BRITISH NEWS.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MARCH 16.

Lord John Russell said, that understanding that reports from the Commissioners had been received from eight dioceses in Ireland, which he supposed would be laid on the table of the House; he would, therefore, with permission of the house, withdraw his motion that stood for this evening, and fix it for the 30th instant, on which day he would move a call of the House.

Sir Robert Peel said, that really the noble lord appeared to be much better informed upon this matter than ministers, for, positively, he was not aware of the arrival of any such reports as those alluded to. He thought the least he could do was to give notice of his intention. After some further conversation, Lord John Russell gave notice for to-morrow.

In reply to a question from Lord J. Russell relative to the appointment of the Marquis of Londonderry as Ambassador to the Court of St. Petersburg. Sir R. Peel said, that the noble Marquis had, in consequence of what had passed in that place, relinquished the appointment. He begged to add in common justice to the noble Marquis, that this resolution emanated entirely from his own judgment; it had neither been suggested nor recommended either by himself [Sir R. Peel] or any of his colleagues.

Lord J. Russell was glad to hear so satisfactory an announcement; but he could not but regret that his Majesty's present ministers should make appointments which that house felt compelled to cancel.

Sir R. Peel said, that it would be much better for the noble lord to bring forward his motion of want of confidence at once, and not night after night be introducing the topics in which he appeared to delight. For his own part, he should be happy to retire from the situation he had the honour to fill, when he found other ministers more capable of conducting with success the business of the country. But he owed it to himself and to the country to remain unmoved by the petty attacks that were levelled against himself and his colleagues.—[Left sitting.]

CANADA.—On the 9th of March, a highly interesting debate took place on the affairs of Lower Canada, when Sir Robert Peel announced that the Ministers had given their best attention to this embarrassing question, and had come to the determination "*to send out a Representative wholly unconnected with local politics, altogether unembued with local prejudices, and completely unmixed with Canadian affairs, who should be able on the spot, to take a whole view of the question, and report the best means of a final adjustment.*" The debate took its origin in consequence of a Petition presented by Mr. Roebuck, who insinuated that unless all the demands were instantly granted, there would be a rebellion, in which the United States would take part. In reply to this improbable surmise and unguarded language, Sir Robert Peel said,

"He, Mr. Roebuck, also undertook to assure us that thirteen million inhabitants of the United States of America, a country with which Great Britain at this moment enjoys the profoundest amity, a country with which Great Britain is almost daily interchanging expressions of most friendly feeling, a country with which Great Britain has scarcely a subject of difference—their old jealousies being now removed, and each, conscious that the prosperity of the other must influence its own prosperity, reciprocally desiring that peace, tranquillity, and good order might flourish in the other—such, Sir, I say being the state of the countries, the Hon. Gentleman thinks it fit to declare that if a rebellion should break out in Canada, the whole of the United States are prepared to interfere in our domestic quarrels, and join these rebellious Canadians. Now, Sir, I will not do the United States the injustice to believe, even for a moment, that they or any one on their behalf could have authorised the Hon. and Learned Member to make such a declaration within the walls of the British House of Commons. [Loud cheers and laughter.] I have too high an opinion of their justice and integrity; but even if that opinion were wanting, I entertain such a sense of their shrewdness, common sense, and discretion, that I cannot believe they would select as their organ in this House the Hon. Member who has thought proper to present himself in that capacity. [Cheers, and great laughter.]"

*Sir Robert Peel said, his Majesty's Government had resolved that this subject should receive their earliest attention, and had therefore resolved to send out a person acquainted with the opinions of government, and who should have full power to decide on such an arrangement as he conceived on a review of all the circumstances, was called for. * * * But if the Canadian people, or any part of them, had instructed the hon. gentleman to declare their determination to rebel, he as a Minister of the Crown would make no counter declaration—but his reply would be, "we still intend to do you justice, and from your own indiscreet menaces we gather fresh inducements to draw public opinion still more strongly on our side—we derive fresh motives for disregarding those menaces, in despite of which we are determined to render you full and immediate justice."—The right hon. Baronet sat down amidst loud and vehement cheering.*

HOUSE OF LORDS, MARCH 18.

Appointment of Viscount CANTERBURY *as Commissioner to Canada.*

The Earl of Mulgrave, after alluding to the disputes which had taken place in Canada, and the intention of Government to send out a Commissioner to that country, begged to ask the noble Lord (Aberdeen) whether he was prepared to name the person who had been selected to discharge that duty? The next question was, whether that person was to act upon his own responsibility? The situation was rather a novel one, and it might be wise to enquire how much was left to the discretion of the individual? It was thought there might be some points on which it would be convenient to allow the commissioner to decide, but their Lordships knew there were also grievances of which the Canadians complained which would be very injudicious to allow him to decide upon, without reference to his Majesty's government at home. He could not also avoid alluding to the delicate situation in which the noble lord who was exercising the functions of government in that country would be placed, when he should be, as it were for a time superseded. He would not decide as to whether his Majesty's government had taken the most proper course; but he would impress upon the noble earl, that no time should be lost in sending out this person. It was impossible that any person acquainted with colonial affairs could be ignorant of the detriment which delay too often occasioned, and he hoped the noble earl would be prepared to tell him that no delay should take place in sending out the person appointed. The House of Assembly would shortly meet, and it would be advantageous that he should be there in time to be present at its meeting. If the noble earl was prepared to answer him upon these three points it would be very satisfactory.

The Earl of Aberdeen in reply said, the noble Lord could scarcely expect him to enter fully into a general view of the policy about to be taken by the government, but of course they would most carefully avoid every species of delay. Surely he could not be accused of delay—the report was made on the 1st of July, and when he entered office he found no steps taken, though six months had elapsed—surely, then, he was not to be charged with delay, when only a few weeks had been suffered to elapse since he had entered into office, (hear.) He did not mention that for the purpose of casting any blame on the late minister, but merely to exonerate himself. He concurred in all that had fallen from the noble Earl as to the great difficulty and importance of the task which the individual who was selected for the place would have to perform, (Hear.) He was perfectly aware that the person charged with such large authority, must be a man of great ability, being possessed of great qualifications; and, above all, have a character of the most conciliating nature. All of those qualifications, he did not despair of finding in the person whom His Majesty had been pleased to appoint. (Hear, hear.) As he (the Earl of Aberdeen) had this day submitted to his Majesty the name of a noble lord, a member of the House, and as his Majesty had been pleased to approve of the appointment, of course he had no difficulty in naming him. As he had said he was a member of that house, though he had not yet taken his seat—Viscount Canterbury was the nobleman who had received his Majesty's approbation. He would now say a few words as to the noble person who now filled the office as Governor. In doing so he begged the house to understand that he had not the least view of disparaging his services, nor was he prepared to say the unfortunate situation in which that country was placed was produced by him, but the fact was notorious, that in the situation in which he was placed, no hope could be entertained of bringing these unfortunate differences to an amicable conclusion. Such being the case, it had been thought necessary to appoint another person with special instructions.

After a few observations from Lords Brougham and Aberdeen the conversation ended.

CHURCH REFORM.

The Report of the Church Reform Commissioners is to be presented to the houses of Parliament this evening. It is, we are informed, an elaborate and most ably drawn up document.

The commissioners have digested the voluminous and complicated details of the important subjects committed to them under the three several heads of *territory, income,* and *patronage.* Under the head *territory* are explained the new arrangement of dioceses proposed, of which the following are amongst the most interesting:—

It is proposed to erect [illegible] *new bishoprics*—one of *Manchester*, the other of *Ripon*. The greater part of the new diocese of *Manchester* is to be taken from the present diocese of *Chester*. The archdiocese of York to supply the new diocese of Ripon.

The number of Bishops in the House of Lords will not however be increased, for it is proposed to unite the Bishoprics of Bristol and Llandaff, the out lying part of Bristol in Wilts and Dorset, to pass to the Diocese of Salisbury; and also to unite the sees of Bangor and St. Asaph.

It is likewise proposed to deprive the see of London of those parts of the metropolitan diocese which lie in Essex and Herts, giving to London all that is in the represented metropolitan districts, which now belongs to Canterbury or Winchester, so as to make the diocese nearly co-extensive with the represented metropolis. Essex is to be transferred to the Bishopric of Rochester.

