

refused to hear counsel and evidence at their bar on the subject renders it rather improbable that any change will take place during the present session. A motion has been made in the House of Lords for returns respecting the state of the Navy accompanied by very severe strictures on its present inefficient condition. The London police returns for 1838 exhibit a fearful extent of delinquency and crime, 19,891 persons having been sent to trial, and the cases of 44,439 summarily disposed of during the year. The following statement gives an interesting view of the extent of the British colonial possessions. The army estimates for this year exhibit the whole force to be kept up as 109,818, and the total of expense, £6,071,068. Two British ships of war had sailed for Patras to demand explanations respecting an attempt to murder Signor Rietti and an assault offered to the British Consul.

BRITISH INDIA AND THE EAST.—The Bombay Gazette of 21st December, contains a long and glowing account of an interview between Lord Auckland, the Governor General and Runjeet Sing, the Rajah of Punjab at Ferozepore on the banks of the Sutledge. The purpose of this interview is said to have been to persuade the Rajah to allow the passage of the British troops through his dominions on their way to Caubul. The grand army was assembled at the place of meeting. It was reported that orders had been received at Madras to embark a large force for operations against Burmah. It would appear that the Shah of Persia's heart has once more failed him in maintaining a hostile attitude towards Great Britain. Information had been received at Constantinople, that he desired a reconciliation and was prepared to accede to the terms which Mr. McNeil, had insisted on before quitting his Court. Lord Ponsonby our Ambassador at Constantinople accordingly sent off despatches, to Mr. McNeil, with this intelligence, with a view of over-taking him on his return to England, through Georgia. A report prevails, but as yet unconfirmed, that Mohamed Ali of Egypt, with all his attendants, was drowned in the Nile by the upsetting of an iron Steamer.

WEST INDIES.—From this quarter the news-paper accounts are still unfavourable, representing the loss of the greater part of the sugar and coffee crops as inevitable through the indolence and extravagant demands of the emancipated negroes. There is much reason to believe, however, that these statements are exaggerated. They are met indeed by decided contradiction from some, who have ample opportunities of learning the whole truth on the subject. At all events, there is but little force in the conclusions of those who employ these unfavourable accounts as arguments against emancipation or in favour of its delay. When the simple and extreme alternative in this case is presented—"I must enslave my fellow man and deprive him of the inalienable rights of humanity, or lose my crops and have my property deteriorated," who can

hesitate in the decision or on what worthy grounds can hesitation proceed?

NOVA SCOTIA AND NEW BRUNSWICK.—It is gratifying to learn that there now remains no danger of a hostile collision between the troops of New Brunswick and of Maine respecting the disputed territory,—Governor Fairfield having withdrawn his forces. It will be recollected that the object of the threatened collision was not the proprietorship of this debateable land, but the right of equal jurisdiction over it, claimed by the authorities of Maine and denied by Sir John Harvey. The following extract from a despatch of Lord Aberdeen, when Secretary of state in 1832 addressed to Mr. Lawrence the American Minister in London, sets the question respecting this right in a very clear light and shows how wantonly and causelessly the authorities of Maine have interfered and by their interference endangered the peace of the world. "This territory" says his Lordship, "ought upon every principle to be considered, for the present, at least, as subject to the authority and jurisdiction of Great Britain; unless treaties subsequent to that of 1783 shall have imposed an obligation on her to pursue, a different line of conduct with respect to it. None of the treaties however posterior to that of 1783 allude to the question of jurisdiction; and from their silence on this point, it may fairly be inferred that the United States who cannot be supposed to have been ignorant of the acts of British authority which had been exercised throughout the territory in question for so many years, did not entertain any doubt of the right of Great Britain in this respect. For if such had been the case, they would surely have stipulated for the introduction into the latter treaties especially into that of Ghent, of some provision respecting the exercise of that authority against which Mr. Lawrence, is now instructed to protest. The United States have never been in possession of the territory; *their title to it under the treaty of 1783 is not admitted by Great Britain*, and every act of jurisdiction done by the United States is an assumption of an authority which they did not previously possess. On the other hand Great Britain has never parted with possession: the jurisdiction which she now exercises is the same, which belonged to her before the treaty of 1783, and which she has ever since that period continued to exercise within the limits of the territory in question. The undersigned need hardly point out to Mr. Lawrence that there is a very material difference, between *suspending* a jurisdiction hitherto exercised and forbearing to introduce a jurisdiction hitherto unknown; and that while the United States offer to forbear from assuming a jurisdiction which they have never exercised, they are demanding that Great Britain should *lay down* a jurisdiction while she has ever maintained: and it may be proper here to notice the erroneous opinion, to which Her Majesty's Government in common, with the Government of the United States are disposed to ascribe the recent attempts of the State of Maine to introduce its authority along the frontier in question, viz: that