


THE  
**VEIL REMOVED,**

OR

**W. W. SLEIGH**

**UNMASKED.**




NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED AT 132 NASSAU-STREET,

*Opposite Clinton Hall,*

JANUARY 4, 1836.





THE  
VEIL REMOVED,

OR

W. W. SLEIGH

*UNMASKED.*

Origen Bachelar

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED AT 132 NASSAU-STREET,

*Opposite Clinton Hall.*

---

1836.

LSCC

pph

Enchelor

WZ

100

56325B

1836

0021



THE

VEIL REMOVED, &c.

---

It is a most erroneous idea by some entertained, that the cause of religion is best subserved by palliating the faults of its professors, and cloaking their iniquities. So far is this from the fact, that those who act in accordance with it are considered partakers of the very sins which they thus attempt to screen, and thereby increase, instead of diminishing, the injury and disgrace which wickedness in its adherents never fails to bring upon it. Consequently, those who not only walk uprightly themselves, but discountenance and discard the iniquity of others, are the ones who manifest for it the greatest regard, and who do the most to promote its true interests. So that it is no less a dictate of reason than of Scripture, that public transgression be openly rebuked. And we find the great Author of Christianity himself carrying out this principle to its fullest extent. While he was all mildness and mercy to the *penitent*, he uttered the most fearful denunciations against hypocrisy. And so far were these denunciations from injuring true religion by affording opposers the opportunity to sneer, that it deprived them of that very opportunity, by showing that whatever might be the fact with regard to the hypocritical themselves, there did exist that true religious virtue which held their deeds in abhorrence. And when churches discipline disorderly members, they manifest to the world that they have no fellowship with their misdeeds, and thereby preserve religion from that reproach which would otherwise fall upon it. It is not those, therefore, who raise their voice against wickedness among professors of religion, that injure religion itself. On the contrary, they render it the most important service; while those who are for covering iniquity, and sustaining the guilty, do it most serious injury. Hence, those who fearlessly and faithfully denounce hypocrisy, act the part of true friends to religion; and those who excuse and palliate it, act a faithless and an injurious part. Indeed, the exposure

of hypocrisy by Infidels themselves, however intended, has a salutary influence on the Church, by making her more watchful ; so that Infidel opposition in this respect is far better for the interests of religion, than the attempts of her adherents to screen the guilty. Let rigid discipline be enforced ; let the Achans be expelled from the camp ; let those who are Christians exhibit the proper regard for right, by hunting iniquity from among them ; and one of the principal objections of Infidels, nay, the one on which they lay the greatest stress, would at once be removed ;—the objection that Christians, by suffering wickedness among them to pass unrebuked, can scarcely be supposed to care for or believe the religion they profess—a religion that denounces wrong with the most unsparing severity.

The foregoing considerations will suffice, not only as an apology for the course which I have pursued, and am still pursuing, in relation to the individual who is the theme of this pamphlet, but also as the reason why I feel *imperatively bound* to pursue it. As a friend to religion ; as one who has toiled night and day for years in her service ; I will not see her disgraced in the eyes of the public, as she has been by the late discussion in this city, without making one effort commensurate with the importance of the subject, as far as my powers can go, to obliterate that disgrace, by inducing the religious community at large distinctly to discard the individual who has disgraced her, and with him, all who give him countenance.

No one will deny that there are bad men—hypocrites—men of moral turpitude so great, as to be capable, perhaps, of any conceivable act of wickedness within their physical power to accomplish.—There are liars, swindlers, thieves, robbers, pirates, and murderers. And, as if to make wickedness still more outrageous, there are those who assume the religious garb, to enable them to perpetrate their abominations with the greater facility and security. Thus, there is hardly an act of wickedness which has not been committed by one or another under the cloak of religion. There have been false prophets, false pretenders to miracles, false religious teachers, and knaves assuming the character of religionists. No one will dispute this. And when we duly reflect on this admitted fact, it would seem no longer incredible that a stranger, assuming ever so much of the religionist, might prove in the end to be one of the greatest of villains. Keeping this consideration in view, let us now proceed to the examination of the case before us.

A stranger appears in our midst, preceded by the introductory annunciation of a victory achieved in controversial combat over the Infidels of a sister city in another State, and of arrangements for a conflict with the Infidels among ourselves. Public curiosity is excited. Multitudes flock to the scene of action. But of the stranger little is known. He may be a good man or a bad man ;



but he remains to be proved. He is understood to be a medical gentleman of fortune and leisure, having no occasion to practise in his profession, and therefore, although a layman, devoting his energies to the promotion of the great and sacred cause of religion, and appropriating the receipts thereby obtained to charitable objects.— A character truly worthy of admiration, if found to be genuine. To be sure he requires an admission fee, no portion of which is to go to his opponents; but its supposed devotion to charitable objects, and his holy abhorrence of Infidelity, which prevent his consenting to permit any of the receipts to be diverted from those objects to fill Infidel pockets, make all appear fair on that score.— The discussion at length begins. A sad committal the very first evening respecting the absolute inability of the heathen to ascertain what is right or wrong, exhibits in our stranger at the outset the tyro in theology, and bodes no very auspicious result. But it is an error of the head, and is therefore passed by. At length, in the progress of the discussion, our Christian champion exhibits a want of the proper gravity and seriousness for a *religious* disputant, and a disposition to triumph rather than convince. He resorts to the little artifices known more commonly as the quirks and quibbles of the bar, and to that angling for plaudits which succeeds best with the occupants of the pit and gallery of the theatre. Nor is this the worst—at least for the cause he espouses. As the discussion proceeds, he exhibits more and more his ignorance of his subject, and his want of competency to do it that ample justice which its importance demands. He first shocks all decency and moral feeling, by attempting to dispose of the Infidel objection of the intermarriage of the children of Adam and Eve, by declaring incest to be no physical evil unless practised to a certain extent, and there leaving it! He next disappoints the high-wrought expectations of the public, by leaving the case of Jewish polygamy in a worse condition than he found it, inasmuch as he condemns polygamy among the heathen, without showing that the Old Testament condemns it among the Jews. In the third place, he fails in his attempt to solve the difficulty in the case of the lying spirit and the prophets of Ahab; also that in the case of God's deceiving the prophet, as mentioned by Ezekiel, &c. Nor does he even *attempt* to show how a divine miracle can be distinguished from a diabolical one, or a divine messenger from a false pretender; nor yet, how the heathen are to blame, on his supposition that they are unable to ascertain what is right and wrong. In short, he shows himself to be a perfect novice in his undertaking. And to add to all the rest, he resorts to assertion the most unfounded, to evasion the most miserable, to sophism the most flimsy, to perversion the most gross, and to assumption the most unwarrantable, as a momentary substitute for that theological infor-

mation without which no man ought to assume the public defence of Christianity. His reckless course induces one of his opponents to retire from the controversy in disgust; brings him into collision with one of his own moderators, which terminates in a separation; disaffects many serious-minded Christians; strengthens the hands of Infidels, and increases their number; and finally, results in his being excluded from the Chapel in which the discussion is holden. And thus the sublime humbug ends! Not so, however, the after-piece, which is still in progress, and of which the exhibitions in this pamphlet constitute the principal part. Let us now shift the scene.

No man can rid himself of his identity: no one can escape from himself. The villain in Cincinnati will, if he come to New York, bring the brand on his brow, and his name and fame will tread hard upon his footsteps. Scarcely had Mr. Sleigh set himself down in our city, ere a rumour was in circulation among some, that he had been incarcerated in Cincinnati. But such was *his* explanation of the case, as to prevent its being made public at the time. It was, that an Infidel, with whom he never had a shilling's dealings, obtained his imprisonment, on the pretended ground that he owed him \$1800! A strange story on the very face of it, and well calculated to excite suspicion that "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth," had not been told. Although, therefore, the matter was suffered to rest for the moment, a letter was despatched to Cincinnati to inquire into it, and at length a reply was received, an extract from which I have already published in my reply to Mr. Sleigh's pamphlet. How different a view of the case does this account furnish! Prior, however, to the publication of this, a *published* account of the affair had fallen into my hands, which I republished in my letter to the six clergymen, making the same charge against Mr. Sleigh of having defrauded a lady of \$1800, as that made in the letter. Besides this, the letter contained *another* piece of information of a similar nature, *viz.*, that the *London Lancet* charged Mr. Sleigh with embezzlement of money *in England*. So confident was I of the truth of these statements, both from their internal evidence and the respectability of the writer, that I had no hesitation in publishing them on his authority, without taking the trouble of examining the various volumes of the *Lancet*. Mr. Sleigh supposing, no doubt, from my publishing nothing from the *Lancet* itself in confirmation of the letter, that I had not that work within my reach, hies to Mr. Buchanan, the British Consul of this city, and, as it would seem, presents for examination in his office certain volumes of it, and then publishes to the world the following memorable document:—



*His Britannic Majesty's Consulate, }*  
New York, Dec. 22, 1835. *}*

I certify that Dr. Sleigh submitted to my examination, various documents, letters and testimonials, which he received in London. With several gentlemen who have signed the same, I am personally acquainted, and I have no hesitation in saying such are authentic.

I further certify that, at the request of Dr. Sleigh, I caused to be examined in my office, the London publication, called the *Lancet*, for the years 1831, 32, 33, 34, and up to March, 1835, and the name of Dr. Sleigh does not appear in said publication.

(Signed)

JAMES BUCHANAN.

