

which the church possesses should be applied to supply that deficiency, and to remove those inconveniences. The petitioners themselves admit, that the evil exists; and it is most desirable, both for the public good and for the good of the Church itself, that those inconveniences should be remedied, and removed. I confess therefore that I heard with astonishment that this petition was got up in the University of Oxford, and that these petitioners prayed that the bill should not pass. My lords, I am of a very different opinion from the petitioners. I am convinced, that no measure could be devised which could more tend to remedy the evils, and to remove those very inconveniences of which the petitioners themselves complain in this petition, and which they say truly attend the parochial system of the church in this country. I think, my lords the Ecclesiastical Commissioners did their duty in recommending this bill. I think it highly creditable to the church, that those inconveniences should be removed by the church itself. I think it highly creditable, that the church should even take the first step in removing those evils, without applying for the assistance of the public money."

If every communicant and *soi-disant* friend of the Church, would take the same clear and common sense view of the question, and have sincerity enough to act up to it, how much better would it not be for the Church itself? But unhappily for the Church, she has too many enemies in her own bosom; men who fawn and fondle only to betray, who love the treason of pleasing flattery more than the loyalty of unpalatable truth.

FROM THE EDINBURGH REVIEW.

We shall take a rapid review of the position in which the Boundary question rests, without however embarrassing our narrative by the detailed history of early times. There is nothing however in that earlier history which does not confirm the conclusions at which we have arrived.

If, up to the present moment, there are considerable doubts in respect to the physical aspect of the country through which the Boundary is to be drawn, how much less informed upon the subject must have been the negotiators of the peace of 1783. At that period the territory could scarcely have had any intrinsic value; and if a more distinct and intelligible line of boundary was not laid down, this omission did not proceed from any wish to leave in doubt an unsettled point, on which disputes might arise in after times. On the contrary, we believe that no men could have been more anxious than were Adams and Franklin that the treaty to which their honorable names were affixed should correspond with its avowed intention—that of establishing a beneficial and satisfactory intercourse between the two countries, upon the ground of reciprocal advantage and mutual concessions, as might best promote and secure to both perpetual peace and harmony. [Treaty of Paris.] In this treaty the boundary intended to be fixed is described as follows:—"From the northwest angle of Nova Scotia, viz. that angle which is formed by a line drawn due north from the source of the St. Croix river to the highlands, along the said highlands, which divide those waters which empty themselves into the river St. Lawrence from those which fall into the Atlantic Ocean, to the northwesternmost head of the Connecticut river." We need not proceed further in our extract, because it is on the construction of these words that all the existing difficulties arise. The points to be solved are, first, What was the river St. Croix? What was the range of hills designated by the Highlands?—and, as connected with the second question, what rivers were meant by those described as falling into the Atlantic and the St. Lawrence?—and lastly, what was the northwest head of the river Connecticut?

In 1794, a treaty of amity was made between Great Britain and the United States; the object being to ascertain what river was meant by the name of the St. Croix. By the fifth article, commissioners were appointed and authorized to decide according to evidence on oath, and it was further agreed that their report was to be "final and conclusive." The report of that commission was made. It appears very probable that the point fixed upon by them as the source of the St. Croix, was about twenty miles too much to the eastward, and that there was consequently a corresponding sacrifice of territory made by England. But the award was held to be "final and conclusive," according to the terms of the treaty; and as such it has been acquiesced in. Here we see that one of the points in dispute was very fortunately, though not perhaps very correctly ascertained; and it is much to be regretted that, at the same period, the other lines were not struck out before any border quarrels had arisen, and false standards of misplaced national pride had been raised up. In 1814, the unfortunate hostilities between the two countries were terminated by the treaty of Ghent. In the fifth article it is declared, "that neither the point designated in the treaty of Paris as the northwest angle of Nova Scotia, nor the Northwest head of the Connecticut, had been ascertained," or the line of the Highlands surveyed. Two commissioners were appointed to declare the boundary, and make surveys of the line of the treaty of 1783; laying it down upon a map—"which map and declaration the contracting parties agree to consider as fixing the said boundary finally and conclusively. A provision is subsequently made, that in case of a disagreement between the Commissioners, a reference should be made to a friendly sovereign or state. The Commissioners not being able to agree on a boundary line, a convention was entered into at London in 1827, by which it was agreed to refer the question to the decision of a friendly sovereign; and the fifth article provided, in the spirit of the previous engagements, that—"the decision of the arbiters when given, shall be taken as final and conclusive, and shall be carried without reserve into immediate effect by the contracting parties."

