POLITICAL.

From the London Times, Jan. 5.

PRESIDENT JACKSON'S MESSAGE.—The Message of the American PRESIDENT, long as it is, and multifarious in its topics, requires, we are happy to say, but very little observation from Englishmen, with reference at least to English interests, and that little of a friendly and satisfactory nature. The numerous questions formerly under discussion between this country and the United States, had for some years past been reduced to two, of which one, viz. that embracing the colonial trade, has been adjusted by a recent treaty. The provisions of the treaty are such as to place the navigation of the North American Republic in the ports of our British colonies on the same footing as that of the most favoured States; but the execution of it was preceded by an entire abandonment on the part of the United States of that offensive claim which had been put forth during the presidency of Mr. Adams to shackle the trade of British vessels clearing out from American ports, with the colonies and dependencies of Great Britain. The President appears to dwell with pleasure on the "frank and friendly spirit" which has characterized the whole of the British negotiations on the above subject, and declares that he shall feel it a privilege, as well as duty, to reciprocate the kindly feelings of this Government to the utmost extent of his ability.

The second question, affecting the mutual interests of Great Britain and the United States, is that relating to the north-eastern boundary of the Republic, where it rests upon our province of New Brunswick. That question has been referred by both parties to the arbitration of the King of Holland, whose time and thoughts are now, we presume, too deeply occupied with his own affairs to expatiate much upon those of other people. After an elaborate, but to foreigners generally an uninteresting, disquisition upon two points of international policy,—namely, the appropriation of national funds to local purposes, and the indirect and circuitous manner in which the President has hitherto been elected,—the Message proceeds to congratulate Congress on the success which has attended the "*benevolent*" policy of the United States, which has for nearly thirty years aimed at the "removal" of the Indians beyond the white settlements! The removal of the Indians means simply their expulsion from every foot of land which they and their ancestors for numberless generations had possessed and enjoyed by indefeasible right, long previous to the existence of the North American Republic. We do not mean to deny the incalculable advantage to the whole world, derived from the substitution of a civilized for a savage community throughout the vast region which at this moment forms the dominion of the United States, but things ought to be called by their proper denominations. The unhappy Indians are "treated with" as the wild beasts are treated with,—they are hunted off the earth, wherever a white man chooses to raise his log-house. There is no "benevolence" in this, but the pure selfishness of unbridled power. The "removal," means a violent expulsion; the expulsion is followed in almost every instance, and even within a single generation of mankind, by extinction. Within the short term of 30 years, many once numerous and powerful tribes of the Indian race, thus ousted from their homes, have perished. General Jackson philosophizes upon these sufferings of the ancient occupants of America, which, says he, upon a "comprehensive" view of the general interests of the human race, is not to be regretted.

A philosopher of a different school might answer, that the needless infliction, and selfish disregard of human misery, is, on the most comprehensive survey of the interests of the race of man, at all times and under all circumstances to be "regretted." Might not the wretched Indians have been taught, and reclaimed to civilization? Might not more fit preceptors have been provided for them, than the barbarous and unpitying backwoodsman?

The tariff is held by the President a subject too ticklish to be meddled with as a whole; and he hints, that its several parts and features should be subjected to separate consideration.

On the all-important matter of the finances, the Message describes a state of public prosperity which may well excite the envy of contemporary nations, and almost fill them with despair.

The whole revenue drawn from 12,000,000 of people does not exceed £5,000,000 sterling; and their expenditure, including army, navy, an extensive outlay for various public works, and the whole charge of the several departments, may be reckoned at £3,000,000 sterling,—a sum not much exceeding, if it does not fall short of, that raised for the civil list of this happy country of Great Britain, together with the sinecures and pensions. Here is the true vulnerable spot—here the ulcer that eats into us. If we cannot bring the annual outgoing of Great Britain into something like a more reasonable proportion to that of other—and those other rival—states, the proportion between British *power* and theirs will every day exhibit a lamentable and fearful alteration.