P. S.—Dr. Sleigh begs to observe, that this journal has thus been examined for three years before he left London, (Feb. 23d, 1834,) and for 13 months subsequently. But had he been abused in it—he would have shared the fate of every Hospital Surgeon in London, viz. Sir Astley Cooper, Abernethy, Brodie, &c. For the refutation of the calumny respecting Cincinnati, he refers to his Attorney, Mr. Drake, and to all the clergy in that city, the Campbellites excepted.

It will readily be perceived, that an attempt is here made to impress on the public mind, that the *Lancet* has nothing derogatory to the character of Mr. Sleigh, and consequently, that the statement in the Cincinnati letter with regard to it is false, and its writer unworthy of credit *in toto*. Short sighted man! to suppose that a publication like the London *Lancet* could not be found in a city like this, or that an individual as well acquainted with his slippery tricks as I am, would not be on the look out for him. I must confess I was somewhat surprised to see such an annunciation as the foregoing from Mr. Buchanan; for I had supposed that the circumstance to which the Cincinnati letter referred was of a much more recent date than Mr. Buchanan's statement would go to show. But I knew that Mr. Sleigh's name was *somewhere* in the *Lancet* at all events, having myself seen it attached to a letter or two of his own inserted in that publication. So to searching I went; when lo and behold! I discovered in the Index of one of the volumes the following ominous phrase: "Sleigh v. Pope." On examining the article to which it referred, it proved to be a trial in the Court of King's Bench, in which certain severe charges against Sleigh's character were sustained! The account of this trial I republished forthwith in the *Sun*, to correct the erroneous impression made by Sleigh, that the *Lancet* contained nothing against him, and to show, also, that the Cincinnati letter was entitled to credit.

The London *Lancet* is a weekly pamphlet, with a cover on each number, on which are advertisements. Each year commences the latter part of September, and consequently one year of the work

itself contains a part of two years ; so that the date on the first page of each number is expressed by both the years, of parts of which a year of the Lancet is composed. For example : " London, Saturday, April 2 [1830-31.]" Each year also constitutes two volumes, six months to each, so that a person unacquainted with the work would be very liable to be confused with regard to the year in which a particular number might have been published. There is indeed, somewhere in the course of each number, an Editorial head containing the year in which it is published, and not the other year. But the Lancet head itself, on the first page, has the prominent date, and is calculated to confuse and mislead one not familiar with its peculiarities of date and division. Under these circumstances, together with the declaration of Mr. Buchanan before my eyes, that the Lancet of 1831, and so up to 1835, did not mention Mr. Sleigh, I got the impression at once, on seeing the date of the number containing the notice of the trial already mentioned, dated with the two years 1830-31, that that number, of course, belonged to 1830, and I so published it accordingly. Be astonished, then, O heavens ! and hear O earth ! to learn, that the Lancet of June 25th, 1831, contains a notice of a trial in the Court of King's Bench, in which the severest reflections on the character of Mr. Sleigh as surgeon of his defunct " hospital," were declared to be amply sustained, even before the close of the trial, and that he must accordingly be non-suited *sans ceremonie*—which was done !

It is difficult to conceive how a *critical* examination of the Lancet could have admitted of a mistake with regard to the years of its publication, and to have led the examiner to suppose that he had seen the whole of the year 1831, when, unless he saw the very volume containing this trial, he could have seen only *six months* of that year. Admit, however, that the examiner did actually *mistake*, by supposing he had seen all of 1831, there is no chance for such an excuse on the part of Mr. Sleigh. *He* KNEW the year on which that trial took place. *He* KNEW that the Lancet of 1831 mentioned him, and noticed the trial. *He* is therefore guilty, in this instance, of a triple deception ; first, in conveying the idea to the public, that the Lancet contained nothing derogatory to his character ; secondly, that the whole of the year 1831 had been examined ; and thirdly, that during that year, he was not so much as named. " A threefold cord is not easily broken." Let those who have snapped a single string, by palliating the only deception in this case hitherto brought into view, try now their strength on this cord of *three* strings.

But it is not merely one, or two, or three articles in the Lancet, that mention Mr. Sleigh, and mention him too in no very favorable terms. The Cincinnati letter is scarcely a circumstance, when compared with the disclosures which rise to the astonished eyes



of the reader, on looking more fully into that work ! O ! how silent is this same London Lancet with regard to Mr. Sleigh ! How unworthy of credit the Cincinnati letter-writer ! Lo ! what a "conspiracy" is on foot against this poor, persecuted man ! Divine Providence itself seems at length to have joined the "conspiracy," and to have rendered his very trickery subservient to his ruin ! The day of his utter overthrow appears at length to have arrived, and his iniquities, after so long a period, to have come down concentrated on his ungodly pate !!!

The reader will be a little curious to know how it happened, that Mr. Sleigh and his concerns should have been so frequently mentioned in the first years of the Lancet, and not afterwards. The following Editorial note in that work, appended to a part of a letter of Mr. Sleigh, will solve the mystery, and show also how the charges against his character, which he prosecuted as libellous, but which were substantiated in Court, came to be published on the Lancet wrapper as an advertisement.

"We cannot insert the remainder of this letter for two reasons :—first, we have not space for it, and, secondly, it contains innumerable libels. Mr Sleigh should bear in mind, that a libel upon an attorney is not quite so easy to defend as to write. The controversy upon the affairs of the Western Hospital has already extended to an unreasonable and inconvenient length, and the papers in this week's *Lancet* are the last that can be inserted upon the subject. Any further letters must be printed on the wrapper, and paid for as advertisements."

How marvellously innocent must Mr. Sleigh have been, not to have appeared in the Lancet after having been excluded from its columns for his libellous communications ! And how greatly does it enhance his innocence, for him to produce the volumes of that work from which he was thus excluded, and make use of their silence with regard to him, as an argument with a community unacquainted with the work, to persuade them that it did not impeach him at all, and that the testimony to this point by me adduced was therefore unworthy of credit ! And how tender must be the moral sensibilities of those who, with this his attempt at deception *before their own eyes*, can still declare his moral character "unimpeached and unimpeachable !"

Let us next examine this same Lancet a little, and see *how* silent it is with regard to this spotless mortal, and *what kind* of silence it observes. I shall give the various articles in their order, commencing with a brief historical sketch of Mr. Sleigh from 1824 to 1829, by the Editor of the Lancet himself, as contained in the number of that work for July 25th of the latter year.

"At that period" (1824) "Mr. Sleigh formed a school of surgery near St. George's Hospital, and as the medical establishment of

that Hospital would not recognise or acknowledge his theatre, the College" (Royal College of Surgeons in London) "refused to receive his certificates. At length, however, the worthy council, dreading publicity, yielded, and Mr. Sleigh became one of the recognised teachers. During the contest, this gentleman was loud in his denunciations against the College; but after the recognition of his testimonials, we heard little or nothing of his opposition;—and in truth, we have every reason to believe, that he was well pleased to participate in the advantages, though small, of a most famous monopoly.—Mr. Sleigh, then, having obtained the recognition of his certificates, was lost to the surgical reformers, and we heard little of him for a long time, except in connection with some squabbles at St. George's Hospital.—On two occasions, he tried to obtain the office of Assistant surgeon in that Hospital, Failing of success on both of these occasions, and labouring under an impression that he had been treacherously dealt with on the last, he was disappointed and enraged, and vowed he would start an "*Opposition Hospital.*" Mr. Sleigh, with his usual industry, immediately set to work, mustered his friends, and selected Nutsford Place, near Bryanstone Square, as the theatre for his grand undertaking. The intended charity was advertised; Lords, Dowagers, and Old maids, who seldom forego such an opportunity of displaying their names in print, forwarded their subscriptions; carpenters and bricklayers were put in requisition, and, as if at the stroke of an enchanter's wand, a hospital capable of containing "one hundred beds," suddenly arose to the astonished view of the natives. It was opened for the reception of patients in August, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-seven. Subsequently, His Majesty and the Dukes of Sussex and Gloucester became patrons, the Duke of Wellington presided, and it is now (July 25th, 1829) supported by a large body of the nobility.

"Since the Institution was first opened, the wards, we understand, have been much better constructed for ventilation, and the building has been enlarged, so as to render it capable of containing from one hundred and sixty, to one hundred and seventy beds; and it would appear, that the Institution is firmly established.—It contains upwards of one hundred patients.—Mr. Sleigh is at least equal in talent to Messrs. Lynn, Carlisle, and Guthrie; and if we turn to other hospitals, we may say, equal to Messrs Headington, Blizard, Andrews, Hawkins, Mayo, Joe Burns, and Bransby Cooper."

In the foregoing sketch, we obtain an insight of Mr. Sleigh's concerns for a number of years. At this period, he had attained a very respectable standing. He was basking in the beams of Royal favor, and supported by the nobility. His hospital was well conditioned, and circumstances were altogether in his favor. He was regarded as a man of talent, and the Institution was considered a great public



benefit. I find in the number of the *Lancet* from which the foregoing article is extracted, the following high testimonial to its usefulness.

Wyndham Place, March 20th, 1829.

I beg leave to state, that the Royal Western Hospital, Bryanstone Square, has, since it was opened in 1827, rendered essential service to the poor of this district, which before then had been totally destitute of such an institution. It has already relieved upwards of *three thousand five hundred*. I cannot but consider it deserving of every support.

THOS. FROGNAL DIBDIN, D. D.

Rector of St. Mary's, Bryanstone Square.

I find likewise in the recent pamphlet published by Mr. Sleigh himself, the following testimonial.

“ ROYAL WESTERN HOSPITAL,

PATRON

HIS MOST GRACIOUS MAJESTY.

