The Daily Crescent.

FIFTEEN CENTS A WEEK. NEW ORLEANS, THURSDAY MORNING, APRIL 3, 1851. VOLUME IV.—NUMBER 26.

The Daily Crescent.

OFFICIAL JOURNAL
Of the Council of the Second Municipality.

Published Every Day—(Sunday Excepted)—
BY J. H. MADDOX & CO.

OFFICE.....No. 93 ST. CHARLES STREET.

TERMS OF THE CRESCENT.
DAILY—Fifteen Cents per week, payable to the carriers, or Eight Dollars per year, payable in advance—half yearly and quarterly in the same ratio.
THE WEEKLY CRESCENT—Three dollars a year, payable in advance. Postmasters and others acting as agents, by sending five dollars, will be entitled to two copies.

THE POET'S LOT—By PHILIP JAMES BAILEY.

Nature in the poet's heart is limned
In little; as, in landscape-stones, we see
The swell of hand, the groves, and running streams,
Fresh from the worlds of chaos; or, perchance,
The imaged hint of antemundane life,—
A photograph of pre existent light,
Or Paradisal sun. So, in his mind
The broad conditions of the world are graven,
Thoroughly and grandly; in accord whereswith
His life is ruled to be, and else to bear.
Wisdom he wills, not only for himself,
But undergoes the sacred rites whereby
The privilege he hath earned he may promulge,
And all men make the partners of his light.

Between the priestly and the laic powers,
The poet stands—a bright and living link—
Now chanting odes divine, and sacred spells,—
Now with fine magic, holy and austere,
Inviting angels or evoking fiends;
And now, in festive guise arrayed, his brow
With golden fillet bounden round—alone,
Earnest to charm the throng that celebrates
The games now—now the mysteries of life,
With truths ornate and pleasure's choicest plea.

Remarks of Alderman Marks,

In the Second Municipality Council, on the Petition to Re-instate William Masterson in the Fire Department.

MR. MARKS, on the petition being presented, rose and moved that it be laid upon the table. He trusted that the Council would not take any action in the matter, as this man had been expelled for the perpetration of a base and serious outrage, whereby a good fireman was near losing his life, and the reputation of the effective Fire Department likely to be much injured. If it had not been understood at the time the case was considered by the Fire Committee, that No. 14 Fire Company had no desire to defend this man, a resolution to disband the Company, and take its charter away, would have been made; and if it had been proved to him at the time that the members of the Company intended to defend this man in the present shape, he would have moved a resolution for disbanding the Company, and deserving it of its charter. He was as warm a friend to the Fire Department as any man in the city, and he had been a member of it for eight years. He valued its unstarnished and spotless reputation as highly as any one, and he should not like to see it sink to the level of some of the departments in the Northern cities. He wished to see it upheld in all the glory of its past efficiency, and to be kept above all that was calculated to reduce the character of its reputation. In the case of this expelled fireman, the Mayor had sent a message to the Committee, couched in terms so positive, that it required more than special notice. (Here Mr. Marks read several extracts from the message of the Mayor, to the effect that the course complained of was likely to injure the Fire Department, and recommending the expulsion of Masterson.) This he believed was the first case of serious disturbance which had been brought before the notice of the Fire Committee, in connection with the members of the Fire Department, and as it was likely to result in serious injury to the members, it was necessary to make some severe example of the delinquent. He wished to say something of the private history of the petition which had that evening been presented to the Council, and this would explain how the petition was brought in at this late stage of the proceedings, and why the members of the Council were taken unawares upon the subject.