POLAND.—The Poles are evidently in earnest, and if we may judge by such fragments of information as reach us, seem to be fully aware of the awful struggle which they will have to undergo. The St. Petersburgh letters, on the other hand, intimate that the Emperor will allow no alternative but unconditional submission, or a war of vengeance. It is pretended that the Russian people are enthusiastic in their cries of "Down with the Poles!" Slaves as the great body of the nation are, we can scarcely believe in this ardour on their parts for the destruction of their brother slaves: if the fact be true, it will indeed be another lamentable proof of the frightful degradation which despotism produces on the human character. But we are incredulous, nor can we attach any credit to the statement of a writer who has the effrontery to talk of the "magnanimous treatment which Poland has experienced from "Russia." If a man who has been knocked down and robbed may reasonably be expected to be grateful to the robber who flings him back half-a-crown out of the spoil, then may Poland applaud the magnanimity of a nation which has torn away its fairest provinces, oppressed its most distinguished subjects, and trampled on its ancient and cherished institutions. No: terrible as the conflict must be between powers so unequally matched, we confess we derive some hope, not merely from seeing all the eminent names of the existing generation of Poles at the head of the insurrection, but also from the certainty of those numerous grievances which have stung the whole population into a determined and energetic resistance to a powerful despot.—*Times.*

His Majesty has been graciously pleased to order one hundred pounds to be paid in aid of the subscription fund established at Newcastle, for the relief of the shipwrecked mariners in the Greenland fishery, and this sum has accordingly been transmitted by Gen. Wheatley, his Majesty's privy-purse keeper, to the Newcastle Bank. This money is to be divided between the ports of Newcastle, Hull, and Aberdeen.

THE FITZCLARENCE FAMILY.—The marriage of Miss Amelia Fitzclarence with Lord Falkland has completed the matrimonial alliances of that family in the female line with the Nobility of England. This fine family consisted of nine children, all the females of which (five in number) are now married. The husbands of these ladies are, the Earl of Errol, the Hon J. Erskine Kennedy (second son of Earl Cassilis,) Mr. P. Sidney (only son of Sir James Sidney,) the Hon. Col. Fox, and Lord Falkland. The only unmarried members of this family are Captain Adolphus Fitzclarence, R. N.; and the Rev. Augustus Fitzclarence, Rector of Maple, Durham.—*Court Journal.*

COLOMBIA.

From the New York Observer.

DEATH OF BOLIVAR.—The Norfolk Beacon of the 8th inst. acknowledges the receipt of late Jamaica papers, which contain intelligence of the death of BOLIVAR. He died on the 17th of December at 1 o'clock P. M. The following particulars are from the Jamaica Chronicle, of January 8th:—

The Liberator expired on the 17th Dec at San Pedro, Alejandrino, a country seat, about a league from Santa Martha in a calm collected manner, confessing and receiving the sacrament at the same time. He made his will, and in every respect, evinced such greatness of soul that he neither spoke against his enemies nor recommended any of his friends. His body was embalmed, and laid in state for three days at the Custom House, the front of which appeared in magnificent mourning, with a monument therein. It is almost impossible to imagine the anxiety that was manifested to get a view of the remains of their Liberator, the staircase being often impassable, from the numbers ascending and descending. His funeral took place on the 20th, and so splendidly and with so much order was it conducted, that the inhabitants of Santa Martha, in the midst of their grief that overwhelmed them for their irreparable loss, were pleased to see so much love and gratitude manifested to so worthy a personage. The ceremony lasted four hours, and in the Holy Cathedral Church a magnificent and tasteful funeral decoration was prepared, which added greatly to solemnize the scene.—The populace flocked there in crowds, to see the last of their beloved leader. The Militia behaved with so much discipline, that no regiment of the line could exceed it. The Band played two funeral marches, and the Moro fortress fired a cannon every half hour, the bells responding with double force. Such is a faint description of what Santa Martha has done on the occasion of the irreparable loss of the "Immortal Founder of Colombia."

The following Proclamation was issued by the Prefect of the Department, announcing his death to the inhabitants:

CITIZENS OF MAGDALENA.—Penetrated with the greatest grief, I am overwhelmed with sorrow. The Father of our Country is no more! The public calamities and the ingratitude of his enemies, have brought him to an untimely grave on the 17th inst. at 1 P M. His end has been hastened by his heroic sacrifices for his country, and the tears of his friends attest the sincerity of their grief for the loss of a hero, whose name must be forever emblazed in the hearts of his countrymen.