A VOTE OF THANKS

TO W. W SLEIGH, ESQ.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

*At the General Meeting of the Governors of this Hospital, held January 21, 1829.*

The Right Hon. Lord DUNBOYNE, in the Chair.

We cannot neglect the occasion afforded by the Public meeting of the Governors of this Charity, of expressing the high opinion we entertain of the public spirit, the indefatigable exertion, and the ability, evinced by Mr. Sleigh, in establishing and mainly contributing to bring to its present state *This Hospital*, and of declaring that his conduct therein deserves our warm approbation and thanks.

(Signed) DUNBOYNE.”

Now then comes the grand enquiry : How is it that this same individual, thus established in London six or seven years ago, is now roaming about this country, obtaining a hap-hazard support by lecturing and debating ? How is it that Mr. Sleigh, who enjoyed the favor of the King, and Wellington, and Peel, and other noblemen in 1829, has been recently debating here with Messrs Offen and Pursur, to obtain a livelihood ? The case speaks for itself to all who know how to draw a logical inference from the most striking facts. He must have been *morally* defective. Nor is it for one moment to be supposed, that those who were at the period here mentioned his

supporters, still continue favorable to him. Who does not see that if this were the case, he would be sustained? He has, therefore, been cast off by those whose favour was worth having; by those who once stood by and sustained him, and who had the best opportunities for judging of him: and for him to produce his testimonials under these circumstances, endeavouring to make it appear that all is right with him, and that he still has the confidence of the community in England, bears the greatest absurdity on its very front. But I will not leave this point to inference. I will prove by the clearest evidence, that the downfall of Mr. Sleigh in England is attributable to his moral delinquency—and to that alone; and that, had he been an honest man, he would at this very moment be at the head of the most flourishing Hospital perhaps in the whole British Empire.

Not a single year had passed away, from the period when this Hospital was in the flourishing condition just described, before we find it in the very throes of dissolution! “Western Hospital—Last effort to prop!” says the index of the *Lancet* of the year following that in which it had given so favorable a description of it. What! the Institution so flourishing but the year before, need propping! nay, even the *last* effort to prop it already put forth! What can *this* mean? Let us turn over and see. Vol. 2 of 1829—30, p. 335.

*From the Lancet of May 29, 1830.*

### THE ROYAL WESTERN HOSPITAL.

The adjourned meeting relative to the affairs of the Western Hospital, was held at the Yorkshire Stingo on Wednesday week, A. Dawson, Esq. M. P., in the chair. There were about 250 persons present.

Mr. Sleigh, with great vehemence, entered upon a long series of accusations against Dr. Ayre, Mr. Truman, and others, whom he charged with having attempted, by the most foul means, to deprive him of the situation of surgeon. Mr. Sleigh concluded by moving a resolution, expressive of the benefits which had resulted from the Institution in question, and the necessity for its continuance, at the same time nominating a Committee to enquire into the state of affairs, and for rendering further support.

Mr. Gale, a governor of the Western Hospital, in seconding the resolution, warmly supported Mr. Sleigh.

Dr. Ayre next addressed the meeting, amidst great interruption. He said that soon after he became attached to the Western Hospital, he discovered that its affairs were in a most embarrassed condition, and he also discovered that Mr. Sleigh's character was so bad, it was impossible the Institution could go on with him. Mr. Sleigh had disgraced himself in the eyes of the medical profession



by his conduct at St. George's Hospital. He had deluded various young men out of large sums of money for a pretended demonstratorship, and a connection with the Hospital, when, in point of fact, both were valueless. One of these dupes had given him bills to the amount of 1500*l.*, but, fortunately, being a minor when the bills were drawn, they were not paid. Mr. Sleigh, also, had deceived many of the pupils, by representing that the certificates of attendance on the "Hospital" would be recognised by the College. Dr. Ayre further charged Mr. Sleigh with having purloined a dead body from the "Hospital," which he sold to the pupils in the Borough, and pocketed the money. An inquiry before a magistrate took place, and the body was returned, but not so the money to the pupils. At the commencement of the Institution, Mr. Sleigh had "received" an anonymous letter, inclosing £200 for the Western Hospital. Now he (Dr. Ayre), on the authority of Mr. Gale, would state, that the letter was written by Mr. Sleigh himself, and was a trick to entice others to subscribe. (Mr. Sleigh here referred to the subscription list, to prove that the money had actually been put to the account of the Hospital.) With a knowledge of all these, and other circumstances, Dr. Ayre maintained that he had sufficient reason for attempting to detach Mr. Sleigh from the Institution.

After a few exculpatory observations from a Dr. Elliott, in reference to his appointment as physician of the Western Hospital, and some laudatory remarks from a pupil of Mr. Sleigh, who said that a party had been got "up" to set Mr. Sleigh "down," Mr. Pope addressed the meeting. The gist of this gentleman's speech was to show, that as a member of the Committee of Inquiry appointed at the former meeting, he had endeavoured to discharge his duty, and as a matter of course, had been aspersed by Mr. Sleigh; but thus it was, that Mr. Sleigh ever abused and vilified those who did not serve his purpose. Reference had been made to various young gentlemen with whom Mr. Sleigh has been connected; but where was Mr. Lynn, of Parliament Street?—Where was Mr. Hicks, of Conduit-street, and the eight or ten physicians who had been, in succession, attached to the "Hospital?" Mr. Pope then went on to show, that the whole concern was greatly involved, there being a debt of nearly 3000*l.*, with an annual rent of 270*l.*, whilst the fixtures, and every thing in the Hospital, were not of more than two hundred pounds value, and at this time there were only ten patients in the Hospital. It had been got up to serve Mr. Sleigh's private purposes; it had failed through mismanagement; and he did not conceive that the institution had any just claim on the public.

Mr. Lambert rose to offer an amendment to the resolution proposed by Mr. Sleigh. He had come to that meeting unconnected with either or any party, &c. He concluded by moving, as an

amendment, "That this meeting does not recognise the necessity for the existence of a hospital."

The amendment was seconded by a gentleman whose name we could not learn, who made some severe remarks on the objections which Mr. Sleigh had made to the committee of Inquiry appointed at a former meeting.

(Mr. Webb and another gentleman also spoke, taking opposite sides.)

The amendment was now put amidst a scene of the greatest uproar and confusion. The Chairman did not determine the question in the usual manner by a show of hands, but desired those who were favourable to say *aye*, and those who were adverse *no*. A division was then called for, and the parties were desired to arrange themselves on opposite sides of the room, and again the shouts of *aye* and *no* were demanded. The clamour was so great, that from not being able to hear the chairman's directions, many were on the side contrary to that which they intended to support; in consequence it was demanded that the numbers should be counted, and that Mr. Sleigh's pupils should leave the room, with which request the Chairman did not think proper to comply. It was at length moved that the meeting do adjourn, when those who had supported the amendment left Mr. Sleigh and his well packed posse of friends and pupils to settle the affairs of the Royal Western Hospital.

The whole scene, which lasted altogether upwards of six hours, beggars all description; the most gross personalities were indulged in; to accusations from either side, there were constant reiterations of "It is false;" whilst the whistling, hooting, stamping, and various discordant noises, could only be equalled by those of a "row" amongst the "gods" in the Coburg Gallery.

"Let us now," as Mr. Sleigh would say, "proceed a little further."

*From the Lancet of the same date, p. 337.*

*To the Editor of The Lancet.*

SIR,—Knowing your disposition to expose all foul play, I am induced to furnish you with the following case:

About two months since there was a woman who took a child to the Western Hospital to have its head dressed, which had been just broken from the fall of an area gate against it; it was there dressed, but not till she had sent to a druggist's shop just by for two ounces of lint, and sixpenny-worth of strapping, and which, of course, she paid for; who dressed it, I am not informed; however, the child was seen several times after, when the woman carried it there on the days on which out-patients are seen by Mr. Sleigh, who, by the way, told the woman it would be necessary for her to get a letter of



recommendation from some subscriber, which she neglected to do till Thursday, the last day she took it to the Hospital, when the following *very just and moderate demand* was made her, and that in Mr. Sleigh's own writing too, for I hold the original :—

“Mr. Sleigh does not furnish accounts to his patients ; however, in the present instance, Mr. Sleigh, for his attendance on this child, expects at least five guineas.”

“7, Gloucester Place, N. R.

“May 13th, 1830.”

Any comment of mine on the above, I feel would be superfluous ; I therefore forbear making any, trusting you will not show similar indulgence.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

---

—————near  
Bryanstone Square, May 21.

P. S. I forgot to say that Mr. S. did once visit the child, it not being, in his opinion, in a proper state to be brought to the hospital, and that the little medicine which it had was bought at —, there being none in the Hospital proper to give it.

ALLEGED ABUSE IN CHARGING FOR ATTENDANCE UPON A  
HOSPITAL PATIENT, p. 396.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

SIR,—I trust you and your readers will excuse my again venturing to occupy a portion of your valuable time or publication ; but I am induced, lest any should be sufficiently incredulous to doubt the veracity of an anonymous correspondence, to send to your office, and there to remain until called for by me, Mr. Sleigh's modest memorandum, a copy of which you inserted in this day's *Lancet*, that should there be any doubters, they may satisfy themselves. I have further to state for your information and that of your readers, should you think this worth inserting, that Mr. Sleigh has sent or gone himself, once or twice a day (Sunday not excepted,) to Moor Street, where the poor woman lives, from whom he wants to extract five guineas for attendance upon a child that was taken to the hospital, and that all sorts of threats have been used for obtaining it, and likewise to get her to the hospital if they could, which they have tried hard for these four days past. Feeling that to appropriate one inch of your space more than is necessary, or otherwise than usefully, would be sinning against many, I beg to subscribe myself,

Sir, your obedient servant,

SCRUTATOR.