The King of the Netherlands was subsequently named as the arbitrator, and his award was given in 1831. In that award the King of the Netherlands negatives the line claimed by Great Britain, as well as that claimed by the United States. The award sets forth, "Que la nature du différend, et les stipulations vagues et non suffisantes déterminées du Traité de 1783; n'admettant pas d'adjuger l'une ou l'autre des lignes, a l'une des dites parties sans blesser les principes de droit et d'équité envers l'autre." And the arbitrator proceeds to state—"Nous sommes d'avis, qu'il conviendrait d'adopter pour limite des deux états une ligne trois, &c. &c." Now let our readers observe how strongly marked was the intention of the parties to the treaties of 1814 and 1827, that the decision when given should be final and conclusive; how greatly it was the interest of each country, looking beyond the lesser and mere temporary interests of the day, that a decision should be authoritatively pronounced, agreed to, and carried into effect. This desire is in conformity with the principles laid down by Franklin and Adams, in 1783; and is in conformity likewise with the acts of the parties to the Convention of Amity, in 1794. To us it would undoubtedly appear, that the spirit and the letter of the obligations contracted, required the immediate adoption of the terms of the award of the King of the Netherlands.

It must be remembered that this decision imposed upon England a much larger sacrifice than that required from the United States; in-

dead, above three fifths of the disputed territory was awarded to the latter.

The conduct of the British Government was frank and honorable. The award of the King of the Netherlands bore date 10th January, 1831. On the 9th of February, Lord Palmerston informed the British Minister at Washington, "that whatever might be the sentiments or wishes of his Majesty on some of the points embraced in the award, his Majesty has not hesitated to acquiesce in that decision, in fulfilment of the obligations which his Majesty considers himself to have contracted by the terms of the convention, and his Majesty is persuaded that such will be the course adopted by the Government of the United States." It is very much to be regretted that these expectations were not realized; but on the contrary—and that, in consequence of difficulties which we shall now proceed to describe—this important question has been left for nine years in uncertainty, much to the risk and prejudice of both countries.

The President had nominated as American Minister at the Hague, Mr. Preble, who was described in the message to Congress, in December, 1831, as being "a distinguished citizen of the State most interested, (Maine) and who had been one of the agents previously employed for settling the controversy." We cannot help thinking that this selection was most unfortunate. Had the British minister been a great proprietor in New Brunswick, and had he already pledged himself to opinions on the subject in dispute—is it not evident that many obstacles would have been thrown in the way of the negotiation? A treaty of peace between our country and South Britain could hardly have been concluded in ancient times by a Percy and a Douglas. The case was one in which calmness and impartiality were requisite beyond all other qualifications; the choice made of a plenipotentiary, who was rather a party concerned than a public servant seemed to exclude both.

The result was consequently most unfortunate. When the award was signed, Mr. Preble did not even wait for the instructions of his government; but assuming at once that the King of the Netherlands had exceeded his authority, he protested officially against his award. The grounds of objection taken were as follows:—

That the award set forth, not the treaty line, but a conventional boundary.

That the award was not a judgement, but a mere expression of advice and of recommendation.

That if the arbitrator found the language of the treaty inapplicable to the topography of the country, no authority was given him to consider what practical boundary could be established.