The leading political events of the week, though few in number, are important in character. Lord John Russell has postponed his motion relative to the Irish church from next Monday to Monday week. The delay is caused by his wish to have as much information as possible on the subject from the reports of the Irish commissioners, which will be before parliament by that time.—Sir John Campbell's bill to abolish imprisonment for debt generally, has been read a second time, and is referred to a Committee.—Sir Robert Peel has brought forward his bill for dissenter's marriages, and it has been received with general approbation.—Greater parts of the estimates have been granted.

LONDON, March 14.—The Navy Estimates for 1835-6, were last night brought forward by Lord Ashley, and, we are glad to find, show a reduction of £232,000 upon the amount of the preceding year's estimates.

Mr. Hume moved that the number of men proposed in the estimates (26,500) be reduced to 20,500: and objected to the system of continuing to build new ships, while "noble ships of 130 guns were rotting in Portsmouth Harbor."

Whitehall, Feb. 28.—The King has been pleased to direct letters patent to be passed under the Great Seal, granting dignities of a Baron and Viscount of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, unto the Right Honorable Sir Charles Manners Sutton, G. C.B., and the heirs male of his body lawfully begotten, by the names, stiles, and titles, of Baron Bottesford, of Bottesford, in the county of Leicester, and Viscount Canterbury, of the city of Canterbury.

The Gazette of Tuesday, contains a notice that a Commission had passed the Great Seal, appointing Lord Wharncliffe, Sir James Kempt, and others, Commissioners "to inquire into the present mode of maintaining discipline by punishments in the army, and to consider whether some other kind of penalty may not be substituted for corporal punishments, without detriment to the service."

Viscount Canterbury has been appointed commissioner to Canada. He is generally considered well qualified for the office. It is supposed that he will be entrusted with full powers to settle all differences.

The following changes and appointments are announced in the late London Gazettes:—

The King has been pleased to appoint Major-Gen. Lionel Smith, K. C. B. (the Governor-Gen. and Commander-in-chief of his Majesty's Windward Caribbean Islands), to be Governor-Gen. and Commander-in-Chief of his Majesty's Colonies of British Guiana, Trinidad, and Lucia; and the King has been further pleased to revive the Commissions appointing Major Gen. Sir James Carmichael Smyth, Bart., to be Lieutenant Governor of the Colony of British Guiana; and the Right Hon. Sir George Fitz-Gerald, Bart., to be Lieut. Governor of the Island of Trinidad; and Col. Sir Dudley St. Ledger Hill to be Lieutenant Governor of the Island of St. Lucia.

Mr. Hume's motion for limiting the necessary Supplies for the service of Government to a period of three months, has been withdrawn.

We copy from the *London Standard* what appears to be an authorised sketch of the intended plan of church reform. It will effect *nothing!* There are to be two new bishops, some equalization of diocesan districts and divisions of large livings. Pluralities are *not* to be abolished; translations are to continue; and the working clergy are not to be better paid. It is said that the lowest income for a bishop will be £5000 a-year! What would St. Paul say to such self-denying *poverty* as this?

The new scheme for Church Reform will fix the income of the Archbishop of Canterbury at £10,000, and that of the Archbishop of York at £8000, while the salaries of the other Bishops are to be equalized at £5000 a year.

The Morning Herald, *which originated the gossip about the Queen, stated on Friday*—"*We have authority to say that there is no truth in the statement which has lately been circulated as to the interesting situation of her Majesty the Queen.*"

On the late election of Speaker of the House of Commons, twenty-five Reformers and seven Anti-Reformers were absent. Among the former were Sir Francis Burdett and Wm. Cobbett, who retired voluntarily. Sir Charles Manners Sutton voted for Mr. Abercrombie, and Mr. Abercrombie for Sir Charles. On the Speaker being led to the chair, Mr. Peel said that deferring to the decision of the House, he felt it to be his duty to congratulate the Right Hon. Gentleman on his election as Speaker.

Mr. Abercrombie is the first Scotch member who has sat in the chair of the House of Commons.

Forty-nine petitions have been presented to the House of Commons, on controverted elections—25 of them from Ireland.