CITIZENS.—The Liberator has been devoted to you to the latest period of his existence. Hear his voice, and respect his decrees, which should we violate, the notional ruin must be the infallible result, and the independence of Colombia will die with the hero who gave her liberty.

CITIZENS,—The Liberator has left us forever. We must be unanimous, and go hand in hand for the good of the Union, and secure what he has already achieved for us—obeying the actual Government, in order to liberate us from anarchy, and our conduct will correspond with the Liberator's desires Remain firmly united together, and swear on his grave to follow up the dictates which his inspired mind laid down for the good of his country, and by this means we shall honor his memory, and discharge a heavy debt of gratitude.

JUAN DE FRANCISCO DE MARTIN.

Carthagena, Dec 21. 1830.

Address of the General commanding the armies De La Plaza y Provincia, to the Troops.

Soldiers!—The Son of Colombia has set! Its beneficial rays have ceased to illuminate this unhappy land! The father of his Country!!—The illustrious Bolivar, is no more!!! One hundred years of mourning are not sufficient to demonstrate to his precious remains all our gratitude—all our love—all our regret!!

Soldiers—You well know what a severe loss Colombia has sustained in the death of Bolivar—a loving Father—a faithful Soldier—a wise Magistrate, and the best protector of humanity!

Soldiers—Our Liberator, confiding always in your patriotism, your virtues, and the affection you always showed him, has made but one request, which you will find in his dying speech:—You cannot possibly refuse it; honor his death, for in fulfilling this last sacred duty, your country will reap a thousand benefits from your submission. I beseech you to it, and will be the first to subject myself blindly to the last wishes of the benefactor of Colombia.

Carthagena, Dec. 21, 1830. IGNACIO DE LUQUE.

The following is the last decree of Bolivar:

THE LIBERATOR, TO THE CITIZENS OF COLOMBIA — You have aided me in concentrating my forces to cherish liberty where tyranny had fixed its abode. I have unceasingly and disinterestedly exerted my best energies for your welfare. I have even abandoned my fortune and my personal tranquillity in your cause. My enemies abuse your credulity, and endeavor to destroy my reputation by questioning my love of liberty; and fellow citizens, I grieve to say it, that I am the victim of my persecutors, who have now conducted me almost to my grave; but I pardon them.

My affection for my country will not permit me to sanction on any extraordinary funeral obsequies. My last desire and my last hope is,—to see the consolidation of my beloved country. Let all unite for the good of the union—let the people confide in the actual Gouernment, to save them from anarchy—let the Priests offer up their orisons to Heaven, and the soldier regard his sword as the best guarantee for preserving the institutions of his country.

COLOMBIANS, I leave you; but my last prayers are offered up for the tranquility of Colombia: and if my death will contribute to this desirable end, by a discontinuance of party feeling, and consolidate the union, I shall descend with feelings of contentment into the tomb, which will soon be prepared for me. SIMON BOLIVAR.

Signed at the Camp of Haciendo, a league from Santa Martha, 19th December 1830.

NEW-BRUNSWICK.

LEGISLATIVE DEBATES.

(Continued from Supplement.)

FREDERICTON, Wednesday, February 23.

SCHOOL BILL RE-COMMITTED.

On the 4th section.——Mr. *Smith* observed, that he could see no reason why female teachers should not receive equal payment with males. He thought there should be no difference between them. If a woman is competent to teach, and performs her duty in the school, her services are worth as much as those of a man.

Mr. Conard concurred. He would agree to limiting the number of female schools, but would pay females equally with males.

Mr. Speaker was inclined to make a moderate allowance for female schools, but he thought if the bill provided too greatly for them, it would defeat the desired object, as the bill might then meet with opposition altogether. He thought it would be better to abandon the bill altogether, and let the present law remain, than to give more than £10 per year bounty to female schools, or to allow more than two in each parish.

