The Weekly Observer.

BEING A CONTINUATION OF THE STAR:
ESTABLISHED IN 1818.

Office in Hatfield's Brick Building, Market-square.

SAINT JOHN, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1831.

Vol. III. No. 33.

The Garland.

EARLY RISING AND PRAYER.

BY HENRY VAUGHAN. 1695.

When first thy eyes unveil, give thy soul leave
To do the like; our bodies but forerun
The spirit's duty; true hearts spread and heave
Unto their God as flowers do to the sun:
Give him thy first thoughts then, so shalt thou keep
Him company all day, and in him sleep.

Yet never sleep the sun up; prayer should
Dawn with the day; there are set awful hours
'Twixt heaven and us; the manna was not good
After sun-rising; far-day sullies flowers:
Rise to prevent the sun: sleep doth sins glut,
And heaven's gate opens when the world is shut.

Walk with thy fellow-creatures: note the bush
And whisperings amongst them. Not a sprig
Or leaf but hath his morning hymn; each bush
And oak doth know I AM,—Canst thou not sing?
Oh leave thy cares and follies! go this way
And thou art sure to prosper all the day.

Serve God before the world; let him not go
Un il thou hast a blessing; then resign
The whole unto him, and remember who
Prevail'd by wrestling ere the sun did shine:
Pour oil upon the stones, weep for thy sin,
Then journey on, and have an eye to heaven.

When the world's up, and every swarm abroad,
Keep well thy temper, mix not with each clay;
Despatch necessities; life hath a load
Which must be carried on, and safely may;
Yet keep these cares without thee; let the heart
Be God's alone, and choose the better part.

MISCELLANEA.

From the London Atlas.

It is stated that Lord Byron never was made aware of the cause of his wife's separation from him. As an evidence of his feelings on that subject, Mr. Moore, (in his life of Lord Byron) publishes the following letter, which his lordship addressed to Lady Byron, in 1821, and observes upon it, that there are few of his readers who will not agree with him in thinking, "that if its author had not *right* on his side, he had, at least, most of those good feelings which are found generally to accompany it."

Pisa, November 17th, 1821.

I have to acknowledge the receipt of "Ada's hair," which is very soft and pretty, and nearly as dark already as mine was at twelve years old, if I may judge from what I recollect of some in Augusta's possession, taken at that age. But it don't curl—perhaps from its being let grow.

I also thank you for the inscription of the date and name, and I will tell you why; I believe that they are the only two or three words of your handwriting in my possession. For your letters I returned, and except the two words, or rather the one word, "Household," written twice in an old account-book, I have no other. I burnt your last note for two reasons:—1stly, it was written in a style not very agreeable; and 2dly, I wished to take your word without documents, which are the worldly resources of suspicious people.

I suppose that this note will reach you somewhere about Ada's birthday—the 10th of December, I believe. She will then be six, so that in about twelve more I shall have some chance of meeting her—perhaps sooner, if I am obliged to go to England by business or otherwise. Recollect, however, one thing, either in distance or nearness—every day which keeps us asunder should, after so long a period, rather soften our mutual feelings, which must always have one rallying-point as long as our child exists, which I presume we both hope will be long after either of her parents.

The time which has elapsed since the separation has been considerably more than the whole brief period of our union, and the not much longer one of our prior acquaintance. We both made a bitter mistake; but now it is over and irrevocably so. For, at thirty-three on my part, and a few years less on yours, though it is no very extended period of life, still it is one when the habits and thought are generally so formed as to admit of no modification; and as we could not agree when younger, we should with difficulty do so now.