We confess that when we compare these objections with the plain and simple language of all the successive treaties, we cannot but consider this protest as being the special plea of an astute lawyer, rather than the work of an enlightened and liberal statesman. The meaning which he attaches to the original reference made to the King of the Netherlands, differs altogether from the construction originally put by the Governor of Maine on the arbitration, which he construed to mean, "a submission to some foreign state, who shall have the power to decide at pleasure on the whole subject, and who will be under no actual obligation or effectual interests by virtue of the treaty of 1783." Mr. Gallatin had also stated at the same period, in language very homely but very conclusive, "that an umpire, whether a king or a farmer, rarely decides on strict principles of law; he has always a bias, if possible, to split the difference." It was further argued that although the government of the States would have been authorized to have concluded the treaty on the basis of the award, without asking the consent of Maine, if the boundary of 1783 were adhered to, yet that if a conventional line were drawn, which interfered in any degree with the territory of a particular State, the consent of that State must first be obtained, before any treaty could be concluded.

Mr. Preble returned from his mission. He appears to have gone at once to the State of Maine, in place of going to Washington. Difficulties and objections, arising out of the points to which we have adverted speedily arose, and were strongly urged. No person can doubt but that, if the central government had been unfettered, this very alarming controversy would long since have been at an end.

That an acquiescence in the award of the King of the Netherlands would have been wise and politic on the part of the United States, we have high authority for believing. "The subject was submitted to the Senate, accompanied by the earnest wish of the President, that the award should be agreed to. The message was referred to the committee on Foreign Relations, who reported their opinion that the President's views should be acceded to. A motion being made that the votes of two-thirds of the Senate should be considered necessary for a final opinion, the views of the government were defeated. 'I am sure,' writes the British secretary at Washington, 'that the President and his cabinet regret this decision on the part of the Senate.'"

It, after more than eighteen months for consideration, General Jackson, Mr. Van Buren, Mr. Livingston, Mr. Forsyth and Mr. McLean, were all desirous that America should come to the very decision taken by Lord Palmerston, within a month after the rejection of the award, it cannot be well suggested, that the proposals of England were unreasonable, or that her conduct can give any just ground of complaint."

Negotiations were renewed by desire of the Senate; and here as on former occasions we can see nothing on the face of the diplomatic papers which does not prove the sincere desire of England that the question should be adjusted, and that in a manner the most satisfactory to the United States. In a state paper of the highest ability, addressed by Lord Palmerston to Sir C. Vaughan, in December, 1833, the attention of the American government is called to the fact, that out of three points at issue, two had been actually decided by the award on the strict basis of the treaty of 1783. Lord Palmerston proposed, as no doubts existed on those points, that they should be adopted by both States; and he proposed further, that on the third question, which was still at issue, measures should be taken to discover a line conformable to the spirit of the treaty, and approaching to the intention of its framers. This too was unfortunately declined. Had the proposal been accepted, the points of controversy would have been lessened and the ultimate adjustment of the dispute would have been greatly facilitated. The two points remaining at issue, (for in fact the source of the Connecticut may be considered as ascertained) are, what are the actual rivers and the actual highlands meant by the treaty. Lord Palmerston made repeated attempts to establish definitions between the two countries which would have led to a solution of the dispute; but here again he was unable to procure the consent of the government of Washington.

We have not entered into this long detail without a strong sense of its importance. The language most unwisely used in some American public documents has been so violent, that we wish by a reference to a few simple and undeniable facts, to prove to our American friends, as well as to our British readers, that there has been manifested throughout the whole of Lord Palmerston's negotiations, the most earnest desire to avoid all pretensions that could justly be objected to, or that could rouse any false feelings of national pride. Yet the claims of England are designate by the Governor of Maine, (April 30, 1837) "arrogant, extravagant and baseless."