Mr. Conard thought Mr. Speaker's fears unnecessary. If the bill were sent up and should come back rejected, it would then be time enough to alter it, and send up such as might be passed above. It was very important to establish female teachers, and he would be for giving them every possible advantage.

Mr. End had not the experience in these matters of Mr. Speaker, nor the facetious eloquence of our Hon Member for Westmoreland, (Mr. Scott). The latter gentleman had, yesterday, made every body laugh, by his vivacious wit; but he (Mr. End,) nevertheless, believed that he had not convinced any body by his arguments. He was surprised and grieved to hear Hon. Members object to giving female teachers the same allowance as males. He thought he could shew very plainly, not only that female schools are entitled to equal, but even to more consideration, than male schools. He had found, on turning over the pages of history of all ages, that the first impressions imprinted by mothers on the minds of children, are the most durable, and conducive to the formation of character in after life. When the tender wax of youth receives a good impression from the mother, the beneficial result will afterwards be evident. As the twig is bent so will the tree be inclined. The best results follow from proper maternal instruction. The country now labours, nay, groans, under the want of female teachers. The sad misconduct which has occurred in male schools, renders a reform imperatively necessary. Many female children had been seduced by male teachers. There had been abominable conduct of the kind at Miramichi, and horrid conduct in Dorchester. If there existed no other reason for female teachers, this was quite enough.—As to the value of the time of females, he (Mr. E.) had heard no argument to prove it to be less than that of males. Males can do many things out of school hours. They may post books, collect accounts, &c. But females have no such opportunities. They must give their sole and exclusive attention to their schools, and ought to be paid accordingly. All the arguments to the contrary, which had been adduced were without foundation. Female schools are pre-eminently useful. They have been found to work well where they have been hitherto established. Such schools were not in contravention, but in furtherance of the law. No difficulty had ever been found in getting a license for Mrs. Smith, of Newcastle, who had for some years had a school there. He (Mr. E.) thought every man—every father, every brother, must be so convinced of the necessity of female schools, that he was surprised to hear any arguments on the other side. He hoped the Commitee would take into consideration the arguments in favour of females.

Mr. Scott thought the Hon. Member for Gloucester incorrect in his arguments respecting females, and also as to what he had said respecting him (Mr. S.)—He (Mr. E.) had said that he (Mr. S.) had yesterday made an eloquent speech. Now he certainly had not, for he was not capable of doing so. He had also charged him with displaying a great deal of wit. Now he (Mr. S.) laid no claim to wit; did not believe he had any; had never pretended to have any. As to not convincing any body; he (Mr. S.) believed he really did convince a number of Hon. Members. But he could not say whether the conviction still lasted or not, because he had heard it said,

"*Convince a man against his will,*
And he's of the same opinion still."—

He thought the Hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. Conard,) appeared to be fully convinced of his duty to the fair sex, in every respect but one, and that was, wrapping them up in the holy bands of matrimony. He believed the Hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. End,) had but recently tied the bonds of matrimony, and he supposed he is so enraptured with its comforts, and with the value of the fair sex, that he wishes to give £90 a year to every bit of a girl that takes to teaching a school. He (Mr S.) thought however that the house should deal justly. They should deal out the public money so as to make it as equally beneficial to the people as possible. They should take into consideration the value of women's wages, which are always much lower than men's. He thought a bounty of £10 quite enough, or, even too much, to give to a female teacher. He should by all means oppose any higher sum. Women's expenses are much less than men's, and their time therefore much less valuable. If £20 a year should be given to every woman that would teach a school, the people would soon be unable to get any male teachers that were good for any thing.

Mr. S. Humbert thought there might be a possibility of extending beneficial views too far, and they should therefore be cautious.—Mr. H. deprecated too much indulgence of jocularity in debate)—As to the assertion that gross misconduct had occurred in schools taught by male teachers, in some counties, he thought that no rule why it should be the same throughout the country. It was a matter of profound regret, that such occurrences had taken place, and hon. gentlemen had done their duty in mentioning them. As to the matter in question, he (Mr. H.) was disposed to be as liberal as any man. But he thought they might go too far.—They might draw the bow too tight, and it might break. They should be careful to keep within bounds. He (Mr. H.) did not think female teachers entitled to an equality of pay with males [Mr. Smith explained.]