This would explain why the petition was not presented at the proper time, when other petitions were presented to the Council, and why they were called upon at the close of the proceedings to take a motion on that subject. About three weeks ago he was called upon and asked if he would present a petition for reinstating Masterson, but he answered unequivocally no. Two weeks ago he was asked if he would oppose such a petition, and he said yes. But now the petition was brought in at the tail end of the business of the Council, that by taking them unawares, it may have a chance of being accepted. He had stated at the time of the occurrence that Masterson should not escape with impunity. He did not look so much at the individual punishment of Masterson, as he did to the dignity of the Fire Department, and to the necessity there was for the Council to exercise its authority, for the purpose of preventing the commission of outrages like that proved against him. Outrages of that character could not be permitted, without doing everlasting injury to the reputation of the Fire Companies. He thought that the Committee had dealt most lenient in that case, and the punishment imposed on Masterson was given for the sake of example, to show that such conduct could not be permitted with impunity. He should vote for refusing the petition to reinstate him not because he had any strong feeling against the man, but because he wished to prevent the destruction of the efficiency of the Fire Department. He was a firm friend of the Department, and he would not the Council, after he had read the report of the Committee on the case, if any one would act contrary to it, reinstate him. The report read as follows:

The Committee to whom was referred the message of the Mayor, and the communication of Mississippi Fire Company No. 3, in relation to a difficulty that occurred at a fire in Constance street, on the 25th October, between members of that Company, and some of those of Philadelphia Fire Company No. 14, having fully and impartially examined the same, beg leave most respectfully to submit the following report:

That it was fully proved that the attack on Mr. Parmele, Foreman of Mississippi Fire Company No. 3, was made by a man whose name is "Wm. Masterson," or, as some of the witnesses termed him "New York-billy," and from what we gather from the testimony, both beaten and improvoked. Said "Wm. Masterson" is a member of No. 14, and had on the equipments of that company. It was clearly proven that he struck Mr. Parmele over the head with a spanner, and otherwise severely injured him. That while it was proven that a number of members of No. 14 were at the attack, and that at the commencement of the difficulty three spanners were seen raised in the air, yet the fact has not been established to the satisfaction of the committee that other members took active part in said attack. One witness thinks he identified the same individual as attacking Mr. Parmele, dragging him to the ground by the hair, and otherwise barbarously maltreating him. Another witness stated that the man who made the second attack was not a member of No. 14, but one Robt. Johnson, who has been running with the company for the last three years. He further stated that the man who, it was proven, knocked Mr. P. so badly while he was down, was not this man Johnson, or a member of No. 14. From the testimony of Mr. Parmele himself, pretty fully corroborated by other witnesses, he neither sought the difficulty, nor did he, in conclusive terms, take charge of the property of the company which he commanded, do any thing—open civing No. 14 the full benefit of the testimony they produced as to the manner in which he conducted himself to perform his duty—to justify or palliate, in the most remote degree, the brutal treatment he received. The fact of the tenure of No. 3 coming into contact with the Engine of No. 14, was not an act of such magnitude that it could not (as it should) have been arranged, without difficulty, on the spot. The attack of this man Masterson on Mr. Parmele, proves fully how much misguided and bad feeling one invidious man may create, by permitting passion and force to control, when as "cooler counsels" and conciliation should alone govern. While this act may have been expected and anticipated, it has imposed a resolution for disbanding the Company, and deserving it of its charter. He was as warm a friend to the Fire Department as any man in the city, and he had been a member of it for eight years. He valued its untarnished and spotless reputation as highly as any one, and he should not like to see it sink to the level of some of the departments in the Northern cities. He wished to see it upheld in all the glory of its past efficiency, and to be kept above all that was calculated to reduce the character of its reputation. In the case of this expelled fireman, the Mayor had sent a message to the Committee, couched in terms so positive, that it required more than special notice. (Here Mr. Marks read several extracts from the message of the Mayor, to the effect that the course complained of was likely to injure the Fire Department, and recommending the expulsion of Masterson.) This he believed was the first case of serious disturbance which had been brought before the notice of the Fire Committee, in connection with the members of the Fire Department, and as it was likely to result in serious injury to the members, it was necessary to make some severe example of the delinquent. He wished to say something of the private history of the petition which had that evening been presented to the Council, and this would explain how the petition was brought in at this late stage of the proceedings, and why the members of the Council were taken unawares upon the subject.