I say all this, because I own to you, that, notwithstanding every thing, I considered our reunion as not impossible for more than a year after the separation—but then I gave up the hope entirely and for ever. But this very impossibility of reunion seems to me at least a reason why, on all the few points of discussion which can arise between us, we should preserve the courtesies of life, and as much of its kindness as people who are never to meet may preserve perhaps more easily than nearer connexions. For my own part, I am violent, but not malignant; for only fresh provocations can awaken my resentments. To you, who are colder and more concentrated, I would just hint, that you may sometimes mistake the depth of a cold anger for dignity, and a worse feeling for duty. I assure you that I bear you *note* (whatever I may have done) no resentment whatever. Remember, that *if you have injured me* in aught, this forgiveness is something; and that, if I have *injured you*, it is something more still, if it be true, as the moralists say, that the most offending are the least forgiving.

Whether the offence has been solely on my side, or reciprocal, or on yours chiefly, I have ceased to reflect upon any but two things—viz. that you are the mother of my child, and that we shall never meet again. I think if you also consider the two corresponding points with reference to myself, it will be better for all three.

Your's ever,
NOEL BYRON.

Anecdote of Sir E. Pellew, now Lord Exmouth.—At Plymouth, several years ago, this gallant officer was sitting alone at dinner, when his servant announced to him that an Indiaman had struck upon the beach, and was in imminent danger of going to pieces. Sir Edward hastened to the shore, and found the intelligence correct, and the surf running so high that no boat dared to venture on board the vessel. Sir Edward addressed the crowd upon the beach, and asked if any of them had heart enough to swim off with him to the ship. A young man stepped forward to answer the challenge; and two lines having been procured, Sir Edward and the stranger each took one in hand and gained the vessel, and after safely landing all on board, were the last to return on shore. On stepping on land, the gallant Admiral, addressing his comrade in danger, exclaimed, 'Give me your hand; you're a fine fellow—who are you?—you must sail with me in future." The young man replied that he was the mate of a collier, and that he should hesitate to quit a situation so comfortable for the chance of doubtful promotion. Sir Edward overcame his scruples, and this singular introduction added to the heroes of the British navy an officer unrivalled in heroic exploits—no less a character than Captain Jeremiah Coghlan.—*Manchester paper.*

The total amount of the effects of suitors in the Court of Chancery in 1829, was £68,886, 13s. 10s. 5d. [*Atlas.*

COLONIAL.

From the Quebec Mercury.

PARLIAMENT OF LOWER CANADA.

Expulsion of Mr. Christie, for the Third Time!!!

Quebec, Friday, January 28.

Mr. *Thibaudeau* (of Bonnaventure) moved that the entries in the Journals of 14th February, 1829, and 22d January, 1830, relating to the expulsion of *Robert Christie*, Esq. be read.

Mr. *Andrew Stuart* inquired what the object of the Hon. member was? It was a necessary consequence in Parliamentary usage, that such a motion was to be followed up by some measure based upon it—now here, it seemed as if a measure was to be brought forward, without any previous examination, without any previous study—precipitately and hastily—and time ought to be given to members to look over and consider all previous proceedings. If, in fact, the Honourable Member for Gaspe was not eligible, let it be so—but do not let us be held up to the public as trampling on the elective franchise, as lightly and inconsiderately deciding upon a question, which involved the rights of all the electors in all the country. Let us not do that without due reflection and consideration. He wished the Honourable member to explain, whether by reading those entries, he meant to follow it up by an immediate motion, or to enter into the question at a future time—in the latter case he should not object to it, but otherwise he must oppose it.

Mr. *Bourdages* said that the old members had already formed their opinion on the subject, and the new members would undoubtedly consider it as an important one, as relating to the dignity and honour of the house. For himself he should support the motion whatever the result might be.

Mr. *Thibaudeau*, it is believed, here stated, tho' in a very low voice, that his object was the expulsion of Mr Christie.

Mr *Cuvillier* wondered that so determined a persecution should be persisted in, without previous and fair notice—it was so important both to the individual, and to the public, that full time ought to be given.

Mr. *De Montenach* observed that, he, as a new member, demanded, legally, and of right, to receive information.—He knew nothing of the matter, and must oppose any thing by which any precedents in the journals, shall be made a rule of conduct. He, as one of the new members, required to know, not that Mr. Christie had been expelled, but whether he deserved to be expelled. He had seen in the public papers,—we, the citizens of this country,—have seen there that he was accused—but we have not seen his defence—" I should like to know whether we are at Tripoli or at Quebec?"