It is asked, in the same document, "how long the people of Maine are to be trampled down by a foreign people?" The conduct of this country is described in another letter to the Secretary of State, as "the existing causes of the anxiety of Maine and of the cupidity of England;" and so late as January, 1840, Governor Fairfield announces, in his message to the State Legislature that "the preference of claim set up by Great Britain to the disputed territory is palpably unfounded and unjust." We cannot but hope that to any person who will attentively consider the official correspondence, it will appear that these unmeasured reproaches are something more than exaggerations; and that the merchants of New York, the citizens of Virginia and of the Southern States, will feel some degree of mistrust, when the cause of the border State is pleaded with such intemperate violence.

The uncertainty in which this question is left, has led to the most formidable dangers.—The two governments, of Washington and of London, have to the utmost endeavored to enforce such a neutrality within the disputed territory as might avert collision. But this has been scarcely possible. We shall not drag our readers through the events of the last four or five years; it is sufficient to say that there have been alternate charges of intrusion and of aggression made by Maine and New-Brunswick. Attempts have been made to exercise jurisdiction, and to claim authority; public officers have endeavored to take a census, and have been arrested, imprisoned, and set at liberty; and the peace between the two countries has been repeatedly put at hazard by the imprudent acts of a few hot-headed border speculators or enthusiasts. In all these transactions however, it appears that the central government of America has acted with prudence, and with good faith. But it should be remembered that a federal government, with many undeniable advantages, cannot possess the strength or restraining authority of a ministry.

To America, these transactions must read the useful lesson of mistrust with respect to the conduct and pretensions of its border population.—Whilst firm in their resolve that the people of Maine should not suffer wrong, the United States should be equally resolute to prevent them from committing injustice. Above all, the great American community should reject those counsels which may lead to war. A lesson will also be read usefully to England by the same events. They must learn to discriminate between the imprudent acts and unreasonable complaints of a few borderers, and the feelings and determinations of a great people. *Neguis simam pacem justissimam bello antefero*, is an admission which neither England nor the United States is called upon to make; but each should be prepared to act upon the principle, that any sacrifice which does not compromise national honor and independence should be made, in order to avert that worst of all calamities to England, to America, and to the civilized world—a contest between two kindred nations.

If American cities along the coasts were attacked by our fleets; if Canadian insurgents were aided by border sympathizers; if the formidable danger which results from a slave population of two millions were hurried to a crisis; if the trade of both countries were forcibly interrupted;—it would be no excuse to either party, if the result were to secure the possession of a given number of square miles, north or south of the river St. John, and the establishment of the line of boundary contended for by one or other of the disputants. But we go further; for we much doubt whether the value of the State of Maine, or the Province of New-Brunswick, would be to either country an equivalent for the jealousy and the hatred, as well as the destruction of property and the check to all improvement, which must be the result of war.

If this calamity has as yet been fortunately averted, we cannot help thinking that much is owing to the good sense and discretion manifested by the Governor of New-Brunswick, and the General commanding the troops of the United States. Nothing can be more gratifying than the good feeling manifested on both sides in this military correspondence, which contrasts most favorably with the more polemical tone of the documents proceeding from too many of the civil authorities. Very just and impressive are the observations of the Marquis of Normanby, in his despatch to Sir John Harvey, of May 16, 1839:—"The correspondence between you and the Secretary of State is honorable alike to you and to him. It is gratifying to observe that the feelings of personal esteem which were established between General Scott and yourself, when formerly opposed to each other in the field, should, after the lapse of so many years, have enabled you both to concur in averting from your respective countries all the horrors of war."

The peace of the American continent should, however, rest on a firmer foundation than the personal character of any two men, however discreet and generous. The President, in his message of 1837, stated "that time has brought about a condition of affairs, in which the true interests of both countries imperatively require that the question shall be set at rest." This is still more true in 1840, than it was at the date of this message. That the territory in dispute can be of no real importance to Maine in a political point of view, is evident from the readiness manifested in 1832 to make the cession to the general government, on obtaining a pecuniary indemnity. To England, it is not for 100,000 square miles of territory that the controversy is maintained, but to secure freedom of intercourse between Fredericton and Quebec.—This is a national object to us; it is a most important object to America also; for if the adjustment is not made, there can be no doubt but that future causes of dissension must arise.

