BRITISH NEWS.

The Irish Tithe Question.—In the House of Commons on the 21st of March, the House resolved itself into a Committee on that part of the King's Speech regarding tithes, in Ireland. Sir H. Hardinge brought forward the subject. He prefaced the resolutions with detailing the state of Ireland and of the Clergy in particular, in consequence of the impossibility to collect the tithes, and then introduced his plan for substituting a rent charge of £75 for every £100 tythe, to be payable by the leading landlords of the parish. In case of default, the clergymen to apply to the Church Commissioners, and they to institute proceedings for the recovery of the rent charge; thus preventing the Clergymen from coming in collision with the parishioners. The rent charges, hereafter, to be saleable, or rather, redeemable—the produce to be invested in land for the benefit of the present tithe owners. The incomes to the Clergy to be guaranteed after the details of the plan illustrative of and enforcing the resolutions (for which resolutions we refer to the conclusion of Sir H. Hardinge's speech.) He adverted to the distressed condition of the Clergy. For the arrears of tithe of 1831-32-23, an Act had passed granting £1,000,000, to be advanced on the security of the said arrears. Of that sum, £637,000 had been advanced. To meet the arrears of 1834 there must be some provision, for tithe could not now be collected in any part of Ireland. As to the reimbursing the sums granted to the Clergy on the security of tithes, that, he feared, was not to be calculated upon, or, as tithes could not be collected, they would not have the means of returning the sums. The Government proposed to provide means for advances on account of the arrears of 1834.

Lord J. Russell said that he would not oppose the resolutions, but content himself with reminding the Committee that there was no essential difference between this measure and the bill rejected last year. That bill was charged with proposing to "secularies" Church property: if so, this bill did the same. He doubted whether any benefit would result from this bill, or whether any beneficial measure could be adopted until the House had come to some decision on the great question of "appropriation."

Mr. Shaw denied that this measure would secularise Church property. It did not provide for payment to the landlords, which the former Bill did, and that he called secularising the Church property.

An extended debate ensued. Mr. O'Connell resisted the measure as useless and hopeless, inasmuch as changing the name of tithe into "rent charge" did not remove the evil.

Mr. Rice moved an amendment to substitute for Sir H. Hardinge's resolution, "That it is expedient to alter and amend the existing laws relating to tithes in Ireland."

On this amendment the Committee eventually divided. The numbers were.—For it 198; against it, 213.—Majority against it, 15.

The first resolution was then carried; and the rest, regarding the money provision, it was understood, were postponed.

SIR ROBERT PEEL AND MR. HUME.

House of Commons, March 20.

Sir,—In the course of the debate this evening, I understood you to make use of expressions of which the purport was that I was pursuing a course in respect to the measure then under discussion that was inconsistent with the conduct of a man of honour.

Thinking it probable that such expressions fell from you inconsiderately, and in the warmth of debate, I gave you an opportunity of recalling them, by an appeal to you in the House.

I could not with propriety pursue the subject further at the time, but I am confident that you will feel that the expressions of which I complain are not consistent with the usages of Parliament, and not warranted by the freedom of debate, and that you will therefore not hesitate to disavow them as applied to me. I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant, ROBERT PEEL.

Joseph Hume, Esq. M.P.

House of Commons, March 20.

Sir,—I expressed myself in the debate, to the best of my recollection, strongly condematory of the conduct of the Government of which you are the head, inasmuch as you and your party had objected to and rejected the Bill of last Session for settling the tithes of Ireland, as inconsistent with the welfare of the country; and I added, that I did not consider it honourable to have done so, and then to come down, as you had now done, to propose a measure every way similar.

When you appealed to me in the House as to the words I had used, and whether I intended to cast imputations on your honour, my immediate answer was, that I could not say what your feelings of honour were; but that I, as a political man, should not have considered it honourable conduct if I had so acted.

It is, therefore, quite clear in my recollection, that whilst I made my observations in allusion to what I would have done, I did not impugn your honour as a gentleman in the course you had taken, as the views you take of your political duty are doubtless as pure as my own, or those of any other member, although your political conduct be the reverse of mine.

