us insane. We prophesy nothing; but this we say—If any person had told the parliament which met in perplexity and terror after the crash in 1720, that in 1830, the wealth of England would surpass their wildest dreams—that the annual revenue would equal the principal of that debt which they considered as an intolerable burden—that for one man of £10,000 then living, there would be five men of fifty thousand: that London would be twice as large, and twice as populous, and that nevertheless the mortality would have diminished one half what it then was,—that the post office would bring more into the exchequer than the excise and customs had brought in together under Charles II.,—that stage-coaches would run from London to York in twenty four hours—that men would *sail* without wind, and would be beginning to ride without horses—our ancestors would have given as much credit to the prediction as they gave to Gulliver's *Travels*. Yet the prediction would have been true; and that they would have perceived that it was not altogether absurd, if they had considered that the country was then raising every year a sum which would have purchased the fee-simple of the revenue of the Plantagenets—ten times what supported the government of Elizabeth—three times what, in the time of Oliver Cromwell, had been thought intolerably oppressive. To almost all men the state of things under which they have been used to live seems to be the necessary state of things. We have heard it said that five per cent is the natural interest of money, that twelve is the natural number of a jury, that forty shillings is the natural qualification of a county voter. Hence it is, that though in every age, every body knows that up to his own time progressive improvement has been taking place, nobody seems to reckon on any improvement during the next generation. We cannot absolutely prove that those are in error who tell us that society has reached a turning point—that we have seen our best days. But so said all who came before us, and with just as much apparent reason. "A million a-year will beggar us," said the patriots of 1640. "Two millions a-year will grind the country to powder," was the cry in 1660. "Six millions a-year, and a debt of fifty millions!" exclaimed Swift—"the high allies have been the ruin of us." "A hundred and forty millions of debt!" said Junius—"well may we say that we owe Lord Chatham more than we shall ever pay, if we owe him such a load as this." "Two hundred and forty millions of debt!" cried all the statesmen of 1783, in chorus—"what abilities, or what economy on the part of a minister, can save a country so burdened?"

(From the St. John's Public Ledger, February 20,)

In the House of Assembly on Wednesday Mr. CARSON brought forward his promised motion for a select committee to examine into certain papers connected with the administration of Justice in this Colony, with power to take evidence thereon. Upon entering the gallery we found the hon. gentleman complaining that he had been unable to obtain all the documents which had been prayed for—he had succeeded in getting some of them, but the most essential ones had been *withheld*, though he did not believe they were in existence. He thought he had succeeded in shewing that the public functionaries of the Island had not performed their duty. It was the duty of the Governor upon the first Monday in every year to swear in a High Sheriff, and it was the duty of the High Sheriff so to be sworn in, before he proceeded upon the business of his office. It was also the duty of the Judges to ascertain that such oath had been taken, which they had neglected to. The Charter which had been granted by his most gracious Majesty had been violated, and that part of it which related to the promulgation of the rules and orders of the Courts had been altogether set aside. It expressly says:—

"And we do hereby, in exercise and in pursuance of the power in us by the said Act of Parliament in that behalf vested, authorise and empower the said Supreme Court of Newfoundland, under such limitations as are hereinafter mentioned, to make and prescribe such rules and orders as may be expedient touching and concerning the forms and manner of proceeding in the said Supreme Court and Circuit Courts respectively, and the practice and pleadings upon all indictments, informations, actions, suits, and other matters to be therein brought, and touching and concerning the appointment of commissioners to take bail and examine witnesses; the taking and examination of witnesses, *de bene esse*, and allowing the same as evidence; the granting of probates of wills and letters of administration; the proceedings of the sheriff and his deputies, and other ministerial officers; the summoning of assessors, for the trial of crimes and misdemeanors in the said Circuit Courts; the process of the said Courts and the mode of executing the same; the empannelling of juries; the admission of barristers, attorneys, and solicitors; the fees, poundage, or perquisites, to be lawfully demanded by any officer, attorney, or solicitor, in the said Courts respectively; and all other matters and things whatsoever, touching the practice of the said Courts, as may be necessary for the proper conduct of business therein."