The proceedings now to be taken, ought to be final; and if it be requisite, Congress and the Legislature of Maine should unite to give the central government full authority to negotiate and to conclude. Some expectation of this kind was held out so long back as in Mr. Livingston's letter of the 21st July, 1832, when he stated that "means might probably be found of avoiding the constitutional difficulty; a negotiation for that purpose being opened between the United States and Maine." If it be possible to trace the treaty line, this difficulty is surmounted; for the boundary of the treaty cannot involve the cession of any portion of the territory of Maine, and the consent of that State will not be requisite. We earnestly trust and believe, notwithstanding all discouragements, that this treaty line may be found. Lord Palmerston has employed two most able and scientific men, Mr. Featherstonhaugh and Mr. Mudge, to survey and examine the state of the disputed territory. They are prepared to demonstrate that a line of highlands does exist, agreeing with the language of the treaty of Paris; and that there does not exist, within the disputed territory, any other line of highlands complying with these conditions. Their Report will negative most conclusively the American line; as it is demonstrable to be physically impossible to connect that line with the northwesternmost head of the Connecticut. If these facts be as stated, (and the characters of the Commissioners employed make us place every confidence in the opinion,) all that remains to be done is, that their evidence, together with any which may be offered in relation to it, should be submitted to some impartial tribunal, by whose decision all parties should be pledged irrevocably to abide. That this course will lead to a final adjustment of the dispute, we are not

sufficiently sanguine to expect; but of one thing we are confident, that if either of the contending powers were to force a war, for a cause, compared with which the *Secchia Rapita* itself would appear a justifying ground of hostilities, the crime of such a proceeding would not be greater than its absurdity;—it would excite not only the condemnation but the ridicule of all the lovers of peace and freedom upon earth.

We have been induced to dwell at considerable length upon this subject. We hope that we have not only succeeded in making it intelligible to our readers, but that we have shown that the British Minister has acted with prudence and discretion; and that no effort has been omitted, on his part, that would have brought to a termination a dispute trivial in itself, but which, if permitted to remain longer unsettled, may lead to the most formidable calamities.

THE EXECUTION OF COURVOISIER.

The execution of the wretched Courvoisier, on Monday morning, has afforded a fresh illustration of the demoralizing effects of such exhibitions. We have long been convinced that the punishment of death, instead of deterring the lower orders from the commission of crime, produces the very contrary result of investing crime with a certain false glory and horrible fascination. It intoxicates the moral sense, and imparts a sort of drunken frenzy to the unregulated passions. Like all other brutal excitements, it plunges those who are affected by the morbid sensations it engenders into riotous excesses and desperate resistance to the laws of society. As a means of prevention it is powerless—as a provocation to the evil spirit that too often prompts the outcast and the ignorant into violations of order and humanity, it exercises a fatal influence. It presents justice in an aspect so hideous as to make it regarded as an agent of a savage revenge rather than of divine retribution; and it brings law into odium and popular hatred. Would any man select the *Neugate Calendar* as an elementary book for the education of youths? An execution is calculated to work similar effects upon the mind of the populace; it is accompanied by the same incentives to vice, by the same false appeal to the sensibilities; it is coloured by the same revolting terrors, and like the narrative of atrocious deeds, it captivates the imagination it terrifies.

We need no further proof of all this than the evidence of the way in which these ghastly spectacles are attended by the multitude—the ribaldry of the crowd—the petty delinquencies that take place while the spectators are absorbed in the agonies of the dying criminal—and the preparations that are made by the people, whose houses command a view of the gallows, for trafficking upon the well known curiosity of a portion of the public to witness such sights. We find the following statement in the newspaper accounts of Courvoisier's execution:—"Places commanding a view of the gallows were freely let at the houses in the Old Bailey opposite the prison; and some of the windows, we understand, fetched as much as five guineas each. At one of the houses immediately opposite the drop, the windows were taken out in order to allow their occupants a more complete view of all that passed."