After some further discussion, on motion of Mr. *Bedard*, the consideration thereof was deferred till Monday next.

Monday, January 31.

The House went upon the order of the day, on Mr. Thibaudeau's motion, that the entries upon the Journal relative to Mr. Christie's expulsion during the last Provincial Parliament, that is to say, of the 14th February, 1829, and 22d January, 1830, be read.

Mr. Thibaudeau, said, that as it did not appear that those resolutions, as they stood upon the Journals of the Assembly against Mr. Christie, had ever been rescinded, he could not but consider them as in full force.

Mr. Leslie, observed that he was a member of the late Assembly, when those resolutions, expelling Mr. Christie for imputed offences against that House, were passed—that he had voted against them—they were imputed offences, of a political nature merely—it was doubtful whether, if clearly proved, they merited the severity with which the house had visited Mr. Christie—but, in fact, such as they were they had not been to his mind satisfactorily proven against him. He could have wished that a hearing at the Bar of the House had been given Mr. Christie according to his petition to that effect—that he could not, therefore, now conscientiously countenance the present proceedings, nor be content with giving a silent vote against those he had then done. That at the time of Mr. Christie's first expulsion, he had considered it an act of great injustice—he still continued in the same belief—one wrong and injustice had, in his opinion, of course been aggravated by a second expulsion for the same imputed offences, after having been sent back to his electors for their sense of the subject. To propose his expulsion now for the third time, in a new House of Assembly, which had no cognizance of the matter, nor supposed to know any thing about it, was altogether unreasonable. Besides the House must observe that the injustice would not fall upon Mr Christie alone, but upon his constituents, the county of Gaspe—upon the whole Province—for an act of injustice to any part was injustice to the whole body of electors throughout the Province—he would vote against that or any other proposition tending to revive a subject, which it was much to be desired were left at rest.

Mr. Lee, rose to oppose the motion; not only on the ground that it was a proposal to the house unnecessarily and wantonly to assail the personal character, and views of an individual and a member of that house, a matter assuredly of some moment in itself; but also because in a public sense it involved a matter of still deeper interest—of interest not only to that house,—not only to the electors of the county of Gaspe, whose Representative was in question; but of the deepest interest to the whole people of this Province—the Elective Franchise.