Mr. Chandler trusted all the hon. members had but one object; the diffusion of general education. But in passing an act like the present, reference must be had to the state of the public funds. If hon. members merely consulted their feelings as men, as fathers, as brothers, they might be very liberal in the matter. But in that house it was necessary they should be influenced by a due consideration of the revenue, and the expenses attending the proposed measure. Looking at it in this way, however hon. members, and especially the hon. member for Gloucester, might be disposed to follow the benevolent impulses of a generous heart, they would find it inexpedient to go beyond the usual sum granted to schools; or, if they did so, they must restrict the number of schools. As to female teachers: if it should be found that two female schools can be established with the same expense as one male, the public will derive a benefit from the regulation. He (Mr. C.) thought the females themselves, who might be affected by this bill, would gladly engage their services for the sum of £10 bounty, in addition to the private subscription. Such women are generally in poor circumstances, and the ensuring such an income would, no doubt, be a sufficient inducement to them. The public would thus derive the benefit of two teachers instead of one.—But the royal instructions were never intended to apply to women. They only intended to provide for the appointment of male teachers, competent to their duties, and of strict morality. Trustees might have granted licenses to females, but such licenses were contrary to the law. If it had not been so, the provisions of this bill, authorising the employment of females, would have been unnecessary.—As to the criminal occurrence in Miramichi; that was the only instance which had occurred in that very large county. The solitary nature of the circumstance alluded to, was a proof that the mischief is by no means common, or to be feared as likely to be so.—As to the bill itself, he would beg hon. members to remember, that it was not in their power to give all they might wish. He hoped they would endeavour to square the act with the state of the revenue, and be governed by that principle. As to the warm hearted arguments of the hon. member for Gloucester, they were an honor to him, and to his nation, which is so distinguished by such liberal feelings; but in his (Mr. C's) opinion, they could not be allowed to have any effect on this bill. The hon. gent. had, probably, been more influenced by his feelings than by long reflection on the subject. He (Mr. C.) was not disposed to allow £20 to female teachers, nor much alteration in the bill.

Mr. Conard observed, that improper conduct in male schools had happened in more counties than those which had been named; and it, therefore, any part of the people found women's schools desirable, the bounty ought to be equally allotted to them. Many men come into the country and obtain situations as schoolmasters, without any previous knowledge of them by the trustees or people; and they might, therefore, be very improper characters to entrust in such situations. But where the people wish to appoint women as teachers, the women and their circumstances are well known, and they ought therefore, being considered competent, to have an equal allowance with men.—The allusion to female servants' wages was irrelevant and improper. No comparison ought to be instituted between a dairy maid and a teacher; and that therefore formed no reason for regulating the pay.

[Mr. Brown, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Slason, & Mr. Clinch, severally expressed their sentiments, and thought the rate of male and female teachers' remuneration should be different.—The latter gentleman observed, that some hon. members were very warm hearted in favour of female schools; they were therefore, at least, entitled to the thanks of the ladies.]

[The section of the bill was agreed to, giving an allowance of £10 to male semi annual schools; £20 to male annual schools; £5 to female semi annual schools; and £10 to female annual schools.]

Some few further observations were made on subsequent portions of the bill; in the course of which, Mr. End took occasion to remark that he would oppose the bill in every stage, while it limited the number of female schools, and lessened the allowance to female teachers. A great many compliments had been paid to his (Mr. E's) heart, at the expense of his head. He reminded Hon. Members, that it was an Irish heart; that its feelings must come out, in some way or other; and that, perhaps, if they did not escape in that way, they might come out in the shape of a leprosy.

The Bill was agreed to with amendments.

[Mr. Scott proposed an amendment to the Bill, to provide female trustees of schools, as well as female teachers; fearing that young male trustees might be too partial to young female teachers, and also that it might not be proper to allow the qualifications of female teachers to be examined by male trustees.—Amendment negatived.]

ELECTION LAWS.

Committee of whole House on the Bill to regulate the qualifications of Representatives in Assembly.—Mr. J. Humbert in the Chair.