One would think there was a coronation, or some royal procession to be seen, so intense was the anxiety of the purchasers of seats. On the evening before, boys are stated to have been walking up and down, soliciting customers for such seats as remained unlet!

At a late hour in the evening, the Old Bailey resembled a fair, and the number of persons continued to increase until midnight, when some returned to their homes to take rest between that time and the morning, while others resolved to remain in the street all night rather than lose the chance of a commanding position. Men stood smoking their pipes and relating anecdotes of criminals whom they had seen suffer on the same spot, while women stood with infants in their arms listening to their narratives."

Such is literally the effect of all such revolting sights. They produce just such an impression as the performance of Jack Sheppard on the stage. Little children draw in the wonder with a shuddering delight, and grow up to emulate the glory of that horrible catastrophe, the terrors of which have filled their young minds with dread and pity. Men relate the scenes of a similar kind they have witnessed; and thus a maddening superstition eats into the heart and understanding, and housebreakers and murderers are created out of the plastic materials of want and ignorance, by familiarity with the punishment and sympathy with the crime.

The depravity by which these scenes are eminently distinguished, proves how deeply they brutalize the natures of the spectators. At two o'clock in the morning the apparatus of death was brought out, and when the sounds of the last hammer ceased, the completion of the work, says the reporter, was signaled on the part of the mob with a shout of triumph! Long before the hour appointed for the execution, the whole space was filled with an eager multitude, and presented the appearance of "one vast mass of human heads." It might be supposed that the object they came to gaze upon would have struck a human awe into their souls; but mark how the great majority of the crowd testified their feelings:—"The general hum of conversation which was heard among the crowd, and the loud and heartless laugh which ever and anon struck the ear, would have induced a person, ignorant of the object which had called them together, to have supposed that had come out for a holiday, or for the purpose of witnessing some passing pageant, rather than to behold a fellow-creature sacrificed upon the scaffold."

And this in England—enlightened England in the nineteenth century. Yet there are men in high places—rich, voluptuous, and saintly men—who have resolved that this people, sunk in the lowest depths of moral depravity, shall not be educated.

But it must not be supposed that this congregation was composed of the uneducated alone. The stain does not lie only upon the lower orders:—"At six o'clock many of the windows of the houses opposite began to be filled by persons who had engaged them for the purpose of witnessing the death of the murderer. At the Lamb coffee-house, which is almost immediately opposite the scaffold, a number of persons remained at the windows all night—determined that no accident should prevent the gratification of their curiosity."

"At the George public house, to the south of the drop, Sir W. W. Wynne, baronet, had hired a room, with a party of friends, he occupied previously to and during the execution, and Lord Alfred Paget, with a party of friends occupied a window at the undertaker's, next door to the George."

We will not venture upon the commentary suggested by these names; but we ask those who, by their position in society, are responsible to the country for the example they set—who are frequently called upon to officiate on the magisterial bench—in whose hands the fortunes and well being of the lower classes are reposed, whether they can conscientiously condemn the culprits whose guilty tendencies are thus fostered and encouraged by individuals of their caste? The subject is, in the last degree, painful and oppressive. The Legislature must interpose to put a final stop to these harrowing exhibitions, and by repealing capital punishments, take the first practical step towards the education and moral emancipation of the people.

QUEBEC, Aug. 30.

We congratulate Mr. Cunard upon the complete success which has attended the commencement of his line of Post Office Steam Packets, from England to the British American Provinces. Ere our selections from the papers received by the Britannia are yet exhausted, we have received news ten days later from the Mother Country, and are proud to say in advance of the steam line to New York. Yet we do not triumph over the foreign channel of communication, for to the enlightened men who set it on foot, we undoubtedly owe that speedy and direct communication, passing direct and entirely in British ships and over British territory, which we now enjoy. It is indeed a new era in the intercourse with the Mother Country, when here in Quebec, we are enabled to publish dates only sixteen days old from the Metropolis of the Empire.