The mover of this question contents himself with bringing forward the mere allegation of a fact which he expects the house at his suggestion is complacently to swallow without further enquiry; and although he has said nothing to the purpose, seems to argue that because we find it recorded on the Journals of the late house of Assembly, that Robert Christie was expelled by that house, the present will in like manner, whether the late house were right or wrong on that occasion, take cognizance of the case, and as a matter of course imitate the laudable example of its predecessor, and vacate his seat without any ceremony or inquiry on the subject. In a word, that because Mr. Christie had been once—nay twice expelled for the same offence, by one house, another house having nothing to do with it, must expel him a third time, to do honor to the decision of the last Assembly, and thereby prove the sense we entertained of its justice.—The members of the present Assembly, who were not of the previous house which adopted that measure certainly are not bound by it, nor were those who were of the late Assembly, and who concurred in the expulsion, if they now found themselves in error, or were convinced that matters had been already carried far enough against Mr. Christie, bound to follow it up under this new Parliament, which was supposed to know nothing about it. Robert Christie was during the late Parliament deemed by the Assembly guilty of what? of a political indiscretion, and he (Mr. Lee,) then voted, as he thought at the time, very properly, for his expulsion from the Assembly—but on what ground and understanding had he given that vote?—not certainly to disqualify him for ever from sitting and voting in that house, but that he might be sent back to his constituents to know whether he had thereby lost their confidence, and if not, on being again elected, that he might be re-admitted and take his seat again as their Representative. He had not in that vote been actuated by any vindictive feelings, nor should members now allow themselves to be influenced by other sentiments than those of justice and liberality, and a desire to promote the public good. The case of Mr. C. was certainly an extraordinary one. He was considered as a criminal, yet singular to say, had been deprived of the benefit of the criminal laws of England—of the benefit of a trial by a Jury of his country—nay he had even been refused a hearing at the Bar of the house, and the privilege of cross-examining in the face of the country the witnesses who had before a Special Committee, deposed against him. His Petition to this effect was not only rejected, but voted by the house as an aggravation of his imputed crimes. If the house were to look to precedents they would find them in favor of Mr. C's. case, as it stood at present. The case of Mr. Bouc which some years ago took place in this Province, might be consulted with advantage. He was expelled from the house, because he had been convicted in a court of justice, of fraud or some misdemeanour. The expulsion did not disqualify him, and he was re elected two or three times. To create the disqualification it was necessary to pass a law for the purpose, and a bill was accordingly introduced. He adverted to the case of Wilkes, and begged to read a quotation from Junius, wherein the proceedings of the Ministry on that subject are called "a new system of "political logic by which a subject was be robbed of "his common right by a vote of the House of Commons." [Here Mr. Bourdages observed that the question did not relate to Junius, with whom the Assembly had nothing at all to say.]—(A laugh.)—Mr. Lee proceeded. By precedents mentioned by the same writer (Junius) it is clearly demonstrated that expulsion alone does not create disqualification, which can only be effected by a law, and that if a member expelled is re elected, he may resume his seat.—There was the case of Wallaston in 1698, who was expelled, re-elected, and allowed to take his seat. In 1712, Mr. Walpole was expelled the House of Commons "for a high "breach of trust and notorious corruption in a public "office" and declared incapable of sitting again in that same Parliament. He however came in at the ensuing Parliament and took his seat, and remained in it undisturbed and unquestioned, notwithstanding the misdeeds for which he had been expelled by the previous House of Commons, and which it must be owned were of a far deeper dye than those laid to the charge of Mr. C. by the late Assembly. In the next place there was Lord Cochrane's case, which is a striking reflection.