I am not aware, therefore, that you had any just grounds for understanding my expressions to impugn your honour as a gentleman. I had no intention to make any such personal charge; and I regret that in the heat of debate I should have so expressed myself to convey a meaning I did not intend. I remain your obedient servant, JOSEPH HUME.

Right Hon. Sir Robert Peel, M.P.

SEAMEN.—The Bills brought in by Sir James Graham—1st. for Registering Merchant Seamen, and securing them strict justice from their employers; 2d, for Manning the Royal Navy by such humane and considerate encouragement to seamen generally as must tend to supersede the abominable practice of impressment—are specimens of a skilful and vigorous policy, highly honourable to Sir J. Graham, and well corresponding with the whole course of the naval administration of that right honorable baronet.

In the first mentioned of the two bills, the important provisions are those which regulate the agreements under which sailors navigate the vessels of their employers, by prescribing that in future they shall sail under written agreements, and that no British sailor shall for the future be left by the captain of a merchant-ship in foreign countries, without the payment of his wages in full, and without sufficient evidence for the necessity of such an abandonment or dismissal of the seaman. Our readers must all recollect the multitude of cases in which the masters of merchantmen have contrived to pick quarrels with poor fellows on the homeward voyage, and, on the plea that they had in some way broken their engagements, left them destitute in distant countries, and without the means of returning home. There are likewise clauses respecting the number of apprentices in proportion to the tonnage of the vessels, and directing a muster and inspection of the hands by a custom-house officer on the return of each vessel into port, to ascertain the due number and the safety of the apprentices taken out. There is further to be a registry of all British seamen, both in the coasting and foreign trade, by half-yearly returns to the Custom-house.

The second bill, which more nearly concerns the navy, enacts, that the right of the Crown to the services of all seamen shall be declared; that in cases of emergency, a proclamation shall be issued, to operate in the nature of a formal summons, claiming the services of all seamen to defend their country, but limiting the service to five years, the lapse of which shall be a protection to the individual ever after; that after the proclamation an interval shall be allowed, during which all volunteers shall receive double bounty, viz. £10 instead of £5; that one year's service of a volunteer in time of war shall go for two years in time of peace, or for two years of compulsory service; that a seaman volunteering again after the expiration of his first term of five years, shall have a second bounty; that 20 years' service shall entitle a seaman to a pension, which pension, should he be further fit for service, he is to enjoy in addition to his pay. In our opinion it needs no more than a bare perusal of these enactments to convince the public of their good sense and their efficacy for the intended purpose, of attaching our tars to the King's service, and ensuring an abundant supply of seamen for the British men-of-war in time of need. Thus will the ulcer of centuries be healed almost in a twelvemonth.

There is reason to believe that one or more useful hints which have been turned to judicious account by the late First Lord of the Admiralty were furnished by Lieutenant Standish Haly, author of a pamphlet on impressment.—*London Times, March 19.*

Sir Francis Burdett, the man of the people, "England's pride and Westminster's glory," at one time borne to confinement for defending public rights, accompanied by the heart-consoling and triumphant acclaim of tens of thousands of voices of the popular hydra, finds at last that he has been in reality a too humble and most obedient servant, to a most imperious and tyrannical master. The Baronet, who it seems, in opposition to the opinions of his Whig and Radical constituency, ventured to entertain a notion that Sir C. M. Sutton would be a better Speaker of the Commons than Mr. Abercrombie, and wishing to be more consistent than his fellow representatives, would have voted accordingly, was waited upon by a deputation of the freeholders of Westminster, who very decidedly expressed their wishes that he should become a political weather-cock; and after considerable parley he only escaped on condition of not voting on either side. A similar display was made because he did not think proper to vote for the Amendment to the Address, considering both it and the opposition to Sir C. M. Sutton as puerile, of no moment, and unworthy to be made a question of the strength of parties: on this occasion he was told in a very friendly manner, that a consultation had been held, the object of which was to get up a public meeting, requesting him to resign. This is the sort of affection entertained for a man, who all his lifetime has been courting public applause; this is the reliance the mob places on one, who for the greater part of half a century has bent to its clamour and fulfilled its behests; and this is the political consistency of the people, which, electing one day a well tried servant, quarrels with him the next, because he is honest enough not to change with every wind that blows. The Baronet's declaration that he was still the same, and that on questions involving public principle he would be found so, was little heeded; and thus do the Political Unions, and Radical meetings, and Reform Clubs attempt a despotism, by depriving the Representatives of Great Britain of consistency and honesty, and lock up their consciences to be at the use of the popular orators of the assembled conclaves, to whom the multitudes listen, and who silently chuckle at the ready and powerful acquiescence given to their plausible schemes.—*Halifax Times.*