And now, said the hon gentleman, comes the gist of the business—

"And such rules and orders from time to time to alter, amend, or revoke, as may be requisite. Provided always that no such rules or orders be in any way wise repugnant to the said Act of Parliament or this Charter. Provided further, that all such rules and orders be promulgated in the most public and authentic manner in our said colony for three calender months, at least, before the same shall operate and take effect, and that the same be, by the first convenient opportunity, transmitted through the Governor or Acting Governor of our said Colony, to us, our heirs and successors, for the signification of our or their displeasure, respecting the allowance or disallowance thereof."

It must be in the recollection of many that when the Supreme Court was opened, in 1826, although there was a great pressure of business, the Judges of that day would not enter upon it until the rules and orders had been promulgated three months agreably to the Charter: and as a proof that the Judges could not dispense with such promulgation, at their pleasure, it would be remembered that His Majesty had refused to sanction two of the rules made on that occasion. At that period there were no complaints against the Grand, Special, or Petit Juries; they were empannelled from a rotation list and then selected by ballot—a mode which was quite fair and which wrought well. On December 1833, a new order of things took place. On that day new Judges were sworn in.—There was a new Chief Justice and one Assistant Judge, who rescinded the rules and orders previously acted upon, and introduced a new state of things. There was at that time a great number of criminals, and common sense—common decency ought to have taught them that they ought not to proceed upon a new system, but to act upon the old one. But it was done to serve an aspiring man who chose to do as he pleased—who had made a new set of rules and acted upon them on the day on which he was sworn in. He (Mr. Carson) was in the Court-house on that day, and observed that there was a Jury of boys whom he had a right to suspect were culled, and culled for an improper motive.—It was a serious charge which he now brought before the House—such as had never been brought before the House of Commons. He charged the Governor with appointing a Sheriff without requiring the necessary oath; and he charged the Bench with having violated the Laws and the Charter. He regretted not having obtained all the papers called for, but to supply the deficiency he would investigate those which he had, with power to examine witnesses. He could not get any document to show that a Sheriff had been sworn in on the 1st January 1834. He thought it must appear to every one that he had made out an excellent case, and therefore he would move that copies of the papers prayed for on the 19th January be laid before a select committee who should have leave to examine evidence.

Mr. KENT in seconding the important resolution was never so deeply impressed before with his inability to do justice to the principle sought by his learned friend in support of the motion now before the House. He felt in full force the crying injustice, the daring assumption of power by a high functionary, which had produced the resolution. With this impression his own inability rested more strongly on his mind, because he could not make so deep an impression on the House as the subject deserved. His learned friend had advanced such cogent reasons that no one could dispute the propriety of appointing a committee. He had asserted that the Charter had been violated in all its primitive parts—that so important a functionary as the Sheriff had been illegally appointed—that there was no such functionary in the Island, and that the individual who assumes it, does so unjustly and unconstitutionally. It had been shewn that the rules of Court had been, contrary to the provisions of the Charter, changed. He (Mr. Kent) dared to say that his hon. and learned friend would be told that he was wasting the time of the House and not adopting the proper mode for investigating the matter; but he had many precedents to guide him—that of O'Connell, who, nine months ago moved in the House of Commons for the investigation of the conduct of a Judge for making a political speech on the bench—that was a precedent. But what do the Royal Instructions say?—that no change was to be made in the existing Judicature Act, without the sanction of that Legislature. The Legislature had the power to make any alterations, but it had made none, and what his hon. friend had said was that changes had been made in the Constitution of the Courts, and that the House could not refuse a committee to report on the papers already introduced. If the House does not exercise its privilege, it would be of no use for hon. members to waste their time there in making Acts of Parliament which may be changed by others at pleasure. The Judiciary system went upon Imperial Acts of Parliament which are still in existence, the original rules and orders under it are also in existence still, and every act which had been performed in the late Courts had been illegal. Men had expiated their lives under the sanction of illegal rules; and in his (the hon. John Kent's) opinion every one concerned in promoting the expiation of those lives had been guilty of murder, and if the friends of those men who had suffered, had sufficient means to carry their complaints to the other side of the water, it would require an exercise of that attribute of mercy which resides in the Sovereign to save the Chief Justice of Newfoundland from expiating his life on the scaffold (!!)