London, May 29th, 1830.

REPLY OF MR. SLEIGH TO THE LETTER INSERTED PAGE 337.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

SIR,—An anonymous letter appeared in last Saturday's *LANCET*, accusing me of having charged five guineas for attending a *hospital* patient, in proof of which a note of mine is quoted, and this conduct is adduced as an instance of how the medical officers of the Western Hospital give *gratuitous* attendance on the poor.\* The statement that I charged a *hospital* patient, is as false as the note of mine quoted to prove it is true. The facts are these:—A fine boy was brought to the hospital (as persons of the first distinction have been on similar occasions, in consequence of a violent injury of the head. The woman who brought him stated to the house-surgeon and to others, that she was only the nurse—that he was the illegitimate son of a member of Parliament (giving the member's name and address at the same time)—that his father would not allow him to be a hospital patient—but that I should attend him at her house; accordingly I did so; prescribed for the child, and desired her to get the medicines at an apothecary's, not because there were no medicines in the hospital, as your honourable correspondent stated, but because I considered him my private patient, and of course she purchased the medicines where she thought proper. One of my pupils also dressed the child's head daily *at her house*. About a fortnight ago, she called with the child at the hospital, and desired I would make my bill. I told her I never furnished accounts, but left my remuneration to the honour of my patients; she then said she must take *some note* from me to the parent of the child, in consequence of which I wrote the note quoted by your correspondent. So much for the allegation made against me, of charging for my attendance on *hospital* patients.

I pity, Sir, the malice of my enemies, who must indeed, be hard driven for an accusation against me, to patch up the above case; and if your readers be improved by perusing such productions, or your Journal rendered more eminent† by publishing them, or my enemies hope, by so doing, to crush the Western Hospital—the sooner they open their budget the better; for my part, I defy the bitter pen of calumny; the darts hurled at me recoil on themselves. At all events, I hope your correspondent, if he be not ashamed of his conduct, will in your next number let the public know *to whom* they are indebted for thus exposing the mal-practice of,

Sir, your most obedient servant,

W. W. SLEIGH.

Royal Western Hospital, June 2d, 1830.

\* The communication was properly authenticated, or it would not have been inserted.—Ed. *Lancet*.

† Mr. Sleigh must be aware that we are obliged to publish many things that do not add to the "eminence" of our Journal. Nevertheless, they do not detract from its utility.—Ed. *Lancet*.



CHARGE FOR ATTENDING UPON A HOSPITAL PATIENT, p. 508.

*To the Editor of THE LANCET.*

SIR,—The statements I am about to make will satisfy you and the readers of *The Lancet*, whether Mr. Sleigh's communication or mine is entitled to most credit.

On Thursday, the 23rd of March, the child was taken to the hospital, dressed by the young men there, who were *not* told that he was the son of a Member of Parliament, as Mr. Sleigh states; and I again repeat that the nurse gave them sixpence to buy plaster. She did not object to the boy's being a hospital patient, but objected to leave him there, because she, in common with all the neighbourhood, knew that the hospital had not common necessities for its inmates. On the following morning, Mr. Sleigh visited the child, wrote for a powder, and observed, that from what he had heard, he expected to find it dead, then left, and neither he nor his pupils saw the child from that time till Saturday, and would not then have done so had not the woman taken it to the hospital; yet Mr. Sleigh says, this was a "private" patient. Mr. Sleigh, at this visit, told the woman, on her complaining of his not having been to see the child, that she must get a recommendation from a subscriber. This she said she could do, naming a Member of Parliament, in whose service she had resided. Mr. Sleigh immediately caught at the gentleman's name, and wished the woman to procure a recommendation from him, for he wanted him to take the chair at a public meeting, and say something in favor of the hospital. He said he had already a half promise from him, and could he mention this case as having been attended to at the hospital, it might be an inducement for him to attend; and then had the impertinence to say, that as it was a nurse-child, perhaps it was his, the M. P.'s. The woman replied, that she did not know whose it was; she had never, to her knowledge, seen the father. With the exception of two or three pupils' visits, the child afterwards regularly attended for six weeks, and took his turn with the other out patients. Not a word respecting "charge" was mentioned until the last day of attendance.

Such, Mr. Editor, was the case of "attendance upon the son of an M. P.," such was the case of a "private" patient; and such the conduct of one of our "pure hospital surgeons."

SCRUTATOR.

"Now, we will go a little further," as Mr. Sleigh would say:—

*From the Lancet of June 5, 1830.*

EXTRACT FROM A LETTER OF MR. BEECHEY.

I recommend Mr. Sleigh and his friends, both for the advantage of the hospital and his own credit, to adopt some other means of de-

fending himself than that he has lately pursued, of endeavouring to avert an attack which was never contemplated (at least by me) by blackening the characters of those whom he may fear as his accusers. If he regarded me in that light, he was mistaken. I have no adequate object, nor is my anger so easily excited ; but he may be assured I shall not tamely suffer the assaults of calumny to pass unheeded ; for though a man's character be fortified and strong as a tower, I am aware it is not always proof against the machinations of artifice and misrepresentation, and shall, therefore, take every means of repelling them.

Trusting you will be kind enough to give insertion in your next number to this explanation ; and apologising for its length, I beg to subscribe myself (in haste),

Sir, your very obedient servant,

WILLIAM NELSON BEECHEY.

May 29th, 1830.

*From the Lancet of June 19, 1830.*

EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER OF DR. AYRE, DATED JUNE 16, 1830.

And now, Sir, with respect to the charges so scandalously brought by Mr. Sleigh against Sir Charles Scudamore. Of the first, namely, that he had recommended the purchasing of the spring-beds of Mr. Pratt, of Bond-street, because he was attending one or two of his sons ; I have the authority of Sir Charles to say, ' that prior to the time of these being ordered, he had not even a personal knowledge of Mr. Pratt, had never been in his house, nor attended any branch of his family, nor, as far as he knows, any connexion of it : ' and that with regard to the second accusation, that of his having got the obnoxious rule proposed relative to an attendance upon servants at the houses of their masters, he was not present when the rule was framed, and had no knowledge of the intention to frame it, and never in a single instance acted upon it, for he disapproved of it.

But further : to the above statement I have now to add the astounding fact, the notice of which has only this moment reached me, that upon a reference to the minutes of proceedings kept by the Secretary, it appears that Mr. Sleigh, who gratuitously denounces it as a crime, was ' himself the originator and proposer of the regulation, ' and must have known himself to have been so ; and he, therefore, is here palpably convicted of the base attempt to fix the offence upon another.

And now, Sir, a few words more, and I will conclude. Mr. Sleigh has given a list of the names of pupils who attest their satisfaction at his conduct ; but he does not tell us, as he might have done, of the threats with some, and the various arts used with others to obtain it, nor does he tell of the still greater number of his pupils



who indignantly refused to sign it, and who denounce, in no measured language, the treatment they received from him. He has given also other attestations, but he has not told us the *price* he paid for them; whether to one who had unsparingly reviled him, a *cognovit* on his furniture and effects, which a week or two after he sold off; or to another a promise, which was *broken*, of a repayment of his debt from the profit of his commendation. Nor, lastly, has he told us of the method by which he procured the letter he has published from Mr. Buchanan, and which was *not* written by that young gentleman, as it purports to have been, from a Coffee-house in Covent Garden, but in Mr. Sleigh's *own house*, and according to *his dictation*, and at the instant after the thousand pound bargain was secured.

But to conclude: Mr. Sleigh has got a legal possession of the house which was formerly the hospital, and, in despite of the landlord's writs of ejectment, retains it; and he, with his associate Mr. Gale, get together meetings made up of a few obscure persons, unknown before to the institution, and in no circumstances to subscribe to it, and he calls these the meetings of the governors, and will, perhaps, if we hear any more of him, appeal to the resolutions of these made-up meetings as the legitimate decision of the governors.

I am, Sir, your obedient, humble servant,

J. AYRE.

14, Somerset-street, Portman-square,  
June 16. 1830.

We have now arrived at the period already mentioned, when Mr. Sleigh and his concerns could no longer find admission into the columns of the *Lancet*. We therefore lost sight of him for the term of nearly a year, leaving him with his ten patients still occupying the hospital *building*, from which, his lease not having expired, the landlord was unable to eject him; his partizans still adhering to him, and enacting the stately farce of passing resolutions to bolster up his fallen fortunes, just as they are doing here. But all this availed him nothing, nor will it now avail him. It would seem that in June of the following year, 1831, a number of distinguished gentlemen, among whom were several which have been introduced in the course of this pamphlet, publicly advertised Sleigh as an individual of very exceptionable character, on that account he prosecuted one of them for libel; but the advertisement being proved justifiable, Sleigh was defeated, and his bad character thereby *legally* established. The following account of the matter is contained in the *Lancet* of June 25th, 1831—one of the very years of that publication which the British Consul has stated to be silent in relation to Mr. Sleigh.

*From the Lancet of June 25, 1831.*

# THE LATE WESTERN HOSPITAL.

"A trial which excited considerable interest, both in and out of the medical world, came on in the Court of King's Bench on Thursday last, between Mr. Sleigh, late of the "Royal Western Hospital," and Mr. Pope, of Manchester-square, for a libel alleged to be contained in an advertisement which appeared on the wrapper of *The Lancet*, and in some of the morning papers of June, 1830. The advertisement, which reflected in the severest terms on the character of Mr. Sleigh, as Surgeon of the "Hospital," was signed by Mr. Pope, the Rev. Dr. Dibdin, Dr. Ayre, the Rev. Basil Woodd, Mr. W. N. Beechey, and other gentlemen.