By the promature death of Sir Peter Parker, Bart., at the early age of 25, the Baronetcy of Parker of Papingbourn, county Essex (conferred on Sir Peter Parker, Admiral of the fleet, 1783), has become extinct, the deceased's two brothers having died before him. The father of the late lamented young Baronet, Captain Sir Peter Parker, R. N., was mortally wounded whilst commanding a party of seamen and marines, at the storming of the American camp, near Baltimore, 3d August, 1814, and his widow married Michael Bruce, Esq.—Sir Peter Parker's death proceeded from a dreadful attack of small pox. The prevalence of this terrible malady at present has caused a feeling of alarm on all sides, from the mortality which has hitherto attended it, and the unusual severity with which it has attacked persons of all classes and ages. The death of Sir Peter Parker who was but a few days since in perfect health, has plunged his family and numerous friends in the severest affliction.

Mr. Speaker Abercrombie's new residence is to be the spacious mansion of the Earl of Warwick, in Carlton-gardens, next door to Mr. Henry Baring's. It is to be furnished at the expense of Government; and the Right Hon. Gentleman will have a new service of plate.

Lord Canterbury, together with Lady Canterbury, who is a sister of Lady Blessington, and family, will sail about the 1st of May in a ship of war for Quebec. It is expected he will be absent about a year.

The Ordnance estimates amount to £1,297,059, being £4,640 less than last year.

Lord Stuart de Rothesay has been appointed Ambassador to the Sublime Porte, in the room of Lord Ponsonby.

Sir Robert Gordon, brother of the Earl of Aberdeen, and formerly ambassador at Constantinople, is spoken of as destined to fill the vacancy at St. Petersburgh. Lord Cowley is gazetted as Ambassador to the Court of France.

The late Earl Nelson for thirty years was in the enjoyment of a pension of £5,000 per annum.

Should Mr. O'Connell be declared not duly elected for the city of Dublin, his second son, Morgan O'Connell, who sits for Meath, will, it is said, resign, and his father be returned without opposition for that county.

The Lord Chancellor has just bestowed a living of considerable value, the vicarage of Bredfield, in Suffolk, on the Rev. George Crabbe, the eldest son and biographer of the deceased poet.

The Marquess Wellesley is seriously indisposed.

To the list of the crowned heads whose health is more or less impaired, a French journal adds the Pope.

We understand the fine new American Ship John Marshall, which arrived at the Broomielaw on Friday evening, is the largest vessel that has ever come up the river, being 821 tons register, and has on board 1014 bales of cotton from Virginia.—*Glasgow Herald.*

Lieutenant Burnes has just presented to the British Museum the whole of the coins collected by him in the course of his travels in Bokhara. They consist of upwards of two hundred Bactrian, Indo-Grecian, Indo-Scythic, Hindoo, and Mahommedan coins.

The Select Committee appointed to report on the plans submitted to them for the erection of the two new Houses of Parliament will proceed to the task without delay; and it is expected that they will make their report in time to be decided upon by the House and approved of by the King before the Easter recess.

Sir Robert Peel, after having accompanied Lady Peel to the Court at St. James's Palace on the Queen's Birth-day, changed his dress and perambulated Pall-Mall and St. James's Street, with his lovely daughter, to witness the splendid equipages displayed on the occasion.

Sir Robert Peel has communicated to Professor Airy his Majesty's intention of allowing him an annuity of £300, in consideration of the eminent services which he has rendered to the cause of general science.

The London Morning Chronicle of the 9th ult. says—"The poets Thomas Moore, Wm. Wordsworth, and Robert Southey, are all at present in London, and each of them preparing to publish a new work."

An action took place in Spain, March 12th, between Mina and Zumalacarreguy, in which the Carlists were defeated at all points. The latter, however, had retreated to a commanding position between Pampeluna and St. Sebastian.

UNITED STATES.