—He had been convicted of a fraud in jobbing on the Stock Exchange, and sentenced to the severe punishment of a year's imprisonment, £1000 fine, and to stand in the pillory—to be sure the sentence of the pillory was never carried into effect. He was expelled the house, while a prisoner in the King's Bench prison, but being returned for Westminster, took, after the period of his imprisonment had expired, his seat in the House of Commons, where there was no talk of his being again expelled. In the case of Wilkes, it would be recollected that an annual motion was made for expunging from the journals the vote for his expulsion, until the measure was finally carried by a great majority. His expulsion took place on the 3d February, 1769. He was re-elected for Middlesex, on the 16th of the same month, his election was on the following day (the 17th) declared void, and he himself also declared incapable of being elected into the present Parliament. He was again elected on the 16th of March, when no other candidate appeared than Mr. Dingly, who had not one vote; his election was on the 17th, again declared null. On the 13th April, he was returned by the Sheriff as having 1143 votes, and his opponent Col. Luttrell, only 296. On the 15th of the same month the house voted that "Mr. Luttrell ought to have been returned," and he accordingly took his seat in the house to the exclusion of Mr. Wilkes. The iniquity of these proceedings was, however, fully acknowledged afterwards, for year after year Mr. Wilkes, who subsequently got into parliament, (it never being for a moment supposed that he was disqualified by those votes, from sitting in a new house of Commons,) with astonishing perseverance, brought the matter forward, until finally on the 31st of May, 1782, thirteen years after his expulsion, the whole proceedings were, by a majority of 115 against 47, ordered to be expunged from the Journals. Lord North had fallen, and the Rockingham administration having succeeded, brought in better principles, and the House of Commons did but an act of justice to themselves and to the kingdom by declaring "that all the declarations, orders, and resolutions of the house, respecting the "election of John Wilkes, Esq. be expunged from the "journals of this house, as being subversive of the rights "of the whole body of electors of the kingdom."—Those distinguished patriots Fox and Burke almost alone, opposed the measure, on the ground solely of its nullity, not that they considered such entries as disqualifying. Ever since the affair of Wilkes, the British House of Commons have abandoned all ideas of re expelling, and of this the case of Lord Cochrane is a recent example. It was, he believed, the argument of some members of the house, that because Mr. Christie has been, according to them, a bad man, his constituents may not send him back again to his seat in the Assembly, but if this were true it would follow that constituencies altogether composed of bad men, for they had already elected him three times running. The mover of the measure now before the house (Mr. Thibaudeau) had he understood, on one of those occasions unsuccessfully opposed him. Mr. Christie had, at the last general election, been unanimously chosen by his constituents. His former opponent, now for the first time in the Assembly, had by the new division of the counties of Gaspe been elected for that part of it at present constituting the county of Bonaventure, and he seemed to think it a praiseworthy act to move the re-expulsion from the Assembly of a representative whom he knew and felt, enjoyed the confidence of his constituents; not being able by the voice of the electors, to prevent his entrance into that house, he expects that contrary to their wishes it should be done by the Assembly.—This he thought rather extraordinary, and hoped the house would not lend itself to such a purpose. The county of Gaspe knew and appreciated its own rights, and would maintain its elective franchises. It was the duty of the house and of the country to support them in their franchises—what, if they should again proceed to the re expulsion of Mr. Christie—was it possible the county of Gaspe would put up with it? The chances were, and he (Mr. Lee) believed they would re-elect him, and if such were the case, to what a state of things would it lead; another re-expulsion, and another after that, would ensue, and in the mean time the county would remain unrepresented,—it would be absolute disfranchisement. It might be said they had themselves to thank for it in chosing a person unacceptable to the Assembly to represent them, but they in turn might say, and with reason, that the Assembly had no right to dictate to them in the choice of their representative, and must admit to his seat the person whom they thought proper, to return as their representative. In fine he conjured members to weigh well the important matter which it was intended should be brought forward, and not to compromise the honor of the house, and the interest of the country, by continuing to visit with so severe a punishment a mere political indiscretion, with the discussion of which it was truly astonishing the house should now again be troubled.