"The defendant pleaded both the general issue and justification. After the examination of numerous witnesses, among whom were the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Duke of Wellington, and Lord Dunboyne, Lord Tenterden stopped the trial by expressing his opinion that the justification which had been pleaded was most amply made out, and that a nonsuit must be entered. This was accordingly done, and the plaintiff being unable to obtain his costs for which he asked, is chargeable with the expenses of both parties."

I have as yet been unable to obtain the number of the *Lancet* with the wrapper on which was published the advertisement containing the reflections on Mr. Sleigh's character as mentioned in the preceding article. But inasmuch as it related to him as Surgeon of the Western Hospital, and Mr. Pope, Dr. Ayre, and W. N. Beechey were among those who signed it, the nature of the charges may be very easily understood, from those which we have seen they actually did make against him as Surgeon of the Hospital, in the articles already inserted which are signed by their names. I can therefore do very well without the advertisement, if Mr. Sleigh chooses to keep it out of sight; though I expect it soon. We ascertain, then, the character of the charges against Mr. Sleigh, viz., that he was guilty of base and dishonest conduct. And then again, consider the character of those who signed the charges. There was the Rev. Dr. Dibdin, an eminent antiquarian, who but two years before, as we have seen,, attested to the great utility of the Hospital, but whom Sleigh, by his misconduct, turned at length into an accuser, as we see. There was the distinguished Basil Woodd, President of St. John's College, Cambridge. There was Wm. N. Beechey, now Sir Wm. N. Beechey, besides Mr. Pope, and other gentlemen. Well, the case was tried in no less a court than that of the King's Bench, the highest judicial tribunal in England. The witnesses on the occasion were some of the most distinguished characters in the British empire—Lord Wellington, (who, by the way, had been President of the Hospital,) the Archbishop of Canterbury,



the first ecclesiastical officer in the Church of England, and Lord Dunboyne, (who also had been chairman of the general meeting of the Governors of the Western Hospital, about two and a half years before,) at which a vote highly commendatory of Mr. Sleigh was passed unanimously. It was where *such* men were witnesses, in *such a Court*, with *such accusers* to back the charges against the character of Mr. Sleigh—charges of gross dishonesty and knavery—that those charges were so amply justified as to render it entirely unnecessary to proceed regularly through the trial, and that Mr. Sleigh was nonsuited off-hand!

It should be recollected, that we get but a glimpse of the character of Mr. Sleigh, from the few scattered fragments of the evidence that we chance to find in the *Lancet*. For a whole year previous to the trial, not a word is said in that publication in relation to him.—And yet, from the little we are enabled to glean from its columns of a prior date, we find quite enough to ruin a man in the eyes of any civilized community. Suppose, then, we had been in Court at the time of the trial, where we could have had the opportunity to hear in detail the testimony of the “numerous witnesses” on the occasion; when, in spite of the deception and trickery of Sleigh, and of the partizan testimony of his adherents, (if any still clung to him at the time) the light of Truth came streaming in with such effulgence, that the eyes of Justice could endure no more with her lips sealed in silence, and she was compelled to exclaim aloud, “It is enough! ’Twere the sheerest insult to my character to imply, by adducing further testimony, that I will not yield to claims already so clearly established. Proceed no further with this trial. The charges against the character of the plaintiff are most clearly proved, and their publication is amply justified. Let the defendant therefore be promptly acquitted, and his assailant reap the consequences of an unfounded prosecution, and of that moral delinquency which cannot stand the test of legal investigation.” Suppose, I say, we had been on the spot at the time, and heard the evidence which produced such a result. In what light, think ye, we should, under such circumstances, view Mr. Sleigh? And in what light should we view those who, separated from the scene by the waters of a vast ocean, and totally ignorant of the whole affair for years after, presume, on the representations made and the documents furnished BY THE IMPEACHED PARTY, to pronounce his character “unimpeached and unimpeachable?” In what light should we view a similar transaction in England, in relation to an individual whose character might thus have been impeached in the Supreme Court of the United States? Verily, we should regard the officious intermeddlers as a rare compound of the most consummate impudence and stupidity, thus to undertake to neutralize and reverse a decision of our highest tribu-

nal, from the mere representation and showing of the guilty party. And in this light will the endorsers of Mr. Sleigh be viewed in England, when their names shall reach her shores, whither they will be waisted as speedily as the winds and the waves can convey them.

To counteract the facts heretofore published by me relative to his character in England, Mr. Sleigh has produced certain testimonials in his favour, purporting to be from the Governors of the Hospital, &c. The latest testimonial of this description which he has exhibited to the public, is dated the 5th of July, 1830. The meeting at which it was adopted is called a meeting of the Institution, at which Hon. Alexander Dawson, Member of Parliament, presided. It follows:—

Resolved, That the governors now assembled learn with regret, that some of the *officers lately discharged* from this Institution, with certain of their friends, have held certain private meetings, at which, without any notice whatever to the governors at large or to Mr. Sleigh, they have drawn up resolutions derogatory to the character of that gentleman. They therefore feel it a duty they owe the public to *pronounce such meetings to be contrary to every Christian and British principle*, not only as affecting that gentleman, who has been **THRICE** so honourably acquitted, but more particularly as calculated to injure this most excellent Institution, which has, under that gentleman's superintendence, relieved so many thousands of destitute sick.

ALEXANDER DAWSON, Chairman.

London, July 5, 1830.

Now, to show what weight should be attached to this resolution, it is only necessary to recollect what Dr. Ayre says in his letter already quoted respecting these same "Governors" at this period. His words are these:—

"But to conclude: Mr. Sleigh has got a legal possession of the house which was formerly the hospital, and, in despite of the landlord's writs of ejectment, retains it; and he, with his associate, Mr. Gale, get together meetings made up of a few obscure persons, unknown before to the institution, and in no circumstances to subscribe to it, and he calls these the meetings of the governors, and will, perhaps, if we hear any more of him, appeal to the resolutions of these made-up meetings as the legitimate decision of the governors.

I am, Sir, your obedient, humble servant,

J. AYRE."

It is true that a Member of Parliament was Chairman of the meeting under consideration; but we have seen how Mr. Sleigh succeeded, in many instances, in deceiving very respectable men for a time, who afterwards, on becoming better acquainted with his character and conduct, abandoned him. Witness, for example, the



case of the Rev. Dr. Dibdin, who gave so very favorable a recommendation of the Western Hospital in 1829, but who was induced by Sleigh's misconduct to become one of his accusers in 1831.— But suppose the meeting at which the foregoing resolution was passed, to have been as regular a Governors' meeting as were the former ones, when the hospital was in its glory. What then? This resolution has hitherto been viewed as having been passed *subsequent* to the trial in the Court of King's Bench, and has therefore been considered by many as neutralizing, in a great measure, the effect of that trial. How is it, say they, that such men continued to adhere to Mr. Sleigh *after* the Court had decided against him, unless it was still a doubtful case? Let them be informed, then, that this last, this great difficulty is now removed. *This very resolution*, which Mr. Sleigh's *outrageous deception* has been the means of leading all parties to suppose to have been passed *after* the trial, was passed nearly a year *before* it, the resolution being stated July 5th, 1830, and the trial having actually occurred in the June of 1831, instead of 1830, as his dishonesty led all to suppose in the first instance; which dishonesty has prevented him from undeceiving them to the present hour; by which means he has basely availed himself of an undue advantage for the time, that has probably contributed more than any thing besides to blind the eyes of the community, and to keep him in favor with some portion of it till this moment. But now that the veil is removed, and the deceiver unmasked in this additional and most unexpected imposition, it is to be hoped that those who have thus far clung to him, will at length let go their hold, unless indeed they are prepared to go down with him.

So then it comes to this: that all the recommendations which Mr. Sleigh has produced, with the exception of a single one from *Ireland*, are of a date a long time prior to the trial in which his character was proved bad, in the highest tribunal in England. Let him now produce any recommendations from England *after that* period if he can. And should he do so, let the public consider whether they come from such a quarter, and are of such a nature, as to outweigh the decision of that high tribunal, the Court of King's Bench in England.

The trial over, and Mr. Sleigh prostrate, we have no farther clue to his history till he absconded from London, after having embezzled funds from an Institution in that city. I have not yet been informed what Institution this was; but from information that I have received from Cincinnati, in addition to that which I have already published, it appears to have been of a literary and scientific character. The hospital with which he was connected may, *as accounts were kept*, have been in debt to him, for aught I know. But we are not to forget the sums of money which he managed to get, in the man-

ner heretofore described, that *ought* to have been reckoned as the funds of that Institution. It does not however appear, that it is the hospital which is alluded to in my advices from Cincinnati, but some other Institution. I trust I shall shortly be favored with the number of the *Lancet* containing the advertisement itself, which I suspect is on the wrapper, like the other advertisements, and which I have not yet had the opportunity of seeing. Yet I have the fact of its existence stated to me in *two* letters from Cincinnati, as will appear anon. And the statement is the more credible, as it corresponds with Sleigh's character as portrayed in the *Lancet*, and in the letters from Cincinnati.

The next we ascertain of him, after his absconding from London, is, that he was in Cincinnati. Here, as usual, he made a dash for a while, lecturing, debating, &c. till his London roguery came to the ears of the Cincinnatians, and till he commenced his old tricks in their city; when they shut him up in prison! But I will not forestal the documents which I have to present, one of which I published in my letter to his six clerical endorsers, another in my reply to his pamphlet, and another I now publish, for the first time, in this pamphlet. For all these documents I have responsible names, one of which is that of an Editor, standing on the number of his work containing the article, which I have already republished. In this article, Dr. Sleigh and his fraud in Cincinnati are incidentally mentioned, in a note introductory to another article. It is contained in the Cincinnati Evangelist of Sept. 7th, 1835, edited by Walter Scott, and is as follows.