Hon. John Anderson, of this city, and Peter H. Green, Esq. of Bath, have been appointed by the Governor and Council, Commissioners to visit Quebec for the purpose of conferring with the authorities there upon the advantages to be derived from a Rail Road from this state to that city.—*Portland Courier.*

Letter Sheets.—The Post Master General has issued a circular directing the Post Masters to charge letter postage on every thing in the *shape* of a letter. This order is directed particularly against price currents printed on letter sheets, which are issued in great numbers in all the principal cities, and which, folded with one end open, or without a seal, have passed as newspapers or periodical sheets. Mr. Barry's efforts to retrieve the condition into which carelessness and incompetence had plunged his affairs, lead him to the most illiberal and oppressive measures. The one now resorted to, is in violation of the interpretation given to the law ever since the law was made. This new interpretation will prove as useless to Mr. Barry as it is unjust towards the community; for it will of course put an end to the circulation of letter sheets. So that whatever revenue is now derived from them, will be lost. The parties chiefly benefited will be ourselves and our cotemporaries the editors of commercial papers. Our big sheets will now be substituted for the letter sheets.—*N.Y. Jour. Commerce.*

The North Eastern Boundary.—It appears from the statement of Mr. Peel in the British House of Commons on the 3d of March, in reply to the inquiry of Mr. Robinson, that no progress whatever has been made in the new negotiation for the settlement of this controversy. Our government has proposed that there should be a new survey. The British Government has agreed to the proposal, provided certain preliminary articles can be agreed to. To this proposal no reply had been received. One of the preliminary articles related to the question whether the Bay of Fundy is to be considered a part of the Atlantic Ocean. In this question is involved the whole question in controversy.—Our government of course cannot admit that the Bay of Fundy, in the view in which it is referred to in the treaty, is not to be regarded as a part of the Atlantic Ocean, and it is apparent from the British Government raising the question, that they wish to regard it as not a part of the Atlantic Ocean.—*Boston D. Adv.*

The Church of Rome, it is said, has appropriated $60,000 for the establishment of a Catholic Convent, at Bertrand, Michigan.

A new epidemic is at present prevalent at Cincinati, viz. pain in the face, intermittent like ague. It is a disease of the nerves, and is confined generally to a single spot near the eye. It is treated with quinine. There is no other illness but the acute pain in one single spot.

Joseph Reynolds, a man 76 years old, and habitually intemperate, was tried at Dover, N. H. week before last for the murder of his son, by striking him over the head with a shovel, when both were excited by intoxicating drinks! He was found guilty of *manslaughter*, and was sentenced to the State Prison for 5 years.

COMMUNICATIONS.

MR. EDITOR.—Professions are oftentimes delusive, and therefore we are not bound to consider the assertions of an anonymous writer veritable and just, because, in his plenitude of conceit, or in his deficiency of proof, he pomposly assumes the signature of "TRUTH AND JUSTICE."—This signature has been adopted by a commentator in the *Courier* of the 18th inst., and I believe that *Error and Injustice* as a *heading* would express more correctly the character of his *Foot*-Notes. This sepulchral compliment to the Legislative rottenness of the memorable resolution of the 16th February is like the inscription of "singular benevolence" upon the tomb stone of penuriousness. The reader may read, but "*credat, qui vult*"; and even so with the "hic Jacet" of the Council commentator, who reprobates the conduct of the House and observes respecting Members' pay, that

"*It was a matter not of Right—*
"*but of pay—a question of £30.*"

In reply, I assert that the question of pay *was a Right*, which the House had enjoyed for years—It was a *Right*, which was acknowledged to be just and proper by the Council—It was a *Right*, upon which the Council desired to construct another in favour of themselves—It was a *Right*, which was withheld by the Council,—BECAUSE the House would not accede to the hireling wishes of the Honorables—It was an established *Right*, which claimed the determined conduct of the Representatives as much as any *right* of the constituency—It was a *right* which was acknowledged by the Council, and therefore it affords the Representatives a strong hold, to resist the *coercing* dispositions of men, who have manifested *weak judgments* and *strong propensities*.—" Truth and Justice" continues to observe that

"*The quoted Resolution of the 16th could*
"*have nothing to do with the Appropriation*
"*Bill.*"