Mr. S. Humbert stated that this bill was intended to repeal the old election laws, and to provide a new law. This was a very important matter. Many doubts had arisen as to the execution of the old laws, which ought to be obviated. Some of those laws ought to be repealed. He hoped the committee would turn their attention to the subject, and, in the course of the discussion of the bill, suggest such amendments as they might deem suitable to the wants of their respective counties. Great difficulties had arisen at elections under the present laws, as to the qualification of electors. Most of them were of the lower class of the people; and many of them very illiterate. It frequently happened, that as the poll they were called upon to swear as to their qualifications, &c., without even knowing the meaning of the words of the oath. One object of this bill was, to simplify the oaths. The first amendment proposed by this bill was contained in one word. It consisted in defining by the word "*male*," those members of society who are entitled to vote.—Questions had arisen, as to the qualification of female voters. Such questions were hitherto undecided, as it appears by the law at present, that females may vote. But such a course was certainly objectionable. The word "male" would obviate every difficulty in this respect. Another difficulty existing, was as to the title on which a freeholder may vote. This required to be rendered more explicit.—Another reason for a new law was, the necessity of consolidating all such parts of the old laws, as it might be expedient to retain.

On the reading of the First Section of the Bill, which went to repeal all the existing laws on Elections—

Mr Weldon thought the present act relating to the trial of contravverted elections, commonly called a copy or child of the Granville act, a very good one. It had been found a very good law in the mother country, and in the neighbouring colonies, from practical experience; and he (Mr. W.) could not see any necessity for repealing it. He should go against the repeal of that act.

Mr. Partelow thought it inexpedient at present to repeal that particular act. If necessary to repeal it, it might be done afterwards, by a separate bill. As to the other provisions of this bill, he accorded with the sentiments of his Hon Colleague, the mover of it.

Mr. S. Humbert acknowledged his intentions were to repeal that act altogether. Notwithstanding its great parent and high origin, he did not think it at needed in this province. The country wanted an election law more simple in its operation, and less expensive. That act had been passed unnecessarily, merely because it had existed elsewhere. The country had gone on peaceably and orderly without it, and did not require it. It had produced very pernicious effects. He was bold to say, that that law had kept petitioners from coming before the House for scrutinies in cases of undue elections. It obliges a petitioning candidate to swear that he is worth £400, before he can come before the House.—What reason was there for this? If petitioners could come to the House as they could have done before the passing that act, they could get scrutinies promptly, and the people would be satisfied. There were many good and sufficient men in the county, capable of serving their fellow-men in this House, and likely to be chosen, who could not put their hands on their hearts, and say they were worth £400. Yet they must do so or they could not come to that House. That requisition was necessary to be repealed. The law in question was founded on tyranny and oppression. A man might have a great extent of property, but it might be mortgaged, and therefore he would be prevented from serving his countrymen in that House. Yet if such a man were returned, who among his constituents would complain of his want of property? Who would raise a murmur against it? Why then should the law prevent it? Such a law ought never to have existed. The sooner it dies, the better for the country.—There were now two laws on the same subject in existence. The original law, which was intended to be superseded by this Granville act, was, nevertheless, not repealed by it. Which, therefore, is to be acted on? The old law allows a person to sit as a member, although his property may be mortgaged; but the later law says he shall not, yet does not repeal the former law. Here is a clashing of interests.—Look also at the language of this new law. "Whereas it is deemed expedient"—to do what?—Do we ever come here to letter and abridge the rights and privileges of the people? No. We come here to guard, and not to sacrifice those rights. But this act says, it is deemed expedient "*to limit and restrain!*"—Such an enactment is unconstitutional. It is inconsistent with every principle of honor and justice. The members of this House cannot restrain the rights of their constituents. If such a thing has been done by this act, the sooner it is repealed the better. It is an iniquitous law. For my own part, if I had my will, I could not sleep another night without repealing it.—The law has been already acted on with great reluctance. Laws should be respected and cheerfully acted on, not executed with reluctance.