Mr ROW had hoped that the gentleman who introduced the resolution would have made out some strong case, as he had promised to do, upon which the House might support the resolution now before it, and that he would not have introduced it for the purpose of criminating certain individuals without strong grounds upon which to proceed. But he did not perceive that the hon gentleman had made out any case to require that the documents should be submitted to a committee. The hon. gentleman had brought forward nothing but vain declamation about the Royal Charter, which was as familiar to every one as household gods.—But the motion had a two-fold object—it was to criminate the sheriff and the Judges of the Supreme Court; and to have made out his case, the hon. gentleman should have pointed out something in those documents upon which the House might grant a committee, for it was not to be forgotten that the object was, (as the hon. mover and seconder had declared,) to attack certain individuals holding very high rank in the colony—to bring them to justice. The hon. gentleman had read some letter, or part of a letter, from he, (Mr Row) knew not whom, nor scacely what about—and from that the House was called upon to grant a committee. With respect to the appointment of the sheriff, it may, or it may not be as the hon. gentleman had stated; but the appointment was in the power of the Crown, and the Governor might, if he pleased, elect the same individual every year. The charter was issued by his Majesty, and certainly it was a duty to act upon it; but when it was said that the appointment was contrary to the Charter, he required that fact to be shown;—and then if there had been even a deficiency in the form, how would that vitiate the office? It rests upon the hon. gentleman's own assertion that the appointment of the sheriff had not been done as it ought, and therefore he would not send the papers to a select committee. It had been stated that the Governor, the sheriff, the judges, and the magistrates and even the House, had not done their duty. But he should like to know in what the House had not done its duty. It had been stated that it was necessary to bring the criminals to justice—that is, the Governor, the sheriff, the judges, the magistrates, and even the House itself, to justice. He, (Mr Row) did not know how the House was going to bring the Governor to justice. Then it was said that the sheriff ought to have sworn in the constables: but that was not the sheriff's duty. He had no objection for the House to investigate the matter, but he did not think it necessary to appoint a select committee; for the object was to find out some means to bring a criminal accusation against some individuals and would it be proper for the House to grant a committee for such a purpose? He thought not, because the effect would be to prejudice those individuals, and if complaints were to be made against public characters, it was proper that they should have a fair trial as well as others. If there were anything in the documents to found a specific motion upon, he had no objection to entertain it; but he could not approve the present proceedings. With respect to the rules of Court, there had been as much light thrown upon that subject, as there had been upon the office of sheriff. It had been stated that the rules had been altered by certain judges before they were sworn into office; but the hon. mover had not shown that, although the documents which the hon. gentleman had in his hands, and which he had doubtless pored over and over again, would probably shew it. An assertion has also been made that a certain Jury or Juries which had been been before the Court had been culled, and that there were boys in it, and the hon. gentleman had said that he had a right to say so. Now, if that statement was untrue, the hon. gentleman had *not* a right to say so; he had no right to come to come to that House and through out criminatory matter against individuals who had not the means of defending themselves, and of saying in contradiction that he had no right to say so. A great deal had been said about the panel of Jurors, at the commencement of the Supreme Court under the Charter. Those rules required a panel of 18 Jurors every day. A year after the passing of the Judicature Act, there was enacted the 6th Geo. 4th, regulating the empannelling of Juries, and the Jury system was then regularly defined, and required that the panel should consist of 48 Jurors, out of which 12 were to be sworn, and it was known, or if not it ought to be known, that criminals on trial for their lives had a right to challenge 20 Jurors; and how was it possible to challenge 20 out of 18? In 1833, there was a number of criminals to be tried for their lives, and would not have been possible to try them under the former system if they had exercised their right of challenge.—there was one prisoner charged with petty treason who had a right to challenge 35, and that would have been impossible if there were less than 48. The prisoner then had the benefit of a choice of 48 instead of 18—and this instead of being considered an act of mercy. was charged as a crime! No man could by an arbitrary rule of the Court be divested of his right of peremptory challenge of 20, and the woman for petty treason could not be divested of her right to challenge 35. Well! the law of England was resorted to, and the prisoners were tried by that law which required the panel of 48. The prisoners had the benefit of their right to challenge, and the public had the benefit of bringing them to trial. At the close of the hon. gentleman's speech he stated that he could not bring a direct charge against the House, and therefore he wanted a select committee. But what was it that he meant?—was it that the select committee might bring a charge against the House itself? The motive seemed to be to cast an odium upon certain individuals, but he (Mr Row) did not see any grounds for imposing that task upon a select committee. Since the hon. gentleman could make no distinct motion in the House, he would oppose the appointment of such committee.