I answer: Nothing more, than to ensure the loss of it—For the resolution of the 16th induced the Members to include their Pay in the appropriation bill—The claim of pay was not considered extravagant by the Council—This provision of the Commons was just and reasonable—The appropriation bill was not rejected because it included a grant for the *Savings' Bank*, (in which a *leading* member of the Legislative Council was particularly interested,) but because it included a more just and reasonable demand, in favour of the Representatives who would not hire the Council to grant it—If the Council had passed "The Members' Pay Bill," which was *acknowledged* to be just and proper, it would not have been included in the appropriation bill; and that bill would have been passed. Therefore, it is very evident that the Resolution of the 16th had *something* to do with the appropriation bill. Again—

"Whatever the Assembly sought, the
"Council sought no more."

I deny it,—The Assembly *demanded* an accustomed and acknowledged Right, which the Representatives had voluntarily reduced in amount, in compliance with the wishes of their constituents and in consideration of the poverty of the Province. The Council *sought* to burden the constituency with increased Taxation, which was recommended as a mere matter of opinion, and did not come before *this* House through any Legislative channel—It *sought* pay under the claim of remuneration, and has found disappointment; it indulged in *retaliatory measures*, and it has created Provincial difficulty and general disapprobation. The majority resolved petulantly under the influence of disappointment:—Time and reflection have induced some of them to say, "*that matters will be all right, when the House meets again.*"

"Secret conclave."

A mercenary majority may well exclaim against exposure, or the public details of conversations, which were *climaxed* by the resolution of the 16th. The Legislative Council is not now, as it once was, an *Executive* and Legislative Council—its sayings and doings should therefore be as public as are those of the Representative body. By what law are Members of the Legislative Council bound to *secrecy?* Is this desire for secrecy in accordance with the boasted and ridiculous resemblance of this Body to the House of Lords? Is secresy imposed by a Colonial Minister, or Mr. Under-Secretary Hay, for the more effectual accomplishment of "*particular objects*" in Colonial Government?

"*Pay limited.*"

Pay may be claimed with more justice from the people of the Province for Legislative Councillors, when they are selected more generally, and the selections are not for the most part confined to a particular village or family. At present the village of Fredericton appears to be the principal hot-bed for the growth of Councillors, who have sprouted up in rapid succession in the town and its vicinity; and it would seem as if *Talent* was confined to the family of **** ******, who, with his cousins and cousins-german have figured so conspicuously in THE *Resolution*. The Colonial Minister may select, and recommend that his selections shall be *paid*. The Representatives no doubt will pay due deference to his recommendation; when he graciously condescends to pay some deference to public feeling and opinion.

"*Pay unknown in England.*"

And yet "*Truth and Justice*" would give it to the Councillors. But pay has been, and is known, tho' not received, in England; Counties are chargeable with it for their representatives. It has not been required, because men of wealth can give their time without pecuniary recompense; this is not the case with representatives in new countries. It is however desirable that in this Province the respective Counties should be assessed for the expenses of Representatives; that in future the right of one party and the petulance and retaliation of another should not plunge the Province into difficulty.

"*Change made in the Council*
"*to silence the complaints of the*
"*House.*"

This is something new!—"*Tell this to the Marines: the Sailors will not believe it.*" The commentator is disposed to be comical, and will no doubt illustrate his ironical raillery with the fable of the frogs choosing a king. But I am inclined to believe that the change was made to please Messrs. Baillie, Odell, & Co., and that the Judges were removed to silence some of the grumblings, which were naturally anticipated. This may, or may not have been the fact—It will take something more than the assertion of "*Truth and Justice*" to dispossess the public of the impression. If the change was made to *silence* the House, it was not calculated to satisfy the country. It would seem as if the Colonial Minister must have had a very incorrect idea of the population and intelligence of New-Brunswick.

"SAFETY VALVE"—"*the Council*
"*so styled, and justly so.*"

The *machinery* of the valve must have been miserably weak, when it exploded with a pressure of *Thirty Pounds!*

"*All Grants begin with the*
"*gentlemen below stairs.*"

And are rejected in the face of Justice by the thirty pound propensities of the "SAFETY VALVE"!