Mr. End thought this bill of great importance. Much as he had often admired the principles, the sentiments, and the practice of the hon. member who had just sat down, he confessed he could not see the use of such expressions as he (Mr. H.) had just uttered.—Perfection could not be expected in any person, or in any law. He (Mr. End) thought many amendments might be made in the old law, and some few in the later law. But the House should be very cautious in making such amendments. He would concur in some things which had been observed by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. H.) but not in others. He did not think this law was founded in tyranny and oppression; though there were certainly some grievances in it. As to the recognizances required to be entered into by a petitioning candidate, and the oath that he was worth £400, he (Mr. E.) thought this part of the law very pernicious, and necessary to be repealed. It restrains the liberties of the people. He never was an advocate for making the qualification of candidates so very high; for the same reason that he advocated the payment of members; viz.—because he thought the people should not be compelled to choose rich men to represent them—they should have the liberty of choosing such men as they felt would be suitable, even tho' they were not members of the aristocracy. The House certainly did do away with the rights of the people, by making any law to secure election to rich men. This might and should be amended.—(The hon. member, we believe, alluded to the referring questions of qualification of members to a select committee, and especially to the case of the petition of G. F. Street, Esq. lately so referred.)—He (Mr. E.) felt every principal of his heart aroused, when he saw a question of mere qualification moved to be referred to a select committee, and not determined by a committee of the whole house.—He did not think the mode of proceeding under the old law at all respectable or proper. A select committee could not swear witnesses. Who would be satisfied to have such questions settled by the evidence of witnesses, who could not be sworn? Certainly such persons should be sworn; but there was no provision for such purpose in the old law. The colonial Granville act amended that.—He did not think that act could well be amended, without throwing down the whole fabric.—As to female voters; women and infants in law certainly ought not to vote. The doctrine of such persons being incompetent, is well laid down in the general law. If, then, this is the written law, it ought to be strictly followed. It is manifestly improper for women to interfere in such matters. The law also is positive on the subject. He (Mr. E.) therefore highly approved of the principle on which the word "male" is introduced into the present bill.—Another amendment requisite is, with regard to the oath to be administered to freeholders at the poll. It is certainly a direct assault on humanity and common sense, to oblige a man to swear as to his qualifications, without knowing what are the qualifications required by law. [Here the hon. member's voice sunk a little, and a few sentences fell short of our station.] Another grievance to which the hon member objected, was the discretion now given the Sheriff as to the times and places of holding the poll. He would as quickly as possible have the house relieve themselves from the operation of such discretion; and have the time and place of holding polls throughout the Province specifically set forth. He would have a committee appointed, to ascertain at what parts of every county it would be expedient to have polls held; and by enacting accordingly, relieve all candidates from the tremendous power now possessed by the Sheriff.

Mr Partelow believed the whole House was of opinion that some amendments of the election law were necessary. The only objection he had to this bill, was, the inexpediency of repealing all the laws by this bill.—If the hon. mover would allow the expunging of that part which went to repeal the colonial Granville act, he (Mr P.) would be satisfied. He certainly approved of the general principles of the bill. But if it were to effect such a sweeping repeal, it might not pass in another quarter.

Mr. S. Humbert arrogated no merit in preparing or bringing forward this bill. It was a duty he owed to his county. He had pledged himself to his constituents to endeavour to get the election laws consolidated and amended. He wished to have this object effected under the dictation and direction of the House. He had no objection to modify the repealing clause, if some Hon. Member would appropriately amend the section.—He (Mr. H.) was very happy that the Hon. Member for Gloucester (Mr. End,) had so clearly shown his wisdom and discretion, in stating such amendments of the law as he deemed expedient. He (Mr. H.) hoped other hon. Members would also candidly do the same; and that the House would make the law as complete as possible.