#### DOCTOR SLEIGH.

Brother Scott:—If the following is of any value, you are at liberty to present it to your readers. It was extracted from a little book brought to this country by the hypocritical Doctor above-named, and is intended to set forth the nature and order of a Church in Camberwell, London, and her sister Churches in England, Ireland, Scotland, and America. Said Doctor, after having defrauded a lady who had resided in his family, of eighteen hundred dollars, left our city, and has not been heard of since.

O. T.

The next document is an extract from a letter from Cincinnati already published, which I now republish, as follows.

“Dr. Sleigh came here early in 1834, as he said, directly from London. He told Dr. Moorehead, a countryman of his, that he possessed a large estate,—but no one believed it. He lectured on religion,” &c. “In the mean time, a work called the *London Lancet* arrived, containing an account that Dr. S. had run away from London, after embezzling funds to a certain amount from an Institution in that city. A Miss Williams, a pious old maid, had



lent the Dr. \$1800, (one account says \$800,) and took his note.— Some time in June or July, 1835, Miss W. asked for her money. It seems that the Dr. had found means to obtain the note, and destroy it!! He denied ever having received any money of Miss W. She then arrested him for swindling, and he was locked up in a felon's jail. In the mean time the Dr. had an interview with Miss W. and confessed his crime to her, and acknowledged the debt. She, like a woman as she was, took his confession and his note, and he was liberated. He immediately quit Cincinnati—said he was going back to London. He has stripped Miss Williams of all her property—left her bare—she now obtains a scanty support by teaching music. I believe this detail to be true in substance, but I am not able at present to leave my room to consult Mr. Underwood.\* The following persons might be written to : Dr. Wm. Price, Dr. Charles Witstack, Alex. Flash, Linden Ryder, and Miss Williams, the sufferer by this abominable KNAVERY."

The third document is an extract from a letter from Cincinnati, which I now publish for the first time. After stating that Mr. Sleigh came to that place about two years ago, and mentioning his lecturing, debating, &c. the writer says :—

"He attempted to show that all the followers of Christ had mistaken his commands, and were in the wrong road ; that he alone knew the right path, and would point it out to others," &c. "This is the amount of what he advertised to do.—In a short time after this, he was confined in the felon's department of our prison. The facts were these. A lady that came to this country in the same vessel that he did, entrusted him with 400 pounds sterling, for which he gave his note, bearing interest. By some means she lost it, or he found means to destroy it, and denied he had received the money, and threatened her with a prosecution for defamation of character. But she had other evidence ;—a paper on which he had calculated the interest, and other memoranda. He finding this, renewed the note, was liberated, and immediately left the city. He also, by one of the numbers of the London Lancet, absconded from that city with the funds of a Literary Society to which he belonged. A former friend of his states, that he was fond of arguing down in private what he advanced in public.—This is an epitome of what I have learnt ; and of course he is considered to have lost every thing that constitutes a man."

In addition to all the foregoing, I am authorized by an acquaintance of mine in this city, who is a Deacon of a Church, to state to

\* In another part of his letter, the writer speaks of being confined by the gout.

the public, that MR. THURSTON CRANE, a merchant of Cincinnati, being here sometime since on business, made statements to him respecting the attempt of Mr. Sleigh to defraud the lady in Cincinnati, and his consequent imprisonment, similar to those already published by me.

One rule of evidence adopted by Mr. Sleigh himself in the course of his discussion, as very conclusive proof, was, "Substantial fact under circumstantial variety." I shall now proceed to show, that this rule is most completely applicable to the case before us.

By "substantial fact," in the case of a question to be proved, is to be understood the *agreement* of the witnesses *in substance*: and by "circumstantial variety," is meant those unimportant differences which occur in narration, from variety of style, and from the omission or insertion of particular circumstances by each writer, according as their importance may appear to him, &c.

Now then, these witnesses substantially agree on the main point, viz. Mr. Sleigh's dishonesty, in his dealings with a lady in Cincinnati; although they relate it each one in a different manner. One calls it *defrauding* the lady. The others relate the particulars, and show that it was only an *unsuccessful attempt* to defraud her. They also substantially agree with regard to *the amount* of which he attempted to defraud her; yet this they express in different terms. One of them says \$1800; another says \$1800, with the additional remark that there was another report of its being but \$800; while another says, it was 400 pounds, which, at \$4. 44 cts. to the pound sterling, and a premium of 6 per cent. is just \$1800. The witnesses all agree, that he soon after left the city. One of them gives no other particulars, having only mentioned him incidentally. But two others having heard he was here, and having also been requested to state particulars, do so. These two substantially agree in the representation, that the note which Mr. S. gave the lady was missing, and that he took advantage of her inability to produce it, denied the debt, and, as the consequence, was imprisoned. But the one says, (by supposition of course,) that Mr. Sleigh found means of destroying it; while the other says, that either he destroyed it, or the lady lost it; which was of course the fact, inasmuch as it was missing. Again. They agree in the particular of his having been confined, not as a debtor, but as a criminal; but they express themselves differently in relation to it, the one saying that he was confined in the felon's jail, and the other, that he was confined in the felon's department of the jail. They both agree that he confessed the debt after being imprisoned, the one giving the reason, the other not. To add to the strength of the testimony of all the witnesses, let it be remembered that they resided in the place at the time. And as to one of them, he publishes the main facts to the



world within a few weeks after its occurrence, in the very city where it occurred, without being called to account by Mr. Sleigh himself!—I shall not pursue the subject. I merely ask those who reject evidence of *this* description, how they would go to work to prove the Bible!

It is unnecessary to dwell longer on the history of Mr. Sleigh. It is enough to know, that after quitting Cincinnati, he made a dash at Philadelphia, where he lectured and debated a short time, and thence took up his line of march to this city. And here he is, the same slippery, dishonest man that he was in London and Cincinnati. And if the New-York community continue to be humbugged by him much longer, all I can say is, they are much more gullible than the population of those cities which have ejected him. But this I am unwilling to believe. I am loath to suppose, that after the disclosures made in *this* pamphlet, a single individual can be found who will still attempt to sustain this wretched outcast, whose knavery has driven him from the bosom of society in other places. At any rate, I covet not the society of those who degrade themselves so much as to introduce to their family and social circles this guilty inmate of a criminal's prison—nor the reputation which such sociality must entail upon them, on the principle that "the partaker is as bad as the thief."

It would seem by the papers, that, notwithstanding all that has hitherto appeared in relation to his character, he is about to deliver a series of religious and scientific lectures. His effrontery in pursuing such a course is altogether without a parallel, except perhaps in the case of Cataline himself, who, notwithstanding his conspiracy against the commonwealth was a matter too notorious to be concealed, had the impudence to appear in the public assembly, just as if nothing of the kind were contemplated or suspected. Thus Sleigh. O! to be sure! *he* can deliver religious lectures. Why not he? Hasn't he talent? Ay, and so has Satan; and I would almost as soon have the one lecture as the other. It needs *character*, as well as talent, to lecture on *religious* subjects—or indeed on any other. If roguery is to be encouraged and caressed, while honesty is kept in the back ground, there will soon be rogues by the wholesale. What effect the bolstering up of Mr. Sleigh, regardless of the charges against him, is calculated to have on the rising generation, every individual of the least discernment cannot fail to perceive. Every good citizen is therefore bound to discountenance him.—How extremely reprehensible, then, must the conduct of those individuals appear, who have recently sent forth to the public the following most extraordinary document:—

*Dr. Sleigh.*—The following document in refutation of the slanders lately published respecting Dr. Sleigh, was unanimously agreed

to at a meeting of several gentlemen, clergymen, physicians, and mechanics, held on Monday evening.

"The undersigned having carefully examined the original documents submitted to them, relative to Dr. W. W. Sleigh, and the Royal Western Hospital, in London, in relation to which certain extracts from the London Lancet, impeaching the character of Dr. Sleigh, have recently been published in this city, are unanimously of opinion, that the professional and moral character of that gentleman is *unimpeached* and *unimpeachable*, by any of his transactions, either in founding that institution, or in the discharge of the duties devolving upon him in his official capacity. The reports and minutes of the Governors of that Hospital, together with numerous testimonials from distinguished men in all the liberal professions in London, *before* and *after* the medical controversies to which the Lancet alludes, and of which *a vindictive use has been recently made*, together with the other papers submitted to them, all conspire to convince them, that Dr. Sleigh has been unjustly treated. Dr. Sleigh being a stranger in this city, they have felt themselves called upon in justice to him, to make such enquiries on the subject as would place his character beyond dispute, and as the result of that investigation, they do hereby express their entire and unshaken confidence in him as a gentleman of sound morals, and of the strictest honor and integrity; and they do earnestly recommend him to the public as an accomplished and skillful lecturer on the evidences of Christianity: and finally, they have respectfully entreated him not to condescend henceforth to notice any newspaper attacks whatever, which may be made on him, by either Christians or Infidels. (Signed on behalf of the meeting.)

W. C. Brownlee, D. D.

Edward Probyn,

A. Maclay, D. D.

Horace Holden.

David Meredith Reese, M. D.

Robert H. Maclay, M. D.

New York, Dec. 29, 1835.