"*Savings' Bank*"—

Had an *interested* friend in the Honorable President of the Council, who *did not oppose* the passage of *this* appropriation as vehemently as that of Members' Pay. Pay *me*, and pay *you*—or *Meum* and *Tuum*, are widely different.

"LOCAL INSTITUTION: *why should*
"*Methodists and Presbyterians be*
"*compelled to raise money for a*
"*Baptist School?*"

And why should Methodists, Roman Catholics and Baptists contribute towards the revenue of a College, at which their children cannot receive the degree of Doctor of Divinity, if they wished it? Upon the exclusive principle of "Truth and Justice," Roman Catholics have a right to a large share of public money, for their own schools, since they form so large a proportion of contributors to the public funds. Did the Council grant that proportion for the benefit of a School—?

"*Catholic School—Poor Children—*
"*The principle is, that those who want*
"*any thing exclusive, should exclusively*
"*pay for it.*"

The principal honors of King's College, Fredericton, are only obtainable by Members of the Church of England—viz—the degree of Doctor of Divinity. Are the funds, derived from the Province, exclusively the contributions of Members of that church? Do Baptists, Roman Catholics, Methodists, Presbyterians, and all varieties of creeds and religious opinions, give to the general fund, from which this Institution draws £1100 annually? *Exclusive principle* is very convenient, when we wish to exclude others from participating in our privileges.

"*Baptist Seminary*" opposed
by the Council "perhaps" because
"*No Public Institution can be well*
"*managed at Fredericton.*"

This is a very prevailing opinion, and has not yet been refuted by the occasional expositions of public offices in that village.

"*King's College*—this place not
"*being quite full, will afford ample*
"*accommodation to the Baptist*
"*Young Men.*"

Will it ever be filled?—How many years has it been established? How many pupils are in attendance? How much has each pupil cost the Province? Baptists may attend; and after studying the lawful time, witness the graduation of Churchmen and be made to feel the *partiality* of an *exclusive principle.*

"COST AT KING'S COLLEGE £40:—
"*Not £40—but only £30 per ann:*
"*and not £5 if* THE YOUNG MEN
"*obtain a Scholarship.*"

I rather *guess* (to use the phraseology of "*Truth and Justice,*") that the commentator has not sent a son to College: if he has, the Youth is a promising Boy, as the statement of "*Truth and Justice*" is widely different from the lamentations of those parents whom I have heard mourning over £40 *plus*, nearly £40 per annum squandered during the honor of Collegiate attendance. "*Truth and Justice*" writes as if every man could compass this expenditure for his son within £5, by his allusions to *scholarships*. This writer, in his next column of Illustrations, would do well to let us know—How many scholarships are offered for competition? Who have them at present? How many are established for students of Divinity belonging to the Church of England? To the Roman Catholic Church? and to the various denominations of worshipping Christians?

"INDIVIDUALS IN COUNCIL—*the very*
"*Persons who used to reveal, what was*
"*passed in secret conclave*—'NATIVE'
"*knows who.*"

And it would seem, as if "*Truth and Justice*" knows *what*—Is any member of Council ashamed of his opinion and argument? Is secresy essential to Legislation? What right have the Council to be a "Secret Conclave"?—When Councillors talk of "*coercing*"—of not giving pay because they cannot get pay—when they oppose just, accustomed and equitable grants—well may they feel ashamed—well may they blush and bluster at exposure. But let them remember that *reeds*, when agitated by the wind, exposed the disgrace of the avaritious and ill-judging *Midas.*

"*Truth and Justice*" has favoured us with his comments upon some other paragraphs in the communication of "Native"; but as these comments will not admit of a comment, being little more than a collection of unmeaning words, I will not occupy your columns with any further reference to them.

April 20. I am your's, &c. P. Q.

MR. CAMERON.—Among the many nuisances at present existing, I would wish to allude to that of Lamp-breaking, which, for the last few months, has become so prevalent. I am glad our *new* authorities have taken it under their consideration in the manner it should be—and that they may still continue to keep a sharp "*look out*" is my earnest wish.