Mr BROWN would support the motion for the purpose of clearing the individuals referred to, or of condemning them. There ought to be no suspicion of impurity in the fountain of justice; and he thought from the state of excitement, which pervaded the public mind upon this subject, nothing but an investigation could set the matter at rest. The Attorney General might be examined, and if he thought the charges groundless, the committee would perhaps, take that opinion.

Mr PACK thought the Charter had been violated and rendered a dead letter. He would support the motion for a select committee.

Mr CARSON offered a few observations in reply, when the question was put, and the House divided,—for the motion, 4; against it 6. The motion was consequently lost.

LONDON, Jan. 6.

We have inserted elsewhere the official tables of the revenue for the quarter ended last night. As compared with the preceding financial year, that just concluded shows, by these returns, an increase of income to the amount of £107,031, but a failing off, upon a contrast of the two corresponding quarters of a sum of £297,694. The Customs and Stamps alone display any improvement upon the whole year, all the other sources of public income a defalcation upon both the periods. Under the head of Customs the dissimilarity of amount from that received during the year ended January 1834, appears enormous, being little short of two millions, while the defalcation in the Excise receipts, upon a comparison of the same periods, is also striking. But this difference is one of form more than substance, and arises from the new arrangement of accounting under one head for duties which used to be credited under another. The apparent advantage in the last year over the preceding one in the Customs is £1,989,707, and upon the quarter £714,434 whilst the defalcation in the Excise is for the two periods—upon the one £1,674,907 and £780,224 respectively. The Stamp duties have proved more productive upon the year by £83,548 but falling off upon the quarter to the amount of £10,650. The Assessed Taxes already shew a falling off upon the year and quarter, the first to the amount of £341,444 and the latter to £175,581. The returns for the Post Office prove deficient on the year in the sum of £25,000 and ought upon the quarter to show a deficit of £1000 though such a result does not appear upon the tables, which is a slight error. Certainly upon a comparison of the receipts of the quarters ending January 5, 1834, and January 5, 1835, £324,000 and £323,000 respectively, the £1000 difference ought to have been carried to the account of decrease of the quarter. The accounts, however, are necessarily made up in haste at the latest moment, and therefore allowance must be made for them. The "miscellaneous" have increased upon the year to the amount of £11,401 but fallen off in an inconsiderable amount on the quarter.—There is in this quarter a trifling increase in the charges upon the Consolidated Fund.—The sum wanted for the service of the quarter, to be raised by Exchequer Bills, is estimated at £5,304,809.

LONDON, Jan. 14.

We have received the entire of the Paris Morning Papers of Monday, and the *Gazette de France*, *Messager*, and the *Journal de Paris* dated yesterday, together with let-