Mr. *Bourdages*—said this was a very simple motion, the mere reading of the Journals could not expel Mr. Christie—let the hon. members, his friends, wait till some measure was founded on it. (Some interruptions having taken place, with cries of order, order,) Mr. B. concluded by moving that the consideration of the question be now referred to a committee of the whole house, which was carried by a division of 45 to 18.

The House in Committee on the motion for reading the entries of the Journals, *Mr. Boissonnult* in the Chair; it was resolved, without any debate, that they should be read, by a division of 45 to 22. And the house resumed.

Mr. *Thibaudeau* then moved, that Robert Christie, returned to this House for the county of Gaspe, is the same Robert Christie who was expelled by the Resolutions.

Mr. *Fisher* said that he was by no means satisfied with the present proceedings—He was not prepared to say whether Mr. Christie, at present, in the house was the same that was in the previous house, of that name—He himself was a new member and in fact neither knew, nor wished to know the occurrences alluded to, that had taken place during the previous Parliament. If he must judge, however, of the case he could wish to look into proofs which had been adduced on the case, for he wished to decide for himself. He would not consider himself as bound by the decision of a former house, unless it were clearly and satisfactorily proved to him that they were right in that decision.

Mr. *Cuvillier*, rose evidently under strong feelings.—He said that notwithstanding that the simple truth of the proposition now before the House was undeniable, he nevertheless would vote for it with considerable reluctance. That the question to be brought on by it was in fact nothing more nor less than the expulsion of one of ourselves—the representative for the county of Gaspe—a body of the Province, involving considerations of a private and of a public nature—the character of an individual,—the honour and justice of that house and of the country—a question which on more occasions than one had agitated England to its very centre, and which Members ought to approach with awe; but which however, he was grieved to observe some were as it seemed to him about to treat very lightly and be treated inconsiderately. Important therefore as it was in every point of view, especially as affecting the elective franchise, Members ought to bring to its consideration, the most perfect coolness.—He hoped that those who were in favor of the proposed measure would support it by reasons and authorities, and that unless they could do so, they would see the wisdom of relinquishing it in time. He had not been present at the time of Mr. C's first expulsion, having that evening been absent on account of a domestic affliction, by the death of a near relative, but it is probable that had he been present he would have concurred in it, although he found fault with the manner in which it had been carried. His wish, if it could be so called, was any thing but justice; indeed justice had been positively refused him, although he had by petition re-peremptorily requested the House to be heard and to cross-examine at the bar the witnesses, whose depositions had been received against him. Not only was this ordinary act of justice refused him, but his petition was declared false, contumacious and vexatious; a breach of privileges of the House and an aggravation of his offence, although he (Mr. Cuvillier) could discover nothing of the kind in it. On the present occasion he was determined to bring to the discussion of the subject, a mind at once wholly unbiassed by his personal friendship for the individual concerned, and with flavoured by over zeal for the privileges, purity and independence of the House, in which he felt convinced no man on that floor took, or could take, a more thorough interest than himself.

In all cases of expulsion that had taken place in the British House of Commons, the greatest care had been taken that the party accused should have every opportunity of defending himself; and this was so much through tenderness and regard by the House to its own privileges as for the accused, both being conducive and contributing to one main purpose—justice—full and impartial justice—Indeed so far was this equitable principle observed in cases occurring in the House of Commons, that not only was the party admitted to a hearing and defence, when he thought proper to request it, but it was usual even to *call upon him* for the purpose; and in cases where he might be under restraint, so jealous was a British House of Commons of their own honor, and the privileges of its Members, that the House would temporarily relieve him of that restraint, and place him in his seat, in order that he might there in perfect freedom take such course as he should deem proper towards his justification or excuse.—The case of Lord Cochrane for instance is in point in respect directly to point. When it was moved that he should be expelled the House, his Lordship was in prison, and the Speaker issued his warrant to have him brought to the House to take his seat and make his defence. There was against him the verdict of a jury of his country, and sentence of a court of justice inflicting an infamous punishment, (the pillory,) upon him,—his defence was not sufficient in the opinion of the House, and he was expelled.—This occurred on the 6th July, 1814. He was returned, duly elected on the 17th of the same month, although in prison at the time. He soon after was escaped, took the necessary oath, went into the House where the Commons usually hold their sittings, before the House had met, and was there apprehended in his seat and taken out of the House by the Marshal, re-conducted to the King's Bench, where he remained until the expiration of the term of imprisonment to which he had been sentenced, and immediately afterwards took his seat in the same House of Commons which had expelled him, where we find him impeaching Lord Ellenborough for partiality at his trial. Upon resuming his seat his previous expulsion was never spoken of or even adverted to, it being a settled constitutional principle in that body, certainly not less jealous of their privileges than we, that expulsion does not create incapacity to be re elected.