I was surprised and pained to hear that a complaint was lodged on Wednesday last, at the Police Office, against a gentleman of the Bar, for *Lamp-breaking*, and that he refused to appear to answer the summons on Saturday,—in consequence of which, the sitting Aldermen have been pleased to fine him in the sum of £10. This is, sir, as it ought always to be: for when a man in a respectable situation, in a respectable community, thus levels himself with the blackguard, he ought to be chastised in a manner proportionate to the offence committed,—and I hope our Magistrates will always act with that firmness so characteristic in this instance.

On Thursday night, I understand, a few more Lamps were demolished,—on Friday night a still greater number were destroyed, and last evening the work of destruction was again extensively practised. As it is not positively known who were guilty on these two last occasions, nothing can be done; but I sincerely trust, that hereafter such a strict watch will be kept, as will preserve our City Lamps from further destruction.

What motives could instigate the perpetrator or perpetrators to such acts I know not, neither can I conceive. Surely it was not to gratify any private *pique*—any particular motive. Did they consider on whom the expense of repairing those damages would fall?—not on the rich, but the poor labourer and mechanic, out of their hard earnings. The sooner these lamp-breakers are discovered, and publicly exposed, the better for our sober citizens, at whose expense they prowl at midnight.

Before I conclude, I would recommend that a reward be offered to any person who may discover the author of a broken Lamp, and that our citizens themselves keep a strict look-out for those, who, while they think they are protected by aristocratic influence, at the same time exercise their organs of destructiveness, in the shape of destroying public property for which they are all annually taxed.

Suspicion of the perpetration is attached to several individuals, and I am inclined to think pretty justly.—If not, I would advise them to keep in their proper places, at the hour of midnight, as they can only by such means prevent that suspicion from becoming a public conversation.

Finally, let our Watchmen do their duty, as well as their limited number will allow, and try their best to discover those gentlemen lamp-breakers and to bring them all to justice, should they still continue that course of conduct. I am, Mr. C., your's, &c.

Monday, April 27. CIVIS.

MR. EDITOR.—The Nocturnal *Worthies*, who are seeking and *obtaining* CHARACTER, by their Quixotic prowess and triumphs over unoffending and defenceless lamps, did mine the honor of an encounter on Sunday night, and prostrated—a gill of whale oil—six panes of lamp-glass, and the Tinman's labour on the frame—a glorious achievement! worthy of armorial distinction! But, Sir, as the Lamp was private property, I hope the GENTLEMEN will have honor and honesty sufficient to replace it. They have had *their Fun*, such as it was, and there is no accounting for *Taste*;—I want my lamp, which I placed before my door for public convenience. Indeed, Sir, if the hot oil, or fragments of glass from a neighbouring lamp had marred the intellectual visages of these sweet Knights-errant, my lamp would have directed them to *immediate* assistance, These *Gentlemen* may think themselves clever, but I have a horse which *surpasses* them, as the *Beast* broke a pane of glass with her *nose*. Now, if our nocturnal aspirants after Fame, will use the same implements of warfare, and will force their *ruddy* noses through the glass, I will replace the lamp for their *enjoyment*, if they will allow me to witness their exploit, which will prove that *asses* upon *two legs*, can do by *intention*, what a *Beast upon four legs* effected accidentally.

I am your's,
27th April. A SUBSCRIBER.

THE OBSERVER.

ST. JOHN, TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1835.

Our European intelligence is to no later date than we announced last week. We have therefore continued extracting the most interesting articles from the resources already at command. The PEEL Ministry appears, hitherto, to be gaining confidence; whether it is an *ignis fatuus* or a reality, time alone can show.—Sir James Graham has brought before the House of Commons two admirable bills, for the regulation of Merchant Seamen and their employers, and for the abolition of impressment, the various provisions of which appear to be highly salutary and satisfactory. The particulars will be found in another part of our paper.—Lord Canterbury was to sail for Quebec about the 1st of May.

The brig *Garland*, which arrived this morning from Greenock, brought a Glasgow paper of the 23d of March, with which we have been favoured, but it contains no later intelligence from London than we were previously in possession of.