Sir Robert Sidney is retained by Mr. O'Connell to conduct the defence of his seat before the Election Committee of the House of Commons. The petition is the longest that ever was presented to the House. Upwards of 500 witnesses will be necessary to be examined, and it is considered that this will be the most interesting investigation that has ever been before a select committee. The counsel retained for the petitioners are Messrs. Harrison, Law, Mereweather, Thesiger, and Charles Philips, and for the sitting members, Messrs. Pollock, Bligh, and Maule. The ballot is appointed for the 19th of March.

Specie.—The exports of the precious metals from London in silver coin only from the 25th February to the 4th of March, amount to the enormous sum of 3,041,814 ounces; whilst that in bars amounts to 7806 ounces. Gold coin 6800 ounces and in bars 5000 ounces.

Mr. Henry Hunt, the [illegible]rated Radical Reformer, died on the 13th of February, at Alresford, in Hampshire. He was 62 years of age. The Tory papers say he died a true Christian. His death was occasioned by a paralytic attack.

At a meeting of the Shareholders of the Thames Tunnel, held on Tuesday week, it was stated that this splendid undertaking would be completed without further loss of time, the late Government having placed at the disposal of the Directors £247,000, on the security of the Company's property. Mr. Brunel has recommenced his labours.

In the latter part of February, a fire broke out in the town of Peterborough, England, which destroyed sixty-five houses, besides damaging many others. In the short space of two hours, 66 families, consisting of 300 individuals, were driven from their houses and habitations, and lost all they possessed.

The Duke of Gordon has been robbed of jewelry to the amount of £10,000.

The first engine has been placed on the London and Greenwich Railway, preparatory to the Easter fair.

An interesting debate took place in the French Chamber of Peers, Feb. 23d, on the abolition of slavery in the French colonies. The Duke of Broglie came out nobly in favor of emancipation.

In Spain both parties were preparing for renewing hostilities with increased vigor on the opening of spring.

The new Emperor of Austria it is understood, will pursue the policy of his royal father, and retain in the service of the state, the renowned Prince Metternich.

The Austrian government, under frivolous pretences, had sent soldiers into Switzerland, to repress the spirit of liberty, which it was feared might extend, and give trouble to the neighboring states.

In Turkey, [illegible]ity of Adrianople had been nearly destroyed by fire. Vast quantities of British manufactures were consumed

GREAT BRITAIN.—The public affairs of our mother country would perhaps engross more of our attention just now, if we had not enough to do with our own, and those of our more immediate neighbors. But of one thing we are satisfied, that it matters very little what set of men now hold the reins of Government in England—they must bow to the dictates of the national will, expressed through a Reformed House of Commons—and that the British people, with their love of order, intelligence, and strong attachment to rational freedom, will sanction any destructive change, or long tolerate any notorious abuse, we have not a fear. The moment that the tories delivered their rash declarations against all reformation, their power was at an end, and when the Whigs wavered in their course of improvement—truckled to their enemies, and clung too tenaciously to the sweets of office; and particularly when an unseemly civil war raged between them and the Radicals—they gradually lost that general confidence, which was their only security and defence. We care nothing for party names—yet we cannot but smile at those, who affect to support the present Ministry because forsooth they are Conservatives and Tories. Sir Robert Peel and the Duke of Wellington well know—if all their admirers do not—that they could not carry on the King's Government for a week, upon those principles that they have professed all their lives; and that unless prepared to concede improvements as full and ample as would have been asked of the Whigs; or as the Radicals, if they were in office, would dare to propose, they could not attempt to face even the present Parliament, which was chosen under circumstances that secured to them every advantage. The Reformers of Great Britain suggest some important reformation—press it upon the country year after year, until the public mind is thoroughly convinced of its value. During all this time they are opposed by another party, who dispute the ground with them inch by inch, and defame them as Revolutionists and Destructives. By and bye this same party eat their own speeches and principles—and to preserve office, consent to adopt the views of their antagonists, and carry the very measures that they have again and again declared would ruin the country. The acute logicians we have referred to, admire and bepraise them all the while—first for their opposition to what they finally proposed; and then for their support at the ninth hour of what, during the previous eight, they had denounced as revolutionary and destructive. But our reliance is on the combined spirit, intelligence and determination of the people—they will not allow the one party to destroy what is valuable, nor the other to impair the national health, by covering up rottenness and corruption.—*Novascotian.*