N. Bangs, D. D.

T. Merritt,

B. Waugh,

R. M'Cartee, D. D.

W. M. Bangs,

Amos Belden,

Among the signatures attached to the foregoing article, I perceive not the name of Rev. Charles G. Somers, one of the six clergymen who signed the first recommendation of Mr. Sleigh; which recommendation was published *prior* to the publication of the first disclosure from Cincinnati. Thus has this gentleman made a most timely retreat, and he deserves much credit for his prudence on this occasion. I perceive, also, the appendage of D. D. attached to the name of Rev. A. Maclay, which appendage, I am informed, has no business there. *If* so, I suppose it was added to give the list of en-



dorsers as imposing an appearance as possible. Let us now consider the article itself to which the names are attached.

The gentlemen talk of *slander*, and then designate what they mean by it, viz. certain extracts from the London Lancet recently published, that is, the account of the trial in which Mr. Sleigh was beaten. Surely this is strange slander.

They speak of testimonials *after* the medical controversies to which the Lancet alludes. Will they please to produce any testimonials possessing the weight of a feather, dated after the trial in the Court of King's Bench in June, 1831, in which Mr. Sleigh's character was decided to be bad by law! They must now keep in mind, that he has been the means of deceiving them, and of keeping them deceived till another undeceives them, with regard to *the date* of the trial, and that too *by a whole year*. Will they still adhere to the man who they must now be aware has thus deceived them?

They say, a *vindictive* use has been recently made of the articles in the Lancet. Now I am the individual who has made use of the only article that has been used at all, and I positively deny that I have made such a use of it; and I must be permitted to know my own feelings better than they do. My object in making use of the Lancet has been, to expose a knave, and thus to prevent his disgracing religion, and imposing on the community.

They say, they are convinced of the good character of Mr. Sleigh from the documents submitted to them. But who submitted those documents? Mr. Sleigh, the accused party. Is this the way to look thoroughly into a subject? Suppose a civil tribunal were to try a case in this manner, what would these same gentlemen say to that? What! pronounce the accused party innocent, merely by examining such evidences as *he* may choose to furnish? What mockery of justice is this! If Mr. Sleigh has not furnished them with all the evidence against himself which I have brought into view in this pamphlet, yea, and much more, which it was in *his* power to do, then have they not seen both sides; and yet they have passed their sentence on the case! But if he *has* shown them all, then, by deciding in his favour in view of the whole, they are just as bad as he is. But what testimonials has he to exhibit which he has not exhibited to the public? He has exhibited some; and he must be a singular man indeed, to produce his *weakest* documents in his *public* defence, and to reserve his *strongest* for his defence *before a few individuals*. The presumption is, that he has already exhibited to the public the best he has; and that finding these insufficient, he enlists *names* and *decisions* in his favour. But this will not answer the purpose in this plain, matter-of-fact country, this country of free investigation, where truth outweighs—no matter how many mere names;—and where all attempts to carry a cause by an array of names instead of facts, is the

the sure way of defeating it. If the gentlemen are in possession of any material documents in this case which the public have not seen, let them be published for the inspection of all; but let them not suppose that their own opinions will answer as a substitute, under existing circumstances.

They reiterate their recommendation of Mr. Sleigh, as a skilful lecturer on the evidences of Christianity. As an offset to their *bare word* for this, I have *proved* that he is a perfect novice in the business; and I now appeal from their decision to any first-rate theological seminary in the United States. And more than this, I am determined to get the decision of some such seminary, to counteract the pernicious effect which this recommendation of Mr. Sleigh is calculated to produce, by leading people to suppose that Christianity has no better defence than that which it receives at his hands.

Finally, they conclude by advising him not to notice any future newspaper attacks. A fine piece of advice truly. How did they know what *kind of future attacks might be made?* what *new evidences might be presented?* At a pretty pass indeed have we arrived, if a man may even be excused from *defending* himself against *criminal charges*, and yet repose in security under the broad ægis of a self-constituted and dictatorial power, unknown either to Church or State? Who are these dozen "Gentlemen, Clergymen, Lawyers, Physicians, and Mechanics," that thus take it upon themselves to examine and decide a case for the whole community? Whose *representatives* are they? What business is it of theirs, more than of others? But they have felt it a duty, they say, to do as they have done, because Mr. Sleigh is a stranger. But cannot this stranger show his satisfactory documents to the public as well as to them?—*to the public*, whose business it is to see for themselves, if to them he would appeal? And then again, what *need* has he of the *undue influence of names*, if he has *convincing facts*? Names to him in this case will prove worse than nothing, by showing that he *needs* them; and the more names, therefore, the worse for his cause. Besides, this attempt to carry his cause by suppressing investigation, and bringing a partizan influence to bear in his favour, will be sure to be resisted even on *its own* account. The friends of truth will never permit this baleful power to come to maturity. They will crush it now in embryo, ere it leap full-armed into life, to prostrate virtue in the dust, and to render iniquity triumphant! They will meet this effort to suppress the investigation of villainy on the very threshold, and give it their stern, indignant rebuke—a rebuke that will make the ears of Sleigh's endorsers ring and tingle during the remainder of their days!

But not only is their decision the height of arrogance: it is most transcendantly absurd and ridiculous. The question with regard



to Mr. Sleigh's character was settled long ago in the Court of King's Bench in England, where he was well known. And now a dozen individuals in America, who know nothing about him, come forward and certify, contrary to that decision, that his character is good! O! how inadequate is language to express the degree of ridiculous absurdity connected with this grave farce! Verily, verily, the days of the Solomons and the Daniels have come once more, and the IMMORTAL DOZEN now occupy the seat of judgment! At their oracular dictum, public opinion is to be smothered, investigation of iniquity is to cease, the decisions of the constituted tribunals of society are to be reversed, and Truth, and Honesty, and Justice, o'erwhelmed by the weight of their malign influence, are to be crushed to the earth, or dragged at the chariot wheels of all-conquering Knavery! Tell me, fellow-citizens, *shall* these things be so? In a voice of deafening thunder, I hear you answer "NO!!!"—Let all the people respond, Amen.

It is a most remarkable circumstance, that these gentlemen do not so much as attempt to justify their *protegè* in the Cincinnati affair, nor do they even allude to it. Yet the villainy of Mr. Sleigh is in that instance as evident as proof can make a thing; notwithstanding which, in their summary manner, these gentlemen, these prodigies of wisdom, of prudence, and of deliberation, with a single dash of their magical pen, set every thing at rights, by declaring his moral character "unimpeached and unimpeachable."—And now let me tell them what they will have accomplished by this course, in the sequel. They will not have sustained Sleigh; *that is impossible*: but they will have degraded themselves, and destroyed their own influence. And if an individual should thereafter produce a recommendation signed by them, "O!" the examiner will say, "this is signed by the men that endorsed Sleigh: it is good for nothing at all, but is rather suspicious than otherwise. Bring me testimonials on which I can depend, and not such as this."

I have already brought into view the surprising fact, that Mr. S. is in the habit of advocating one sentiment in public, and a contrary one in private, which, together with his conduct, leads me to believe him to be a real Jesuitic hypocrite, disbelieving in Christianity, but making use of it as the best means to accomplish his own sinister purposes, without caring how much he injures and disgraces it.—As an additional corroboration of this idea, and at the same time as an act of justice to an injured individual, I will insert a statement furnished to me by Doctor Burdell, a Member of the Medical Society of the City and County of New York; the gentleman who, for having had the honesty and independence, when called forward by Sleigh, to deny an unfounded assertion of his, on the last evening of the debate, was branded by that brazen-faced impostor

as a quack and an infidel ! Dr. Burdell is neither the one nor the other. He is a regular, authorised physician, and a professor of religion, whose character is not thus to be maligned with impunity by such an individual as Sleigh. As to Sleigh himself, *he* is neither a quack nor an infidel, in the ordinary sense of those terms. He *knows* better than he *says*, and is therefore *worse* than a quack ; and he *does not believe* what he *advocates*, and is therefore worse than an infidel. Christians should abhor such a man, infidels should despise him, “ and there should be a whip in the hand of every honest man, to *lash the rascal* naked round the world ! ” But for Dr. B.’s statement ; which, by the way, would not have been furnished to me, had Sleigh made the public recantation which he should have done :—

### TO MR. BACHELER.

The abuse I received from “ Dr.” Sleigh at the Chatham street chapel, respecting the contents of the pericardium, was only prevented from coming before the public by his making to me an apology, and *admitting my assertion* to be correct, that it *was* not, and *could not have been*, the *aqua pericardii*, or “ waters of the pericardium,” that issued from our Saviour’s side when pierced with the spear. I believe, of course, that Christ was *actually dead* when taken from the Cross, and that he arose from the dead, and subsequently ascended into Heaven ; but it was certainly a gross absurdity, on the part of *Professor* Sleigh, in holding forth the “ fallacious ” doctrine he did, in order to prove that he could not have been resuscitated, after having been taken from the Cross. If “ Doctor ” Sleigh is determined to maintain every assertion he advances, “ right or wrong,” I think he is the *wrong* man to advocate the truths of Christianity, and I cannot blame Mr. Purser for refusing to continue the discussion with such an antagonist. An honest, honorable, and true-spirited Christian, (not a fanatic,) I believe to be an image of Him who suffered on the cross ; and such an individual is a bright orb in the constellation of Christianity ; while a dishonest and quibbling demagogue reflects odium upon the cause he pretends to support, and entails disrespect on the divine doctrines of revelation.

Comment on the foregoing is superfluous, and I therefore leave it as it is, commending it to the notice of Mr. Sleigh’s endorsers, and the public at large.