We beg to call the attention of our city readers, and especially those armed with magisterial power, to the communications of our Correspondents, "*Civis*," and "*A Subscriber*," contained in another column. Every peaceable and well conducted citizen must rejoice at the probability that, at last, those mischievous individuals who have so long committed midnight ravages with impunity on public property, will, by the impartial firmness of the magistrates, be brought to condign punishment. But will it be credited, that since the conviction of Saturday last, as stated in the Police Report, the disgraceful offence has been extensively *repeated*; and that on *Sunday* night last, the sacred duties of the Sabbath were daringly followed by a wanton destruction of nearly a dozen more of the city lamps? Yet such is the disgraceful fact. It seems as if the mischievous gang, instead of taking warning by one example, were determined on setting the law at defiance, and on effecting the greatest extent of violence and destruction that malice and opportunity will allow. It is high time therefore that these daring depredators were taught, by the most summary and extreme vengeance, that peaceable citizens will not be disturbed, nor property violated without exposure and retribution. We care nothing for the rank or station of the parties: their *acts* stamp their grade, because it is utterly impossible that such things can be perpetrated by any persons having the slightest pretensions to the character of gentlemen; they are, indeed, the indubitable characteristics of riotous bacchanalians, midnight prowlers and felonious burglars. *Lamps* are intended for the convenience and safety of the people; those who wilfully destroy them must, therefore, have some iniquitous design against that convenience and safety, and it will not be at all surprising if we find that those who commence by breaking lamps will soon proceed to greater enormities. We would therefore advise every householder to be thoroughly prepared for such events; let them be well furnished with defensive weapons, and let the first depredator on any part of their property meet the well merited result of his iniquity. The utmost vengeance which the law allows, in the defence of property or life, will be none too great for such flagrant violators of the public peace. But, in fact, private individuals ought not to be subject even to the inconvenience of such watchings or preparations: it is the bounden duty of the Civic Authorities to use their utmost efforts in putting down these midnight rioters. It is too bad that peaceable, industrious citizens should be compelled to pay, from their hard earnings, for public property destroyed by such miscreants: it would be far better that some expense should immediately be borne, in detecting and preventing the recurrence of such practices, than that the public should be continually liable to damage and disturbance. Let *large rewards* be immediately offered for the detection of such offenders, which, added *to one half of the fine for the informer*, may be a sufficient inducement for honest and hardy men to lie in wait for them; and we venture to predict that the practice will soon cease, provided that *every convicted criminal be indiscriminately* and promptly visited with the utmost vengeance of the law. Should the above plan, on trial, prove inefficient, other and more effectual modes may be adopted; which, however, should not be detailed in the public prints, for the information of the delinquents themselves. We would only observe, that the present system of *watching* the city is a pefect farce, serving only to extract money from the pockets of the citizens for no earthly benefit; and we would say to our new corporation, (who appear to be making a good beginning,) "O! reform it altogether."—We would also especially press upon the magistrates, the absolute necessity of communicating to the *public press* the convictions which take place before them; how, indeed, can they effectually fulfil their design of becoming "a terror to evil-doers, and the praise of them that do well," if all their proceedings be enveloped in Cimmerian darkness? Criminals are *criminals*, no matter what their rank or station in life; and public exposure is of infinitely more efficacy than private punishment, especially when the latter only affects the *pocket*. Had a *poor* man been detected in lamp-breaking, he would instantly have been incarcerated; and, upon conviction, perhaps *flogged*; and why should a rich offender escape with any better treatment? His crime is far greater, because the very advantages on which he prides himself invest him with greater responsibility, and require from him more exemplary deportment. To such persons, a paltry fine of £5 or £10, privately paid, is no punishment; let then the *pecuniary* infliction be extended to the utmost limits, so as to ensure payment for *all the damage done*; and let every criminal be publicly exposed. The *motives* of these nocturnal depredators appear to puzzle many; there can be neither wit, advantage nor glory in committing acts which require skulking secrecy, and which the perpetrators are afraid to avow; for our own part therefore, we opine, that the confraternity (for it is not an individual but a *gang* concerned in these violations,) "love darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil," and that they hope, by persevering mischief, to terrify the Corporation into a removal of all the lamps, that they may henceforth roam and riot in obscure security. But we earnestly entreat our Authorities to be more than ever alert, to exert every possible effort to bring these miscreants to exemplary punishment, and to preserve peaceable inhabitants and their property from the daring ravages and terrors of midnight banditti; while at the same time we again urge upon *every householder* the propriety of being well prepared for such lawless visitants.