But in the case of Mr. Christie, he saw nothing like this; there was no such spirit in that or the proceeding now for the third time to be brought before the house, and a house too that knew and ought to know nothing of the matter. Members would no doubt recollect the great political excitement that existed when Mr. C. fell under the displeasure of the Assembly, and it was a circumstance worthy of their consideration.—We were then fresh bleeding from the wounds inflicted upon us by a detestable administration—injured men seek to retaliate—we looked round and found none within our reach but this unfortunate Robert Christie, and vengeance was taken upon him for all the mischief that had been done in the Province with or without his participation for the last eight years, while the chief actors and great delinquents escaped with impunity and were probably enjoying the spoil they were now affording in hunting down an individual for the iniquities of others. Knowing the fallibility of human passions he should have mistrusted himself if he had judged on that occasion, but he sincerely hoped that the decision of to night would show that political excitement was over—he admired the zeal exhibited to preserve the rights and privileges of the Assembly, but he should like also to see an equal zeal and regard for the rights and privileges of the Electors. The election by the people of their Representatives is the very essence of the Constitution, and a fundamental law, whereas the right of expulsion by the Commons only belongs to them by usage and custom. A reference to precedents would show how very delicate the English Commons were in the exercise of this usage and custom, wherever circumstances compelled them to it. They have rarely expelled for a period beyond the Session, and not always for that even; for instances have occurred in which a member expelled has been re elected and taken his seat in the same Session. The case of Mr. Wollaston in 1698 is an example of this kind—he was "*expelled*" simply, without its being added for "*this Session*" or any other shorter or longer period. He was re-elected and resumed his seat at the same Session in which he had been expelled. Sir Robert Walpole was in 1711 expelled the H. Commons, for a high breach of trust and notorious corruption, and re-elected—he took his seat again, but was then again re expelled "*during last Parliament*" and he accordingly remained out during the remainder of that session, but afterwards was re-elected and came into the new Parliament, took his seat there with striking quietness, and served for many years in Parliament. He was afterwards Prime Minister, and finally raised to the Peerage with the title of Earl of Oxford. Here then members must see with what circumspection they proceed in cases of expulsion in the British House of Commons.—In a new Parliament they all come back, old and new members on an equal footing—they are all member-alike and no one more or less so than another—they have no right to question each other on any incident of their political life—nor has the whole house any such right over any one of its body. There was no instance in the annals of Parliamentary History, in which a member expelled during one Parliament was therefore expelled by the succeeding Parliament, or on that account declared incapable of sitting or voting in the new Parliament.—Let the gentlemen who are on the other side of this question, if they do not mean to carry it by mere force of numbers, shew but one precedent—one solitary precedent for the measure they propose to the house.—If they can—I declare (said Mr. Cuvillier) I will immediately go over with them to the other side. But without argument, without precedent, without evidence of guilt of any kind, without having heard him, and contrary to all precedents in cases analogous to it, to re-condemn a man, was what he could not contemplate without revolting at the idea—such a proceeding would entail a stigma upon the Representatives of the Province, and justly expose them to the public obloquy, as acting under passion and prejudice, or at the very least, of exercising a cruel kind of justice, unmingled with the least disposition for mercy. He hoped and believed there was a spirit of moderation and equity in the house—that the representative for Gaspe as he was fully entitled to his seat by the unanimous voice of his electors, would be allowed to retain it. If contrary to his expectation, that the seat was to be rendered vacant, the Freeholders of Gaspe would be aggrieved and have just cause to complain that they are disfranchised—they already do complain of it, and have given ample proof to the country that they understand their rights and will maintain them at all hazards. Do not members recollect with what resentment the country sent back to the assembly their insulted representatives the last time they were violently dissolved? He would, in concluding, repeat his demand for justice,—let justice be done,—the pound of flesh, but not one drop of blood.

[Remainder next week.]

Extracts from the Address of the House of Assembly of Lower Canada, to Lord Aylmer, in answer to his Speech:

"We receive with great respect the information which your Excellency has communicated relating to the events which have interrupted the progress of the measures contemplated by his Majesty's Government respecting the question of Finance, and also the assurance that his Majesty's Government is deeply impressed with the necessity of an immediate and satisfactory adjustment of that question; and we learn with satisfaction that your Excellency is led to hope for instructions calculated to prevent the chance of future collision on this subject.

"Under the most trying circumstances it has ever been the sincere wish of His Majesty's Subjects whom we have the honor to represent, to provide for the exigencies of the Government, as seemed to them consistent with their constitutional rights. We thankfully appreciate His Majesty's declaration that he has no desire to call upon his faithful subjects in Lower Canada for any supplies beyond such as may, upon full consideration, be found essential; as we recognize in His Majesty's Gracious expressions in favor of the comfort, the prosperity and the happiness of a people connected to him by so many ties, that benevolence of the Royal feelings towards his Canadian Subjects, which has distinguished the Sovereigns of his illustrious House.

