

and indeed I have not permission, to go into the details of the conversation which passed between her Majesty and me on that occasion. All that I shall say on the subject is, that nothing passed on my part inconsistent with the principles I have already stated—which I maintain are the correct principles to govern a case like the present, and most particularly that part of the subject which related to the administration of the influence and control of the Royal household, supposing her Majesty should think proper to call me to her government. My right hon. friend has stated correctly that part of the conversation which related to the interpretation and decision to which her Majesty had come—"that the whole should continue as at present, without any change." This was her Majesty's determination, and accordingly I did, as before stated, immediately communicate to Sir Robert Peel, who was in the next room, the decision of her Majesty to that effect. I do not know, my lords, that it is necessary for me to go any further into this matter; and afterwards had a communication with other noble lords and right hon. gentlemen, and we found it impossible for us to undertake the conduct of her Majesty's government unless this point was put to rights. (Hear, hear.) The noble viscount has stated that he gave her Majesty advice upon the subject—to write a letter on a statement which he admits was erroneous. (Hear, hear.) I don't mean to draw any conclusion from this, except that possibly it might have been better if the noble viscount had taken some means to ascertain what the right statement was before he gave the advice. (Hear, hear.) Whether the statement was erroneous or not, the noble viscount had a right, if he chose, to act on the principle that our advice was erroneous; that our demands were such that they ought not to have been made; but it would be well for noble lords not to be in so great a hurry in future as to give their opinion and advice upon such important matters without well assuring themselves that they have a really correct statement before them. (Hear, hear.) My lords, I cannot but think that the principles on which we proposed to act with respect to the ladies of the bedchamber in the case of a Queen regnant were the correct principles. (Hear, hear.) The public will not believe that the Queen holds no political conversations with those ladies (hear, hear,) and that political influence is not exercised by them, particularly considering who those persons are who hold such situations. (Hear, hear.) I believe the history of this country affords a number of instances in which secret and improper influence has been exercised by means of such conversations. I have, my lords, a somewhat strong opinion on this subject. I have unworthily filled the office which the noble viscount now so worthily holds; and I must say, I have felt the inconvenience of an anomalous influence, not exercised, perhaps by ladies, but an anomalous influence, undoubtedly, of this description, and exerted simply in conversations; and I will tell the noble viscount that the country is at this moment suffering some inconvenience from the exercise of that very secret influence. (Hear, hear.) My lords, I believe I have gone further into principles upon this subject than may, perhaps, suit the taste of the noble viscount; but this I must say, that at the same time we claimed the control of the Royal household, and would not have proposed to her Majesty to make any arrangements which would have been disagreeable to her, I felt it was absolutely impossible for me, under the circumstances of the present moment, to undertake any share of the government of the country without that proof of her Majesty's confidence. (Hear, hear.) And now, my lords, in concluding this subject, I hope with a little more moderation than the noble viscount (hear, hear.) I have only to add the expression of my gratitude to her Majesty for the gracious condescension and consideration with which she was pleased to listen to the counsel which it was my duty to offer; and I must say I quitted her presence not only impressed with the feeling of gratitude for her condescension and consideration, but likewise with deep respect for the frankness, the intelligence, the decision and firmness, which characterised her Majesty's demeanour throughout the proceedings. (Hear, hear.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS, May 13.

SIR ROBERT PEEL, in allusion to the causes which led to his abandonment of office, said—

I said to those who were intended to be my future colleagues, that with respect to all those ladies of the household who were below the rank of a lady of the bedchamber, I should suggest no change to her Majesty (cheers from the opposition benches); but with respect to the superior class of ladies holding office, I expressed a hope that those of them who were in immediate connexion with my political opponents would immediately relieve the new government from any further trouble on the question by voluntarily resigning. (Loud cheering from the opposite side of the house.) At the same time I stated that I did think it of much importance, as conveying an intimation of her Majesty's entire confidence and support, that some change should be made with respect to some of the higher offices of the household filled by ladies, and I did express the ladies of the bedchamber. I said, that even in some instances of these, where there was not any strong political connexion, I did not think any change would be necessary. This passed on the Wednesday evening; and I mention it merely as an indication of my willingness that any blame arising from any imperfection of my explanation, or from any misconception as to that explanation, should attach to me only. I saw her Majesty on the Thursday—and here I repeat, I shall confine myself, unless pressed to it, to the letters that passed between her Majesty and me. Early on the Friday morning, May the 10th, I had the honor to receive the following letter from her Majesty:—

"Buckingham Palace, May 10, 1839.