NEW ZEALAND.—*Capture of a British vessel and massacre of the crew by New Zealanders.*—The latest accounts from Van Diemen's Land state the particulars of the Harriet, Capt. Guard, and the massacre of twelve of her crew by the New Zealanders, had created a great sensation in the colony. The vessel went on shore, and the crew landed, having saved ammunition and several muskets. About 240 natives, with tomahawks, attacked Capt. Guard and his men, and killed several, carrying them away, and cutting the bodies in pieces. Mrs. Guard and her child were twice knocked down, but the remainder of the crew fought their way through the natives, having been reduced from twenty-eight to fourteen, and escaped by means of a friendly tribe of islanders. An attack had also been made upon another British vessel, but they plundered the ship without killing any of the crew. These facts having come to the knowledge of the Governor of Van Dieman's Land, he had despatched a body of troops to New Zealand, as was fully expected, with the intention of capturing these islands, especially as it was known that the more civilized part of the population applied to be placed under the protection of the British government. Should this be effected, the trade between New Zealand and the colonies of Van Dieman's Land and New South Wales would be greatly increased.

COMMUNICATIONS.

MR. EDITOR.—When I read the absurdities of "*Investigator*," which appeared in the City Gazette of the 9th instant, I thought he was labouring under *Lunar influence*, especially when I came to that part respecting his several classes of Emigrants, and his supposed case, that the union of England and Scotland had not taken place till 1801.—Now suppose it had *never* taken place, what bearing would this circumstance have upon the present political disputes in this Province?

Investigator has made copious quotations from Dr. Story, but I am yet to learn how the remarks of this "*American Jurist*" are to be applied to recent occurrences in our Legislature. I ask Investigator to explain in what way *common Law rights* will apply to the rejection of the Appropriation Bill by the Council? And further, what have *statutes*, of the British Parliament or of this Province, to do with the question? It appears to me, that the whole matter turns upon a *constitutional principle*, to which *common or statute law* does not in any way apply. The point at issue between the Council and Assembly is simply, whether the Commons of New-Brunswick shall freely and voluntarily give and grant their own money, and in such way as they, who alone can levy it, may think best for the public welfare; and the whole argument is here brought into a nutshell. Undoubtedly it is the People alone, by their Representatives, who raise the Revenue, by means of a Bill which cannot originate from any other source; and surely, after providing for the necessary services of government, these same Representatives are the sole *constitutional* judges of the proper objects to which the surplus shall be applied. Now if Doctor Story can controvert this, I have mistaken what is the birthright of every Briton; if the *common law* can affect this right, I should like to have the *case* quoted; if any *statute* takes away this right, I should be glad to know in what *King's reign* it was enacted: Investigator is no doubt a Lawyer by profession, and he can surely quote the case or statute, if any such exist.

Leaving Dr. Story to those who can apply him to our Provincial disputes, I now come to the remarks of Investigator relative to the proceedings of the Assembly in 1823; and here his object becomes more clearly discerned. He here names the persons composing the Committee of Privileges, appointed by the Assembly to consider the absurd and unwarrantable claims of the Governor and Council, with respect to *Money Bills.*

The majority of this committee made a *long report*, and Investigator is surprised "*that the names of Mr. C. Simonds and Mr. Stubbs are not affixed to it,*" they being two of the committee. These two members, it appears, took a different view of this *celebrated report* from the majority of the committee who signed it, and it seems that they had substantial reasons for objecting to it; the principal one was, that in speaking of the system of sending up items of appropriation by *resolution* to the Council for concurrence, previous to their being inserted in a *money bill*, this report states it to be, on the part of the Assembly, "*a concession of their acknowledged rights*"—and "*that they find many instances of the arbitrary abuse of this unconstitutional power on the part of that branch of the Legislature*" (the Council.) Here, then, this celebrated report states that the Assembly did in 1801 concede (to the Council), their *acknowledged rights*; and hence it follows, that they betrayed the high trust reposed in them, for they were elected for the express purpose of preserving those rights; and the report further speaks of the arbitrary abuse of the power which the House had basely yielded to the Council, thus admitting that the Assembly had exposed the people to an exercise of an arbitrary power; and after stating all this, the report actually recommends the Assembly not to depart "*from the usages and modes of proceeding hitherto pursued by former Houses of Assembly of this Province*":—in other words, because former Houses of Assembly had betrayed the trust reposed in them, by adopting the *resolution* system, therefore all future Houses ought to follow the same modes of proceeding, and acquiesce forever in this base concession of their acknowledged rights, and tamely submit, like willing slaves, to the arbitrary abuse by the Council, of the arbitrary power yielded to them by the Assembly of 1801!!!—Now surely such a recommendation was never before made to British representatives, and I am not surprised that Mr. Simonds and Mr. Stubbs should have refused to sign this extraordinary report.