Before entirely quitting Mr. Sleigh’s “ TWELVE,” I must be permitted just to jog their memory, by way of reminding them of the fact, that Mr. Sleigh, when he came to this city, repeated the farce which he played on making his *debut* at Cincinnati, by passing himself off for a gentleman of fortune and leisure, when he was not worth a cent on earth ! And should he produce any more of his



"governors'" testimonials as to his *character*, let me also just remind his *Board of Examiners* to inquire of him whether the *Chairman* of said "Governors'" meetings (if he happen to have an M. P. to his name) was not the identical Member of Parliament whom Mr. Sleigh supposed to be the *natural father* of the poor child mentioned in this pamphlet, and whom, *notwithstanding this*, he was so desirous of getting to preside at meetings of the kind !

Having now attempted to do justice to Mr Sleigh and his endorsers, I must, ere I conclude, do one act of justice to myself.

For the course which I have pursued in relation to Mr. Sleigh, I have by some been denounced as a Judas, by others I have been viewed as acting a most unaccountable part, and so on to the end of the long catalogue of "evil surmisings." But *why* have I been denounced as a Judas? *Why* have I been supposed to act an unaccountable part? *What have I done* that I *ought not* to have done, from the beginning of this affair till now? To those grovelling worms of earth who can see no motive to action but gold, and to whom an act in an individual which they cannot trace to such a motive appears strange and unaccountable, I have nothing to say. I hold no parley with such. Their heads are incapable of comprehending, and their hearts of appreciating, those ennobling principles of action springing from disinterestedness and love of truth. But to those who are possessed of generous feeling, and "can find a luxury in doing good," I offer a few words of explanation.

In the first place, I saw that Mr. Sleigh was not the man to do justice to Christianity, either in word or deed. In the next place, I had hints of his bad character, but such hints as I could not for the moment divulge. Under these circumstances, I perceived that he was likely to bring serious evil upon a cause which I, holding to be sacred, regarded more than all things beside. To rid Christianity of such an incumbrance as this, and thereby to prevent his doing present or future harm, I proposed to aid his antagonist in bringing forward such objections as I knew would drive him from the field, thus forcing upon the stage some other advocate who would not disgrace the cause, but do it ample justice, & thereby accomplish great good. What an awful Judas I must be, to think of such a thing as this ! But not too fast, my friends. Although I did not recollect any precedent at the time, and had nought but the plainest principle of common sense for my guide, I find on reviewing the *Memoirs* of the late celebrated President Dwight, of Yale College, an expedient of a similar nature at least, adopted by that enlightened Christian advocate, for the extirpation of infidelity in that Institution, the account of which I here introduce for the information of those who were not aware of it before, and for the consideration of those who are opposed to thorough religious discussion.

"At the time of his accession to the Presidency," (1795) "Infidelity was fashionable and prevalent in the College. . . To extirpate a spirit so pernicious and fatal, he availed himself of an early opportunity. Forensic disputation was an important exercise of the senior class. For this purpose, they were formed into a convenient number of divisions; two of which disputed before him every week, in the presence of the other members of the class, and of the resident graduates. One of the questions presented by the first division was this: "*Are the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments the Word of God?*" To their surprise, the President selected it for discussion; told them *to write on which side they pleased*, as he should not impute to them any sentiments which they advanced, as their own; and requested those who should write on the negative side of the question, to collect and bring forward all the facts and arguments which they could produce: enjoining it upon them, however, to treat the subject with becoming respect and reverence. Most if not all the members of the division came forward as the champions of Infidelity. When they had finished the discussion, he first examined the ground they had taken; triumphantly refuted their arguments; proved to them that their statement of facts was mistaken or irrelevant; and to their astonishment, convinced them that their acquaintance with the subject was wholly superficial. After this, he entered into a direct defence of the divine origin of Christianity, in a strain of powerful argument and animated eloquence which nothing could resist. The effect upon the students was electrical. From that moment Infidelity was not only without a strong hold, but without a lurking place. To espouse her cause was now as unpopular, as before it had been to profess a belief in Christianity. Unable to endure the exposure of argument, she fled from the retreat of learning, ashamed and disgraced."

As to my exposure of the *bad character* of Mr. Sleigh, I have no explanation to give. Those who do not know enough to understand that an impostor, especially a religious one, should be exposed, and prevented from gulling the community, could not understand an explanation were one to be given. And those who suffer themselves to be gulled after the exposure is made, have less understanding still. And here I shall rest my defence, feeling conscious that I have acted right, and that it will soon be so admitted by every man of common sense and common honesty.

It will be seen that I have nowhere in this pamphlet given Mr. Sleigh the title of Doctor. The reason of this is, that I do not find him thus denominated by friends or foes in England. His own testimonials call him *Mr. Sleigh*; and I presume the literati of England know what is good English. I have therefore given him the title he bore in that country.



With regard to the two or three papers in this city that have taken advantage of the unjust prejudice existing against me for the moment in the minds of the ignorant and the malignant, to misrepresent and abuse me, I have only to say, that in pursuing this course, they have been merely at their old vocation, and that I am not their only victim. The Commercial Advertiser, for example, has misrepresented and abused me most shamefully ; but it has done the same to others, and this is well understood. Hence, I apprehend no serious harm from any thing it has said or may say of me. As to another paper, whose Editor abused Mr. Sleigh till he found him to be a knave, and then immediately espoused his cause, this was all perfectly natural. His fraternal sympathies would of course gush forth at the sight of a brother so dear to his heart. In relation to a certain *weakly* concern, all I have to say is, to advise its Editor to go to school a quarter or so, and learn syntax and punctuation ; for really, so jumbled are his sentences, and so obscurely expressed, that it is sometimes difficult to divine his meaning. I do hope he will not become my advocate, as I should regret to be found in such illiterate company.

Should any portion of this community continue to adhere to Mr. Sleigh, after becoming acquainted with the disclosures made in this pamphlet, then shall I, for one, be constrained to confess, that we are of all cities the most gullible ; and I should hardly be surprised to hear, that some not only believed that man-bats had been discovered in the moon, but that the moon itself, as it is sometimes said, is made of green cheese !

I will now bring this pamphlet to a close, by expressing the hope that it will have such an influence with this community as to lead them so to act in relation to this case of Mr. Sleigh, as will leave the impression on the minds of the young, that the path of *virtue* is the path of *safety*, while the way of *the transgressor* is *hard*.

ORIGEN BACHELER.



## **P O S T S C R I P T !!!**

Praise to God ! that he has not left without witness an individual who is striving to the utmost of his power, against a torrent of opposition, to snatch the suffering cause of truth from the sacrilegious hands of an impostor whose heart is black as Erebus—an impostor who may be said fairly to out-Boroughs Boroughs himself—an impostor whose name is doomed, like Satan's among the Infernals, to

stand pre-eminent—on the scroll of infamy, till the very name and memory of these devils incarnate shall perish in oblivion!

*"The lip of truth shall be established forever, but the lying tongue is but for a moment."*—Prov. xii. 19.

I stop the press to announce, that a letter has just been received from Cincinnati, dated and post-marked Dec. 27th, signed by a respectable citizen of that place, from which I am permitted to make the following extracts:—

"I have to apologise for not replying to your favour of the 10th inst. before, but must plead press of business at this season of the year, which rendered it difficult to confer with Miss Williams on the subject you wrote on.—I have seen that lady, and she has prepared and furnished me with a written statement of the wrongs she has suffered at the hands of Dr. Sleigh—but as the statement is somewhat bulky, and would prove expensive if transmitted per mail, I reserve them for some favorable opportunity to forward them.—In the mean time, I will briefly state the substance:—

"In Nov. 1833, Miss W. became intimate with Dr. & Mrs. Sleigh, on the ground of similarity of religious sentiments, about which time the Dr. was in a state of pecuniary embarrassment, and was in dread of arrest for £46 str. Miss W. relieved this by a loan of that amount. In December, a friend suggested to the Dr. that he might succeed in America by sugar refining, with a small capital to commence with.—Miss W. increased the loan to £400, and consents to accompany the family to this country.—Shortly after their arrival, Dr. S. evinced great arrogance, and wished to be thought a man of property—subsequently slandered Miss W. to many of her acquaintances in this city.—Miss W. having arrived at a knowledge of these facts, is compelled to leave his house, not however with a view of withdrawing her funds, but from the vile insinuations thrown out by the Doctor—together with the assertion that he owed her nothing—induced Miss W. to apply for the amount through the medium of a friend. He then *denies the loan*. This compelled Miss W. to apply for legal aid. He is arrested and imprisoned—his wife implores Miss W. for his release, and he writes a note stating that "The aspersions I have at any time cast on Miss W.'s character, are false, infamous, and unfounded."—He then gave Miss W. his note at 18 months for \$1800, and was liberated from prison.—These are the leading facts of this case, with which you may make such use as may benefit society.—I regret that I have not time to spare to enlarge on this subject.—I have seen the documents in Miss Williams' possession, and I believe the whole of this statement to be strictly correct."

In view of the foregoing letter, together with the mass of evidence of Sleigh's abominable character furnished in this pamphlet, no reason on earth can furnish a sufficient excuse to his endorsers to continue to give him countenance a moment longer. They are at the least bound to say to the public, that such are now the evidences adduced against him, that they *withdraw* their endorsement till something further can be ascertained in relation to this "stranger."—One word of caution to those who attend his lectures. *Pay only as you go*; purchase none of his twelve evening, ten shilling tickets; lest, ere you are aware, he give you the slip by absconding from the city "between two days," and leave you to whistle for your money.

ORIGEN BACHELER.