"In your Excellency's declaration that a steady adherence to the principles of justice and impartiality will be the rule of your conduct, we find the best grounds to hope that your Excellency's efforts will be crowned with success.

"We most respectfully assure your Excellency that in endeavoring faithfully to discharge the duties with which we have been entrusted by our Constituents, it will be our earnest desire that harmony may prevail between the several branches of the Legislature, that full effect may be given to the Constitution as established by Law, and that it may be transmitted unimpaired to our posterity."

Quebec, Feb. 7.—We are informed that in the new Commission of the Governor General, it is provided that in the case of his death or absence, and the absence of the Lieutenant Governor, he is to be succeeded by the next Officer in military command in the Canadas, which at present is Sir John Colborne, Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada.

His Excellency Lord Aylmer, was sworn in as Governor in Chief with the usual ceremonies on Friday afternoon at 5 o'clock. His Excellency's health has now much improved.

The Revenue of Lower Canada, for the year 1830, is estimated at £162,000.

Montreal, Jan. 14.—*Earthquake.*—Yesterday morning, about 6 o'clock, the very rare and unusual occurrence of an earthquake alarmed many of our good inhabitants. The shock was distinctly felt in all parts of the city, and was tolerably smart.—*Gaz.*

NEW-BRUNSWICK.

Council Chamber,
15th February, 1831.

His Majesty's Council this day presented to His Honor the President their Address in answer to his Speech, as follows:

To His Honor William Black, Esquire, President and Commander-in-Chief of the Province of New-Brunswick, &c. &c. &c.

THE HUMBLE ADDRESS OF HIS MAJESTY'S COUNCIL IN GENERAL ASSEMBLY.

May it please your Honor,

We, His Majesty's Council beg leave to thank your Honor for your Speech at the opening of the present Session of the Legislature.

We have heard with feelings of unfeigned regret of the lamented demise of his late gracious Majesty George the Fourth, during whose auspicious government an increased lustre was added to the political and military history of the United Kingdom, which, under His fostering sway, eventually experienced for so many years the blessing of profound Peace; but we turn with renewed and abundant hope to the accession of our present most excellent Sovereign, William the Fourth, in the unbounded confidence that Great Britain and her Colonies will prosper through His paternal care, and enjoy undiminished, the manifold and peculiar advantages they derive from our glorious Constitution.

We reciprocate with thankfulness your Honor's sense of the blessings conferred upon us at the hands of Divine Providence by the late fine seasons; and we heartily rejoice in the improving condition of the Province, and in perceiving the gradual but strong development of the agricultural powers of the country.

It is a matter of great regret that the proposed establishment of a Light House on St. Paul's Island should have been necessarily delayed, but the subject shall receive from us all the attention which its importance demands.

Fully impressed with the value of good and sufficient means of internal communication in this young and rising Country, so peculiarly calculated as they are to accelerate and promote agriculture, and thereby forward the general welfare and prosperity of the Province, we shall cheerfully unite, not only in such measures as may tend to so desirable an object, but in every other which may be calculated to increase the wealth and cherish the substantial interests of New-Brunswick.

To the establishment of so beneficial an Institution as a public Penitentiary, we shall turn our serious attention; and conscious of your Honor's anxious desire for the wellbeing and happiness of that portion of His Majesty's Dominions confided to your charge, we request to assure you, in the furtherance of these important and interesting objects, of our cordial co-operation and support.

To which His Honor was pleased to return the following answer:—

Mr. President and Gentlemen of his Majesty's Council—I receive this Address with much satisfaction, and return you sincere thanks for the gratifying assurance of your ready attention to the subjects recommended for your consideration, and of your cordial co-operation and able support in the furtherance of all measures tending to promote the prosperity and happiness of the Province; from which the most beneficial consequences may be expected.