The arbitrary attempts made by the Council during the late session, gave the Assembly a favourable opportunity of recovering their acknowledged rights, by returning to the *proper Parliamentary mode* of proceeding, of sending all the grants of money to the Council *by Bill*, instead of the contemptible mode of sending up items by resolution, and the Council fully expected that this course would have been pursued by the House. It is well known that Mr. Simonds has, since the session of 1821, uniformly opposed the resolution system, and had the Assembly in 1823 abolished this system, so slavish in its principles, the difficulties which the loss of the appropriation bill will occasion, would never have occurred; for, had this been the case, and a proper compensation for the expenses of the Members of the Assembly been sent up to the Council in one of the appropriation bills, there can be no doubt that such bill would have been concurred in; but, by the present system, the Council having rejected the *resolution* for such provision, they stood upon a point of honour, not to pass a *bill* having the same provision in it. They could not have given the rejection of a similar provision, as a reason for throwing out the appropriations of a whole session; therefore the Assembly are deeply culpable in so long submitting to the loss of their acknowledged rights; in so long smarting under the abuse of the arbitrary power conceded to the Council.

Investigator's observations respecting Mr. Grenville and Sir John Cust, the Speaker of the House of Commons, are proofs that he has not comprehended what he has read in Hatsell.—If a *new* tax or burthen is to be laid upon the people, it certainly ought not to take place while the Speaker was in the chair, and this is what is meant by the precedent quoted. But surely it will not be contended by any one, (excepting Investigator,) that it is not competent to the Assembly, *in the House*, to make a small amendment to a money bill, by *reducing the amount* of one of the items in it from about £40 to £30! It will be seen by reference to Hatsell's Precedents, that *grants of money not recommended by the Crown, ought not to be voted in supply*; that committee being raised for the purpose of voting *supplies to Government*; and a little investigation will therefore prove, that no rule was violated by the Assembly in passing the appropriation bill.—(What sort of Ryder would the following be, to a *money bill*, viz. "*dele £40, and insert £30*"?)

I am inclined to think that the Speaker's memory was not so short as Investigator would insinuate; in 1818 the Assembly did pass a Bill with a suspending clause, in which provision was made for the paying of the Council; this was an experimental bill, to ascertain whether his Majesty would allow them to receive wages: His Majesty refused, and consequently no provision was ever voted by the Assembly to the Council; which a reference to the appropriation bills since that period will fully prove.

I make these explanations to relieve Investigator, knowing *how much pain* it would give him, to discover any inconsistency or impropriety in the present Speaker of the Assembly.

April 18. AN ELECTOR.

