the court directed him to do so.

In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to take a note of such evidence as was laid before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.—*"Perth, 12th October, 1843.—In respect that the said Justice of Peace gave judgment on the 2nd of the month of September to the respondent to appear before the Sheriff next Friday, Mr. Kirk with a summons to appear before the Sheriff the same day, on a charge of defamation—damages, £8, 8s. Mr. Kirk has also served Mr. Morrison with a summons to appear before the Sheriff the same day, on a similar charge—damages stated at the same amount.*

COUNSEL FOR THE PRINTER.—Mr F. L. Maitland Heriot;—*"Agree—Mr Thomas Pratt, writer, Cupar."*

MILE MEASURES—APPEALS TO THE CIRCUIT.
In the month of August last, Mr Robert Robertson, Inspector of Weights and Measures for the county of Fife, brought two actions under the statute 6 & William IV. c. 63, before the Justices of the Kirkaldy District, for confirmation of the enactment.

The first action was against Mr James Kininmonth, Inverkeithing. The prosecutor's petition set forth that by the act above referred to it was, *inter alia*, enacted—

"That every person who shall use any weight or measure other than those authorised by this act, or some aliquot part thereof, as described in the act, or some part thereof, which has not been authorised by the act, or which shall be found lighter or otherwise unjust, shall, on conviction, forfeit a sum not exceeding five pounds; and by section 23 of said act, it is enacted that the person in whose possession weights or measures, light or otherwise unjust, shall be found, shall, on conviction, forfeit a sum not exceeding five pounds."

The petition forced to state that Kininmonth, the proprietor of this same Free Kirk Mill, set up an opposition kirk in another part of the town to that of the Establishment, he was solicited not to notice or imagine overmuch into what kirk his servants resorted: and we doubt not St Patrick of the Free Kirk Mill will not be worse to his dependents than John the Baptist.

DUNFERMLINE.

Now, we desire in this present instance to call the attention of our readers to the unhappy consequences of the law of which the following is a summary:—

"The petition forced to state that the same past, but more particularly on Tuesday the 28th of August, of keeping in his possession, and using for the sale of milk, an unmarked and illegal measure, which measure will be produced in Court in evidence against the above-named James Kininmonth."

On the 4th September the prosecutor appeared in court before Robert Stocks and George Anderson, Esqrs. Justices; and the defendant also appeared, and was represented by Mr. Doug, cabinet-maker, on the West Sands. Mr. Doug pled that, as the tinner had never been in the harbour, the collector had no case. The collector answered that the tinner was landed on the town's property. The Sheriff ordered the case to proceed.

JURICY OF PEACE COURT.—A court was held here on the 11th instant before Robert Paullo, Esq., and Captain James Wemyss. William Hunter, son of Kirkenny chisel toll-bar, brought up by the county police, was charged with having on Sunday the 5th instant, been guilty of damage or destruction into the cause of Dunino, using threats towards the inmates, and otherwise behaving himself in a very disorderly manner. He was fined in the sum of £5, and failing payment, sixty days' imprisonment. The fine was immediately paid.—Honesty is strongly suspected of being the person who broke the windows of Austruther chisel toll-bar, which was done the same night.

MEETING OF COMMISSIONERS OF POLICE.—At a recent meeting of this board, a committee was appointed to investigate the conduct of the police in the course of their duty. This committee has had several meetings. At the last one they resolved to examine more than one witness in the course of their investigation, and to call in the services of a solicitor to advise them as to the course to be pursued. This decided the case without permitting him to lay the whole evidence before them.

2. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court refused to allow the appellant to forward witnesses, whom he had in waiting, to prove that the illegal can or measure produced, having its contents in the possession of the said James Kininmonth, or of his servant.

3. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court refused to allow the appellant to forward witnesses, whom he had in waiting, to prove that the illegal can or measure produced, having its contents in the possession of the said James Kininmonth, or of his servant.

4. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court refused to allow the appellant to forward witnesses, whom he had in waiting, to prove that the illegal can or measure produced, having its contents in the possession of the said James Kininmonth, or of his servant.

5. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court refused to allow the appellant to forward witnesses, whom he had in waiting, to prove that the illegal can or measure produced, having its contents in the possession of the said James Kininmonth, or of his servant.

6. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court refused to allow the appellant to forward witnesses, whom he had in waiting, to prove that the illegal can or measure produced, having its contents in the possession of the said James Kininmonth, or of his servant.

7. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

8. In respect that the two Justices of Peace who gave judgment on the 2nd of the month of September to the respondent to appear before the Sheriff next Friday, Mr. Kirk with a summons to appear before the Sheriff the same day, on a charge of defamation—damages, £8, 8s. Mr. Kirk has also served Mr. Morrison with a summons to appear before the Sheriff the same day, on a similar charge—damages stated at the same amount.

9. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

10. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

11. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

12. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

13. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

14. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

15. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

16. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

17. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

18. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

19. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

20. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

21. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

22. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

23. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

24. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

25. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

26. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

27. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

28. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

29. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

30. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

31. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

32. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

33. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

34. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

35. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

36. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

37. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

38. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

39. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

40. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

41. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

42. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

43. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

44. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

45. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

46. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

47. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

48. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

49. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid before them, and to direct the respondent to do so.

50. In respect that the said Justice of Peace Court not only refused to allow the appellant to lay the whole evidence before them, or of the substance thereof, or to state distinctly the grounds on which the same was laid