"The Queen having considered the proposal made to her yesterday by Sir Robert Peel to remove the ladies of her bed chamber, cannot consent to adopt a course which she conceives to be contrary to usage, and which is repugnant to her feelings.

In three hours after the receipt of her Majesty's note, I addressed the following letter to her Majesty:

"Whitehall, May 10, 1839.

"Sir Robert Peel presents his humble duty to your Majesty, and has had the honor of receiving your Majesty's note of this morning.

"In respectfully submitting to your Majesty's pleasure, and humbly returning into your Majesty's hands the important trust which your Majesty had been graciously pleased to commit to him, Sir Robert Peel trusts that your Majesty will permit him to state to your Majesty his impression with respect to the circumstances which have led to the termination of his attempt to form an administration for the conduct of your Majesty's service.

"In the interview with which your Majesty honoured Sir R. Peel yesterday morning, after he had submitted to your Majesty the names of those whom he proposed to recommend to your Majesty for the principal executive appointments, he mentioned to your Majesty his earnest wish to be enabled, with your Majesty's sanction, so to constitute your Majesty's household, that your Majesty's confidential servants might have the advantage of a public demonstration of your Majesty's full support and confidence, and that at the same time, as far as possible, consistently with that demonstration, each individual appointment in the household should be entirely acceptable to your Majesty's personal feelings.

"On your Majesty expressing a desire that the Earl of Liverpool should hold an office in the household, Sir Robert Peel, requested your Majesty's permission at once to offer to Lord Liverpool the office of Lord Steward, or any other which he might prefer.

"Sir Robert Peel then observed, that he should have every wish to apply a similar principle to the chief appointments which are filled by the ladies of your Majesty's household; upon which your Majesty was pleased to remark, that you must reserve the whole of those appointments, and that it was your Majesty's pleasure that the whole should continue as at present, without any change.

"The Duke of Wellington, in the interview to which your Majesty subsequently admitted him, understood also that this was your Majesty's determination, and concurred with Sir Robert Peel in opinion that, considering the great difficulties at the present crisis, and the expediency of making every effort, in the first instance, to conduct the public business of the country with the aid of the present parliament, it was essential to the success of the commission with which your Majesty had honoured Sir Robert Peel, that he should have that public proof of your Majesty's entire support and confidence which would be afforded by the permission to make some

changes in that part of your Majesty's household which your Majesty resolved on maintaining entirely without change.

"Having had the opportunity, through your Majesty's gracious consideration, of reflecting upon this point, he humbly submits to your Majesty that he is reluctantly compelled, by a sense of public duty, and of the interest of your Majesty's service, to adhere to the opinion which he ventured to express to your Majesty.

"He trusts he may be permitted, at the same time, to express to your Majesty his grateful acknowledgments for the distinction which your Majesty conferred upon him, by requiring his advice and assistance in the attempt to form an administration, and his earnest prayer that whatever arrangements your Majesty may be enabled to make for that purpose may be most conducive to your Majesty's personal comfort and happiness, and to the promotion of the public welfare."

It is stated by a London paper of the 14th May that—

When Sir R. Peel came away from the house, he was followed by the whole mob about the house, and cheered to an immense extent. When they reached the turn to Whitehall-gardens, he bowed and thanked them. Not satisfied with that, they followed, notwithstanding the police, who tried to keep Sir R. Peel free from them, as far as his house, and then gave him three tremendous cheers. It is further stated to us, that Lords Melbourne and Normanby were violently hooted, and came away only under the protection of the police.

We subjoin, after the above official explanations, the following opinions of the press.

From the Standard, May 11.

The farce is now over—and the country may read by a light to which none but the utterly blind can be insensible, the whole scheme of Lord Melbourne's policy since the accession of Queen Victoria. It is to be remembered, in the first place, that Lord Melbourne formed the Queen's household; and it is to be remembered also that he did not form that establishment of the "friends of her Majesty's youth," as has been asserted by the "enormous liars" who characteristically support the ministers, but of his own creatures and dependents. This was observed upon in 1837, in an article of the Quarterly Review, which, in imitation of the Times, we have re-printed. So far from the Melbourne household being composed of "the friends of the Queen's youth," the Duchess of Northumberland, the earliest—and, after the excellent Princess who had the first claim to the Sovereign's affections—the best and most beloved friend of the Queen's youth, was excluded—not merely excluded from office in the Royal Household, but even from the honour of receiving her pupil as a guest. The household of the Duchess of Kent would, with the Duchess of Northumberland, constitute the circle of the Queen's friends in the retirement in which her Majesty was educated. How the household of the Duchess of Kent have been treated by the Melbourne Royal household is too well known to the public.

This is the answer to the lying pretence, that Sir Robert Peel insisted upon changing the whole of the household—upon depriving the Queen of the society of all the friends of her youth. Could the gentlemanlike feeling and dutiful loyalty of Sir Robert Peel permit him to make that demand, as assuredly they could not, the opportunity was not given to him—for he was plainly told that, so far from changing all, he should not change one member of the Melbourne-formed establishment—though that one might be the wife of a Cabinet minister and an expectant Premier, as the case of the Marchioness of Normandy—or the sister of another Cabinet minister, as the case of the Duchess of Sutherland—or the sister-in-law of another, as the case of the Marchioness of Tavistock—or the daughter of another, as the case of Miss Rice. In short he was told that he must carry on the Queen's government in the Queen's name, leaving the Queen's person surrounded exclusively by persons whose families would once more divide among them all the power, emoluments, and patronage of the State as the consequence of his failure—by persons every one of whom must regard him as an enemy, who had occasioned to them, and to their families, more or less of privation. Could any man carry on the government to his own honour, or to the public advantage, under such circumstances? But another consideration pressed upon Sir Robert Peel, and would have left him greatly criminal if he had not insisted upon a modification, at least, of the Melbourne household, had the opportunity been allowed to him, which it was not. He owed it no less to the Queen than to the country, to rescue her Majesty from the thralldom of the Melbourne household, and to restore to her some of "the friends of her youth."

It has been truly said that the monarch of a party is sovereign of but half a people, and such must grow to be the condition of a sovereign gaoled and dungeoned within a selected circle of party-keepers. In this position Lord Melbourne has fixed the Queen; and Sir Robert Peel would have failed in his duty as a good citizen, a loyal subject, and a gentleman, if he had been accessory to retaining her in it.

He might have taken office, leaving the Queen in her thralldom—he might, perhaps, have carried on the government in defiance of the Melbourne household; and he certainly would have done so with more ease if he published the obstruction offered by the Court, as a Whig-Radical would certainly do. All this he might have done; but doing so he would inflict a blow upon the monarchy, and the honour and happiness of the reigning Sovereign, only less fatal than that which the sordid, selfish, heartless person who fills his place has dealt. The effect of the late proceeding upon the monarchical principle is, we own, something which we dread to contemplate. We have the consolation to reflect that the Conservatives have done their duty, and that nothing worse can be said of them, even by their enemies, than that they refused to take office upon terms which they considered dishonourable to themselves, and dangerous to the people and the monarchy.

THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON'S EXPLANATION.

From the Morning Herald, May 16.

The speech of the Duke of Wellington will be read with the deepest interest in every part of the country.

The illustrious duke's statement proves that perfect unanimity prevails amongst the leaders of the Conservative party, as to the course adopted by Sir Robert Peel, in regard to the household appointments.

The illustrious duke approves most cordially of every portion of Sir Robert Peel's conduct. His Grace would seem, indeed, to have settled, in his own mind, the expediency of that course of action which Sir Robert Peel adopted, even before Sir Robert Peel was required by the Queen to form an administration.

Not merely did the Duke of Wellington lend the sanction of his unrivalled authority to all the steps taken by his right hon. friend; but the illustrious Duke, in a mode indirect indeed, yet not to be misunderstood, condemned, with unsparring severity, the course adopted by Lord Melbourne and his reputable associates. His Grace spoke in reference to these points with great solemnity of manner. He spoke as one "who had served the Sovereigns of England 50 years,

through evil report, and through good report"—as one who did not covet office—yet as one willing to consult the pleasure of the Queen, by serving her Majesty in any way she might desire at the present perilous conjuncture. The illustrious Duke declared that, in his opinion, no statesman could have abstained from claiming the privilege which had been claimed by Sir Robert Peel—the privilege to remodel the household appointments—without failing, at the same time, most grossly in his duty to his Sovereign, and to his country. His Grace observed, moreover—and the observation will make a deep impression on the country—that "he had not conceived it possible that the Sovereign should insist on the stipulation which had been insisted on by the Queen."

Such were the conclusions at which, after much reflection, the Duke of Wellington had arrived, before he was sent for by her Majesty. What took place at his interviews with the Queen the illustrious Duke did not feel himself at liberty to declare; but nothing, his Grace assured the House of Lords, did occur "inconsistent with the principles laid down" by him, as indispensable for the guidance of a new administration.

Already do the effects of Whig treachery begin to react injuriously upon its Royal victim. Lord Melbourne and his fellow conspirators have betrayed the Queen into a false position. The statement of the Duke of Wellington that, during his interviews with her Majesty, nothing occurred "inconsistent with the principle," that the new minister ought to regulate the household appointments;—this statement, we say, will go far to convince the country, that during the first interviews of the Duke and of Sir Robert Peel with her Majesty, no opposition was offered by her Majesty to the principle in question—and that the objections which were subsequently stated by the Queen were prompted by Lord Melbourne himself, or by his agents in the royal household!

The loathsome hypocrisy of the pretence under cover of which the Whigs have sneaked back to office has no parallel, so far as we are aware, in the annals of political meanness. The Whigs cannot endure that anything "repugnant to her feelings" should be pressed upon the Sovereign! How long, let us ask, have the Whigs approved themselves so chivalrous in their loyalty? Did they regard what was "repugnant to the feelings" of William the Fourth when they forced themselves back upon that monarch, as his advisers, in April, 1835? Did they regard what was "repugnant to the feelings," not of a queen regnant, but of a queen consort, when they denounced Lord Howe's connection with Queen Adelaide's household? Did they, and their organs of the press, regard what was "repugnant to the feelings" of the Sovereign, when they denounced Queen Adelaide as "a German woman," for no other reason than because that illustrious lady's partialities were presumed to be Conservative?

Lord Melbourne and his confederates, we repeat, have, for their own most despicable purposes, betrayed their young and inexperienced Sovereign into a false position. Lord Melbourne admitted, a week ago, that he had forfeited the confidence of the representatives of the people. He returned to office, as he assures the world, simply in order to gratify the Queen;—in other words, he represents the Sovereign as being desirous to conduct the affairs of the country, by the agency of ministers who do not enjoy the public confidence! Whether the inevitable results of such an unconstitutional course on the part of her ministers must not prove bitterly "repugnant to her Majesty's feelings," the lapse of a very brief period will determine!

WHAT WILL MINISTERS DO?

From the Times, May 16.

The Whigs are trying to put the broken-down coach again into motion, either on its old wheels, or with the help of new ones. What their hammering and shoudering may effect it would be idle, in the present darkness, to guess; though we believe it quite safe to say, that at present they are still in the slough of despond. But suppose the machine hauled out of the mire, and again set upright on its axle, what are the roads that lie open to it, and who are to be the conductors of the "turn-out"?

The immediate cause of the Whig downfall was the shock from the Radicals. Can the future recurrence of such crashes be prevented? No doubt it may be, by throwing off the noble author of the late "letter to the electors of Stroud," and all that section of the Cabinet who concur with Lord John Russell in the opinion that the time is come when any further organic change must be resisted, and that "England cannot afford to have a revolution every year." Protest against these Tory doctrines; eject those of the ministry who mince their treason to the constitution, and replace them by resolute fellows, who for the fatted calf will go the whole hog: the entire force of the Radicals will then support you, and you may start as a thorough-going ministry. But then what becomes of those among your supporters who agree with Lord John and the finality sect? Why, as your irregular auxiliaries march in at one end of your camp, your own veterans file out at the other, and the whole-hog government begins in a state even weaker than its predecessor left off. What Lord Melbourne and Lord John, in alliance with the rank and property of the Whigs, could not achieve, Lord Normanby will hardly effect in opposition to that force, even though to the Irish tail he add the offscourings of every prison, gaol, penitentiary, comptrol, bridewell, and house of correction in England, Scotland, and Wales. On the balance, the renewed Cabinet's whole gain is a loss.

Some of these speculations suppose a continuance of the Melbourne and Russell dynasty; others the intromission of fresh experimentalists in their room. But seriously, is there any possible combination of Whig and Radical materials which the country will tolerate in the form of a ministry? Will the radical constituencies allow their representatives to go on in the liveries of the Finality Whigs? Will the Finality Whigs allow the remnant of their influence and importance, and the yet entire mass of their property, to be annually pared, plucked, and broken up, by hungry Radicalism? Will the bulk of this great conservative nation allow its sterling institutions to be melted in the crucible of Lord Durham, or snipped into stage tinsel for the Marquis of Normanby?

LOWER CANADA.

DESTRUCTION OF THE JOHN BULL STEAMER.

We regret to say that the destruction of this noble vessel, by fire, occurred at three o'clock yesterday morning, off Lavallrie, she having at the time two ships in tow. It is much to be feared that this accident, as yet not satisfactorily ex-

plained, was attended by the loss of four lives; three emigrants who were passengers on board, and the second Engineer, who was on watch at the time, being missing. We entertain little or no doubt that all these persons have perished, although the river is not very wide where the fire broke out, and good swimmers might have reached the shore. All the other passengers, and the crew, were saved by the boats and hands of the ships she had in tow.—Montreal Transcript.

MONTREAL MARKETS,

MONTREAL, Friday, June 7, 1839.

A number of Upper Canada Merchants have been in town for the last fortnight, and have bought freely. Business, in general, is now considered to be in a more healthy state, than it has been for many years.

ASHES.—The quantity in store is very great; several small lots have changed hands as low as 26s for Pots, and 31s a 31s 6d for Pearls; which is a reduction of 1s 6d a 2s per cwt. upon our last week's quotation. Shippers have not been buying very freely, even at that rate, as they anticipate a further decline.

FLOUR.—This article has been rather dull for the last few days; in the beginning of the week some large sales were effected at 37s 6d for Superfine, 35s for Fine, and 32s 6d a 33s 9d for Middlings. The general impression seems to be that a reduction of 1s 3d a 2s 6d per barrel will take place before another week.

PROVISIONS are also dull, as the first demand has been supplied. No variation, however, has taken place in the price of either Pork or Beef. The retail market is a shade lower than it was last week.

BUTTER has been sold in Market this week as low as 8½d a 9d for salt, and 9d a 10d for fresh.

SUGARS.—Muscovado has been sold at auction 2s a 2s 6d lower this week than last; but Refined is rather looking up. By the last accounts from Glasgow it had advanced 1s a 2s per cwt. in that market.

MONEY.—Since the Banks resumed Specie payments, the "Shin Plasters" have been disappearing fast. Exchange on New York has fallen ¼ per cent this week, but remains steady on London at 10 per cent premium.

The Flour and Corn Market in New York has been dull, and a farther decline in both articles has taken place.

The average price of Beef in the New York Market, \$11 per 100lbs.

We are happy to perceive from papers from all parts of the Union that there is every appearance of an abundant harvest. From the South favourable accounts are received of the Sugar, Cotton and Tobacco crop.—*Id.*

UPPER CANADA.

ANSWER OF SIR GEORGE ARTHUR TO AN ADDRESS FROM THE INHABITANTS OF CORNWALL.

GENTLEMEN,

I thank you most cordially for this loyal address.

I receive this manifestation of your support with a more lively thankfulness, because my Government has recently been placed in the most trying circumstances.

It has been my painful duty to cause the extreme sentence of the law to be carried into effect in the cases of many desperate offenders—whilst towards others, I felt that a free and unconditional pardon might be extended.

I am quite aware that there are many excellent, loyal persons amongst you, who consider that this last course is impolitic, and that their families will be subjected, by it, to fresh aggressions.

Your kind disposition towards me personally, is therefore the more gratifying; for it assures me, you are convinced, if I have erred, that it has proceeded from an incorrect judgment, and by no means from indifference to, or unconcern for, your safety and protection.

I frankly avow to you, that it has been with me, an object of great anxiety to call forth a generous feeling from those who have acted towards this country with cruel treachery and wanton violence. If the endeavour be successful, (and I still shall leave no honourable effort unattempted to accomplish it,) it will be to me a source of unbounded satisfaction—IF IT PROVE UNSUCCESSFUL, WE MUST CAST ALL FURTHER THOUGHTS OF DIPLOMACY INTO THE ST. LAWRENCE, AND TRUST TO THE HEARTS AND HANDS OF HER MAJESTY'S LOYAL SUBJECTS TO BRING ABOUT CONCILIATION BY A DIFFERENT PROCESS—and, in that operation, I am very confident, there are no men more entirely to be relied upon, than the inhabitants of the Eastern District.

ANCIENT INDIAN BURIAL PIT.—An interesting discovery was made a short time since in one of the rear concessions of the Township of Manvers in this district, which has become an object of general curiosity and inquiry. Some three weeks ago, a settler of the neighbourhood, walking through the woods noticed a singular looking hollow or pit of circular form, about twelve feet in diameter, and two feet or so below the general surface of the land. It was surrounded by a high bank of earth, which evidently had originally been thrown up from its bed, though at some very remote period, for upon the bank had since grown up a fine beech-tree, and in the hollow itself a bass-wood tree, both of large dimensions, (they have since been cut down, when the beech was found to be 147 years old by its rings, and the bass-wood 187!) Looking closer at the Pit, he noticed to his astonishment lying in it partially covered by the soil, several large bones apparently human—which they proved to be, and on a subsequent examination the pit has been found to be fully eight feet deep and filled with human skeletons thrown promiscuously in and numbering it is supposed at least seven or eight hundred. How long they have lain there and what their history is matter of interesting inquiry for the Antiquary. The most natural conjecture seems to be that some great battle has been fought near the spot; but we are told the Indians of the present day have no such tradition among them.—*Star.*

DIED.—In the town of Hamilton, on Monday morning, the 27th May, Mr. JOSEPH WILLIAM BULL, aged 20 years, eldest son of Mr. George Perkins Bull, Editor of the Hamilton Gazette.

List of Letters received to Friday, June 14:—

Rev. E. Cusack, rem.; J. Burwell, Esq. rem.; Mr. A. Menzies; Rev. G. Archbold, rem.; Mr. S. Fry, add. subs.; Angus Bethune, Esq.; Rev. E. Denroche; Rev. G. R. Grout, add. subs.; Rev. T. Green.