Mr Conard was happy to go with the Hon. Member for St. John (Mr Humbert,) in general, because his views are usually so very liberal; but tho' that Hon. Gentleman had approved of the remarks uttered by the hon. Member for Gloucester, he (Mr. C.) thought them very futile, and mere sophistical reasoning.—If the Law defined the qualifications of electors, should it not also define those of candidates?—If the whole wisdom of the county were contained in the heads of the lower classes, it might be proper to give them the right of sitting in that house; but when every good qualification was found in men of property, men of rather better station in society, he (Mr. C.) thought such men ought to be elected. Much reference had been made as to the late decision of the House, with respect to a petition against an Hon. Member for want of due qualification. That decision was such as he [Mr. C.] had wished to see. He hoped never to see the guard removed, which had caused that decision. He hoped never to see a controverted election tried at the bar of that house. The select committee would fairly try the cause. He felt perfectly satisfied that the decision of the Committee would be equitable. Such a mode of trying such cases would be a great saving to the country; as, in the mean time the House could be proceeding with other business. This was one effect of the Colonial Granville act. Another very important provision of that act he would mention. Before the passing of that act, a petition against a return might be brought in with impunity, without a shadow of ground for complaint. Certainly persons aggrieved ought to have every facility in obtaining redress. But if a petition has no foundation, it has no right to come before this House. The Granville act provides, that where a petition is frivolous or vexatious, the petitioner shall pay all expenses caused by its presentation. He [Mr. C.] could never wish to see encouragement given to frivolous and vexatious petitions; petitions that would harass others, without paying their expenses.—As to the conditions of the oath, which a voter is required to take. The party is required to swear he has a freehold of a certain value, and that he is qualified to vote.—By the same rule which enabled him to judge the value of his freehold, he would be capable of judging of his qualification to vote. When sworn, he is qualified to vote according to the law. The same common sense which would enable him to swear to the one matter, would enable him to swear to the other. If he should happen to have the misfortune to be a fool, why he could do no harm; for in his (Mr C's) opinion, he certainly would not be accountable for that which he did not understand. He [Mr. C.] did not see the propriety of doing away with the Granville Act.

Mr. Weldon had no objection to the section of the bill under consideration, providing the repealing clause could be modified as proposed. The Hon. Member then proceeded to advocate the benefits of the Granville act, and to prove the necessity there had been for passing it.—He also contended for the evident justice of compelling petitioners to pay the expences caused to sitting Members, by frivolous and vexatious petitions.

Mr. S. Humbert commented to the modification of the repealing clause, but contended that there had been no need of passing the Granville act, and stated that members in the House at the time of passing it had been unaware of its contents, and would have opposed it if they had been so.

Mr. Taylor said a few words, which were almost wholly inaudible to us. We understood the sentiments of the Hon. Gentleman, on the matter in question, to be somewhat similar to those of Mr. Weldon.

Mr. Chandler expressed himself very favorable at all times to the consolidation of the laws. Whatever might now be the opinion of Hon. Members as to the operation of the Colonial Granville act, he (Mr. C.) believed it was fully understood at the time it was passed, that it was a necessary measure. Committees formerly met and decided questions as to elections, without the forms and solemnities now in force. It was then strenuously contended against such Committees, that they were invested with very large large powers, administered no oaths, and observed no solemnities in their proceedings. On this account the House saw fit to pass the Granville act.—As to the terms, "tyranny and oppression;" he (Mr. C.) really did not understand the expressions. To whom, or to what, were they intended to apply? Was it to the whole body of members who passed the Granville act, or to any individuals, that these expressions were intended to apply? In either case, he thought the Hon. Member for St. John, mistaken in the view which had caused him to utter them. He (Mr. C.) thought such observations uncalled for and unnecessary. What had been the monstrous inconveniences occasioned by resorting to the act in question, in the case lately before the House?—A petition had come before the House, respecting the qualification of an Hon. Member. A select committee had been chosen from the members of the House. The names had been duly drawn, and properly objected to and struck off by the parties, until a proper committee was legally formed. That committee would be bound by oath, to decide according to the evidence. The evidence will be duly examined by them, and no improper evidence will be received. Was there any thing objectionable or oppressive in such a course as this? Formerly, great prejudices had existed against Committees, because their proceedings were secret. But this is not the case now. They are publicly appointed by the House. They will sit in a place where the public may have free access; the whole of the evidence may be publicly heard; and it is only when the members wish to deliberate and consult among themselves, that other parties will be ordered to retire. He (Mr. C.) could not see how such a proceeding could be said to be founded in tyranny and oppression; nor how it can operate to the prejudice of persons asking relief under the election laws. The present act certainly operates to prevent