MR. EDITOR.—It is really ludicrous to see how industriously the *aspirants for Lordliness* are endeavouring to palm off the precious Resolutions, passed by *sixteen of their faction* at the late one-sided *Westmoreland* farce, as the genuine expression of public opinion in that intelligent County. Not content with favouring all *our* Provincial papers with copies of those Resolutions, they have pompously communicated them also to the *Novascotian*, with the ridiculous assertion of their having been passed "*by large majorities*," and, with every effort of chicanery, have endeavoured to gull the talented Editor of that independent and faithful paper into a belief of their being the real sense of the people of Westmoreland. But Mr. Howe is too wide awake to be so easily deceived; and when he knows that their boasted *public* meeting was got up at the instigation of a few *Council-Worshippers* alone, expressly to suit their own purposes, that a notice of only *four days* was given for the assembling of the freeholders of that extensive and populous County, at a time of year when communication and travelling are almost impossible, and that consequently only *twenty-three* persons contrived to get together, of whom six were Magistrates, and 3 or 4 Members of the House of Assembly, (all but one on the *minority* side of the House), and that only 16 out of the said 23 formed the "large majorities" so ridiculously vaunted, surely, I say, Mr. Howe, with his usual perception and good sense, will see that the whole thing is too ridiculous for any thing but laughter and contempt. Mr. Howe has evidently looked upon late events in our Province with an impartial and penetrating eye; he has favoured us with a few of his sentiments, and I hope he will not drop his faithful and powerful pen till he has gone a little farther into the matter. Disinterested as he is in the question, his opinion is valuable, and is therefore desirable. By the bye, Mr. Editor, I wish that your Westmoreland correspondent, who sent you an account of the meeting, (in which he so candidly mentioned the speakers' names, numbers of voters, &c.—matters which the resolutionists themselves most carefully conceal,) had favoured you with some little account of the *speeches* on the occasion. I should like much to know what arguments those honourable Members, who were so "eloquent in discussing the *demerits* of the Assembly," adduced to bear them out in their fraternal animadversions on their Legislative brethren. Your's, Mr. Editor, SENEX.

To His Worship the MAYOR.

SIR,—I beg leave most respectfully to suggest to your consideration, the propriety of enacting a municipal regulation respecting the price of *Cord Wood*, which claims equally with Bread the interference of the public authorities, to prevent the shameful imposition of exorbitant charges in times of scarcity or severe cold weather. If the article of Bread can properly be restricted in its price by law, surely the sale of Wood should be subjected to similar regulations for the protection of the poor. They are each the productions of the soil—with this difference, that the growth of wheat is uncertain, and expensive, while the growth of wood is the natural production of the soil; wheat is converted into flour by an expensive and laborious process—wood is obtained with less labour. Flour is principally imported from foreign markets, exposing the baker to fluctuating prices—wood is procured at a comparatively small expense, and at greater or less distances from the town itself. They are equally important in our climate for the comfort and existence of mankind, which should be secured from the rapacity of Fore-stallers and extortioners. I have been induced to make the foregoing remarks, from having witnessed the miseries of the Poor, during the last winter, many of whom actually suffered from the want of fuel; and I believe every person is aware, that the price of wood per cord has suddenly been raised from 4 to 7 shillings, not from the increased expense of obtaining it, but from the severity of the weather increasing the consumption, demand, sale, and consequently the profits at a fair price. A regulation of the price of wood would not lessen the quantity brought to market; for we find the market just as well supplied, when the price is 10s. or 11s. per cord, as when it is 18s. or 24s.; and if the vender can make money by the sale of it at an honest charge, he will not relinquish the traffic because a regard for the public comfort has restricted him to reasonable and sufficient profits. Therefore, I sincerely hope that you will be pleased to give the subject its merited consideration; and if the power is not vested in the Corporate Body, that you will, at the next session of the Legislature, take the necessary measures to obtain the requisite authority. By so doing, the Public, and especially the Poor, will always remember with grateful feelings the Mayoralty of W. H. STREET, Esquire, and the exertions of his co-adjutors. I am, Sir,

Most respectfully your's, &c.

St. John, April 20. A WELL-WISHER.

THE OBSERVER.

ST. JOHN, TUESDAY, APRIL 21, 1835.

[The following observations were prepared for last Tuesday's Observer, but unavoidably postponed at that time.]