The Committee to whom was referred the message of the Mayor, and the communication of Mississippi Fire Company No. 3, in relation to a difficulty that occurred at a fire in Constance street, on the 25th October, between members of that Company, and some of those of Philadelphia Fire Company No. 14, having fully and impartially examined the same, beg leave most respectfully to submit the following report:

That it was fully proved that the attack on Mr. Parmele, Foreman of Mississippi Fire Company No. 3, was made by a man whose name is "Wm. Masterson," or, as some of the witnesses termed him "New York-billy," and from what we gather from the testimony, both beaten and improvoked. Said "Wm. Masterson" is a member of No. 14, and had on the equipments of that company. It was clearly proven that he struck Mr. Parmele over the head with a spanner, and otherwise severely injured him. That while it was proven that a number of members of No. 14 were at the attack, and that at the commencement of the difficulty three spanners were seen raised in the air, yet the fact has not been established to the satisfaction of the committee that other members took active part in said attack. One witness thinks he identified the same individual as attacking Mr. Parmele, dragging him to the ground by the hair, and otherwise barbarously maltreating him. Another witness stated that the man who made the second attack was not a member of No. 14, but one Robt. Johnson, who has been running with the company for the last three years. He further stated that the man who, it was proven, knocked Mr. P. so badly while he was down, was not this man Johnson, or a member of No. 14. From the testimony of Mr. Parmele himself, pretty fully corroborated by other witnesses, he neither sought the difficulty, nor did he, in conclusive terms, take charge of the property of the company which he commanded, do any thing—open civing No. 14 the full benefit of the testimony they produced as to the manner in which he conducted himself to perform his duty—to justify or palliate, in the most remote degree, the brutal treatment he received. The fact of the tenure of No. 3 coming into contact with the Engine of No. 14, was not an act of such magnitude that it could not (as it should) have been arranged, without difficulty, on the spot. The attack of this man Masterson on Mr. Parmele, proves fully how much misguided and bad feeling one invidious man may create, by permitting passion and force to control, when as "cooler counsels" and conciliation should alone govern. While this act may have been expected and anticipated, it has imposed a resolution for disbanding the Company, and deserving it of its charter. He was as warm a friend to the Fire Department as any man in the city, and he had been a member of it for eight years. He valued its untarnished and spotless reputation as highly as any one, and he should not like to see it sink to the level of some of the departments in the Northern cities. He wished to see it upheld in all the glory of its past efficiency, and to be kept above all that was calculated to reduce the character of its reputation. In the case of this expelled fireman, the Mayor had sent a message to the Committee, couched in terms so positive, that it required more than special notice. (Here Mr. Marks read several extracts from the message of the Mayor, to the effect that the course complained of was likely to injure the Fire Department, and recommending the expulsion of Masterson.) This he believed was the first case of serious disturbance which had been brought before the notice of the Fire Committee, in connection with the members of the Fire Department, and as it was likely to result in serious injury to the members, it was necessary to make some severe example of the delinquent. He wished to say something of the private history of the petition which had that evening been presented to the Council, and this would explain how the petition was brought in at this late stage of the proceedings, and why the members of the Council were taken unawares upon the subject.

This would explain why the petition was not presented at the proper time, when other petitions were presented to the Council, and why they were called upon at the close of the proceedings to take a motion on that subject. About three weeks ago he was called upon and asked if he would present a petition for reinstating Masterson, but he answered unequivocally no. Two weeks ago he was asked if he would oppose such a petition, and he said yes. But now the petition was brought in at the tail end of the business of the Council, that by taking them unawares, it may have a chance of being accepted. He had stated at the time of the occurrence that Masterson should not escape with impunity. He did not look so much at the individual punishment of Masterson, as he did to the dignity of the Fire Department, and to the necessity there was for the Council to exercise its authority, for the purpose of preventing the commission of outrages like that proved against him. Outrages of that character could not be permitted, without doing everlasting injury to the reputation of the Fire Companies. He thought that the Committee had dealt most lenient in that case, and the punishment imposed on Masterson was given for the sake of example, to show that such conduct could not be permitted with impunity. He should vote for refusing the petition to reinstate him not because he had any strong feeling against the man, but because he wished to prevent the destruction of the efficiency of the Fire Department. He was a firm friend of the Department, and he would not the Council, after he had read the report of the Committee on the case, if any one would act contrary to it, reinstate him. The report read as follows: