

COUNTING-HOUSE CALENDAR, FOR THE YEAR 1828.

Calendar table for 1828 showing months from January to December with days of the week and dates.

Post-Office, Fredericton, November 9, 1827.

PUBLIC Notice is given, that at Wednesday next, the Mails for Halifax, St. John, &c. &c., which have heretofore left this Office on Wednesday, will in future be dispatched at 5 o'clock on Tuesday Evening, and it is requested that all Letters, intended to be forwarded by that day's Mail, will be entered by 4 o'clock.

Wm. B. PHAIR, Post Master.

UNITED STATES.

[FROM THE NATIONAL JOURNAL] To those who may have been apprehensive that the exclusion of our vessels from the direct trade to the British Colonies would cripple our commerce, it will be satisfactory to learn, that no such result has either taken place, or is to be numbered among the probable consequences of this measure.

COMMENTS.—Admitting for the present, and only for the present, for we do not believe it, the correctness of the statement here made, we then say, that in order to justify the remark here so flippantly made by the leading administration print at Washington, it will not be necessary for the writer to show us what is the present actual amount of the value of the colonial trade as now enjoyed, subject to its great inconveniences and losses, but we ought also to be informed what it would have been, had it been permitted to go on as had been customary for years before. The British Government had declared by an Act of Parliament, that it was ready to agree with any nation, (and of course with us) which would pass acts opening their ports to her, to open hers to them on equal terms. Instead of availing ourselves of the offer, our administration absolutely refused to accede to the terms, alleging for their reason, that they forsooth preferred an arrangement by treaty to a law; and they persisted in adhering to this impertinent and trifling preference, against the solemn warning of some of our best and wisest statesmen. The Executive was, however, doggedly obstinate, and insisted upon having its own way, or none at all.—Accordingly, the disastrous consequences that had been foreseen and pointed out, took place: the English Government having waited nearly two years in vain, and finding nothing done, or likely to be done, issued the order in council, interdicting all colonial trade in American bottoms. And this is what the message calls a "sudden and unexpected exclusion by the British Government, of access in vessels of the United States to all their colonial ports!" But we are truly happy to be informed, through the origin of the administration paper, that, after all, "no such result as had been apprehended has taken place, or is likely to take place;" although the President, to be sure admits in terms, that "the adoption of this measure has harshly affected the interest of the United States"—and that "the British Government have manifested no disposition to recede from it (their order in council). We have been given distinctly to understand, (says the same message,) that neither of the bills which were under consideration of Congress at their last session, would have been deemed sufficient in their concessions to have been rewarded (yes...rewarded!) by a relaxation of the British interdiction." It so, it may be regarded as rather disastrous information, and which we certainly did not look for, after being informed by her minister at Washington, Mr. Vaughan, that had bills of a similar nature passed, he had instructions from his government then in his pocket to accept them, and conclude an amicable arrangement instantly. If, then, other and different views prevail in the British cabinet since, have we not additional cause to lament that the opportunity was not embraced when we certainly had it completely in our power to embrace it, and to secure, permanently, this great source of national wealth and national strength? Can candor or kindness itself avoid heaping censure and reproaches upon the heads of those through whose blind obstinacy this trade was lost, and, as we are told forever? We are

strongly inclined to think, however, that instead of the word "forever," it would have been a better reading to have said "during the existence in power of the present ill-fated administration, guided as it is by a man whose unremitting rancour to the British nation renders any amicable accommodation on favourable terms, while he remains in power, utterly hopeless. We may spare ourselves, therefore, the trouble and expense of sending of a successor to Mr. Galatin to England, for if the capacity and shrewdness of this statesman, with the aid of his great experience, could not procure such accommodation, we may resign all hopes to secure it, by the abilities of any one, until a change takes place in the state of things at home.—N. Y. Evening Post.

COLONIAL.

From the Quebec Official Gazette, Dec. 13.

THE SPEAKER.

We recur to this subject, rather as to one of literary enquiry and amusement, than as hoping to convey any information which will bear more strongly and convincingly on the question, than the numerous authorities already quoted. The more we read, enquire into, and reflect upon the subject, the more indisputable appears the right of rejection on the part of the Crown; and the more impregnable the position taken by the Executive in consequence of that right. The additional authorities, which we this day adduce, prove the uniform practice on the part of three Colonial Governors under the same circumstances; and this very uniformity, each of the three making the same unqualified assertion of the Royal Prerogative, ought to weigh considerably in favor of its just and correct exercise. In fact, the evidence which has been adduced by the witnesses who have been brought *coram iudice* and submitted to popular examination, establish so incontrovertibly the point for which we perhaps unnecessarily contend, that we do not hesitate to say, in any Court of Law and with any Jury, it would be irresistible. It must be remembered that in addition to the practice of the three Colonial Governors, quoted below, we have already adduced that of the Lieutenant Governor of NOVA SCOTIA; and in the STAR of yesterday, we perceive also a precedent in BERMUDA to the same effect, the whole forming a mass of testimony, afforded by five different persons under similar circumstances, impossible to be gainsaid or shaken.

Whatever may have been the immediate views of the majority of the House of Assembly, in persisting in a course which they knew would render their meeting nugatory and their Session abortive...whether it arose from their unconquerable devotion to the merits, character and conduct of Mr. PAPINEAU, or from a not, perhaps, ill-grounded fear that the communication which HIS EXCELLENCY the GOVERNOR in CHIEF had announced himself as ready to make to them on the part of HIS MAJESTY, respecting the state of the Province, would contain matter unpalatable, and destructive of the influence they have obtained over a deluded people...we say it is matter of congratulation, that by committing an overt act against Parliamentary Law, and Royal Prerogative, they have at last joined issue on the general question, to be tried in a Superior Court, whither it must speedily be removed for final decision. The KING and the PARLIAMENT OF ENGLAND must now judge between the rights of the Crown and the Representatives of this Province... the voice of the nation will be heard, and its sense taken, on a question not difficult to be

understood; and which, when ultimately decided, will prove most clearly, how much safer a course it would have been on the part of our Assembly, to have reverentially followed the practice of ages, than to commit themselves to a contest they cannot maintain, without the greatest inconvenience to the people, whose interests they are bound to consult, free from any bias of personal views, motives or prejudices. It would have been no degradation in our House of Assembly to have followed the courteous practice of the House of COMMONS OF GREAT BRITAIN...it would have been more creditable to their discernment, and a special proof of their fitness for the exercise of the power delegated to them by that HOUSE OF COMMONS, to have paused for a while, until they had well weighed the bearing of the authorities to be produced against the systematic course they have taken. It was, indeed, a most extraordinary and suspicious unanimity on the part of the majority...it was truly remarkable, that among forty individuals, there was not one that did not think the welfare of the Province, and the reception of HIS MAJESTY'S communication, objects to be postponed to the personal gratification and mischievous ambition of one individual. Was there no moderate man in the majority, willing to sacrifice the prosecution of a favorite plan to the public good?...not one, in the popular Assembly of LOWER CANADA! Not one to suggest an expedient, not one to recommend Mr. PAPINEAU himself to withdraw, not one to raise a warning voice against the lengths that some among them seem determined to go, at all hazards and consequences! The British Empire will judge of this singular unanimity in violence, and pronounce, we doubt not, a memorable decision on the premises.

Mr. Neilson's paper, of Thursday last, asserts that it "has never been denied, that the King has a right to disapprove of the Speaker elected by the Commons. All that has been contended in opposition to the late exercise of this right, in this Province, is, that it has been exercised contrary to the usage of Parliament for the last 150 years, during the whole of which time, the usage has been to approve of the choice of the House." Nothing can surpass the sophistry of this passage, but is the writer vain enough to expect, that it will not be readily detected by the public, who have perused the authorities adduced on our side? If the House of Assembly never meant to deny this right altogether, then there is no meaning in words, or we are incapable of understanding, rightly, those of Mr. CUVILLER or his Resolutions. Mr. NEILSON says, it is "the exercise of this right" only which is objected to; Mr. CUVILLER in his Resolution tells us, and we prefer him as an authority for his own meaning, that the GOVERNOR has no right by the Constitutional Act to refuse, because his approval is not required. Let any one compare the Resolutions themselves with Mr. NEILSON'S sophistical statement, and he may convince himself whether the House did, or did not, palpably deny the right of Rejection. The assertion that "the usage has been to approve of the choice of the House," is an attempt to deceive the public. Show, one instance where an obnoxious Speaker has been presented to the KING, and approved; and it would only demonstrate, that HIS MAJESTY did not choose to exercise the right of rejection... but no such instance can be shown, because the Commons never presented a person liable to be refused. If, therefore, "usage," as Mr. N. says, "is the Law of Parliament," which we admit, the usage of the British Parliament is undeniably against him.