The recent arrivals from Great Britain have furnished us with news of the greatest importance. The Imperial Parliament is at length again in action; the first trial of party strength has been made, and has resulted anti-ministerially. The Ultra-Whigs and Radicals have beaten the Moderate Whigs and Conservatives, in the contest for the Speakership, by a majority of 10; and Sir CHARLES MANNERS SUTTON, after a long and vigorous reign of eighteen years as the first Commoner of Great Britain, is at length superseded by Mr. ABERCROMBIE—a whole Whig. Sir Charles, however, is consoled for his deposition, by a peerage, with the titles of Baron Bottesford and Viscount Canterbury. This event is fraught with interesting and important circumstances; a new Ministry, composed of what have hitherto been the strongest materials in the country, defeated at their very outset, in a measure to which they applied the utmost concentration of their forces, is certainly a curious and peculiar object for contemplation; and it is utterly impossible for any one, so remote as we are from the sphere of action, and so shut out from the means of calculation, to anticipate the result. If the present Ministry copy the example of the last, they will care nothing for a few defeats; no exploded notions of delicacy will induce them to resign upon the first misfortune, but they will tenaciously stick to office to the last gasp, and yield only when to retain is impossible. For ourselves, being neither Whig nor Tory, but reserving the right to judge of matters as they arise, unfettered by party adhesion, we cannot but regret the present position of affairs. We have seen no good reason for ousting the late Speaker, who, by universal admission has, for a long course of years, exercised the duties of his office to the fullest satisfaction of all parties. The only plausible charge brought against him, viz. of having advised the dissolution of the late Parliament, has never been proved on the one hand, while it has been positively denied on the other. The opposition, therefore, have turned him out, merely for the sake of doing so; and while they declaimed against Sir C. M. Sutton as a party man, they have elected Mr. Abercrombie, an openly avowed party-man! The benefits of the change remain to be proved. The experience and practical knowledge of the late Speaker cannot be possessed by the new one; whether his moderation, urbanity, courtesy and impartiality will be transferred with his official mantle, we have yet to learn. When the late Whig Ministry commenced their career, we rejoiced, because we expected great benefits therefrom. They began moderately, and succeeded in effecting some salutary reforms; but inflated by success, they suddenly lost self-guidance and prudence, and hurried headlong into the most reckless thirst for revolutionary subversions and despoliations. In common with many others, we therefore saw their downfall without regret; and, satisfied that public opinion had now sufficiently established its influence, to operate as a salutary controuller of any future ministry, we witnessed the accession of the present cabinet with something like complacent indifference; more particularly, as we were well aware, that the Tories or Conservatives have invariably shewn a far greater regard for Colonial interests than their opponents. As far, therefore, as we are personally concerned as Colonists, we may rather wish for their continuance than their defeat. Whether they will be able to maintain their stand under the present extraordinary circumstances, is beyond our divination. At any rate, we feel morally convinced, that they never can do so, without moderating, to a very great degree, their olden principles, and admitting, under the *salvo* of "*Conservatism*," that liberal amalgamation both in doctrine and practice, which the present enlightened tone of public opinion demands, but which thorough "*Toryism*" never can adopt. They must effect necessary reformations on prudent principles, to prevent revolutionary spoliations by unprincipled Radicals; and that they may succeed in doing so, is our fervent hope. To prune a tree is safe and salutary; but to cut it down, under the specious pretence of rendering it more prolific, is mad destruction. His Majesty's speech points out two or three important objects for rational amendment; and we hope that the present Ministry will be enabled so satisfactorily to effect these desiderata, as to be entrusted with others in due time for a similar process, and to save them from the ruthless grasp of more reckless hands.

We rejoice to find that Viscount CANTERBURY, (late Sir C. M. SUTTON, and ex-Speaker of the House of Commons,) is appointed by His Majesty's Government to proceed, as Special Commissioner, to Lower Canada, for the purpose of fully enquiring into the unhappy differences at present there existing, armed with full powers to enter thoroughly into the investigation, and instructed to report to His Majesty's Government such measures as he shall think best adapted to re-establish a "spirit of conciliation and friendship" in that now distracted Colony. From the known character and extensive experience of Viscount Canterbury, we feel the fullest confidence in his appointment, and sincerely wish his Lordship every success in his highly important and amicable mission.

"*The Loss of the Appropriation Bill chargeable on the Legislative Council; with a vindication of the proceedings of the House of Assembly. By a Freeholder.*"—This pamphlet was published on Thursday last, according to announcement, and is rapidly wending its way throughout the Province. Having already so fully stated our opinions on the important subject on which it treats, we need scarcely observe that we perfectly coincide in its every phrase and sentiment; and we therefore earnestly recommend it to the attention of the constituency of the country, as presenting a lucid, logical, comprehensive, and, above all, a *true* statement of and commentary on the facts of the case. Public opinion must settle the matter now at issue, and the public should therefore thoroughly inform themselves of every thing connected with or bearing upon it. Popular ignorance on the one hand, and sophistical mis-statement on the other, are the grand reliances of the adverse party. To remove the former and nullify the latter are the objects of this