TORONTO, Aug. 19.

The Church of last Saturday, talks of the "political deceit" of endeavouring to comprehend within the pale of the Church of Scotland, all presbyterians in the Province. We are not aware of any such attempt having been made, and our contemporary must have known, when penning his charge, that it was not consistent with truth. This he must have been aware of, from the manner in which the returns of the census of the different Townships were made up, which for some time occupied so conspicuous a place in the columns of the Church. The charge of "political deceit" can with much greater propriety be applied to our contemporary, and those with whom he has all along acted; and had he added "political dishonesty," a somewhat more correct definition would have been offered, of the course which they have so long followed. As to the church of England not having been governed by "a rigid adherence to her own interests," the less that is said on the subject by our contemporary the better. The Archbishop of Canterbury made the best bargain he could under the circumstances, and nothing has had a greater tendency to prejudice the interests of the church of England in the province, than the violent conduct of conspicuous members within her pale. They now begin to find out their proper place, and by moderation and sobriety of deportment on their part, past differences may be overlooked.

With regard to the yearly payments at present made, to the churches of England and Scotland, in Canada, the House of Commons in committee, sustained a resolution moved by Lord John Russell, that provision "be made out of the consolidated fund, to make good the deficiency of the fund to be created by an act of the present parliament, for the sale of the Clergy Reserves in Upper Canada." The precise bearing of this resolution, it is not easy to comprehend, without having access to the Clergy Reserve Sale Act, to which it refers.

We refer to the despatch, by the Governor General, to Lord John Russell, on the subject of the abuses in the management of the funds of King's College. We are indeed pleased to observe the independence displayed by Sir George Arthur, in having discontinued the salary so long paid to Dr. Strachan for doing nothing; and this may in some measure account for the asperity of the Compact towards His Excellency. The jobbing of the Bishop in the College funds, is brought forward very clearly by the Governor General in this despatch, and we are encouraged to hope, that in future the funds of that Institution, will not be subject to similar peculations. The reluctance with which His Excellency abstained from pursuing the delinquents farther at that time, holds out a fair prospect of measures being taken, to recover the public property so unjustly taken possession of for private purposes, by parties entrusted with its management for the public benefit. We understand that the volume from which the despatch referred to is extracted, contains a curious correspondence on this subject, between Mr. Secretary Murdoch and the Bishop, which we may probably hereafter have an opportunity of referring to.

KINGSTON U. C. Aug. 3.

Mr. Buckingham's Lectures.—This distinguished gentleman has fully realized in Kingston the high conception entertained of him previous to his arrival. His Lectures on Egypt, at the Union Church, despite the great Canadian attraction of a Travelling Circus, were remarkably well attended, and the satisfaction afforded so great, as to induce the Lecturer to prolong his stay in town, and deliver his course on Palestine, the last Lecture of which is given to-night. In speaking of Mr. Buckingham, we find it impossible to avoid using the commendations of others, and our notice, therefore, must be comparatively tautologous and brief.

Mr. Buckingham, although past the middle age of life, possesses a noble and commanding countenance, and his delivery is graceful in the extreme. His voice, though not loud, is nevertheless clear, and his enunciation so good as to make every word felt, even in a crowded auditory. His manner is highly pleasing, and his lectures are rather a series of lively descriptive anecdotes, than a mere topographical detail of the countries he describes. His powers of elocution is great and varied, and we question much whether any given Lecture has been delivered in the same or even similar language to two audiences. Mr. Buckingham is unquestionably one of the master spirits of the age, and although the fashion in some circles at home has been of late to deride him, yet it is well ascertained fact, that no single individual ever engrossed the public attention so much, or maintained that infatuation so long as himself. He has now been eighteen years before the British and American public, six years of which he passed in Parliament, and his attraction is as great as ever. Mr. Buckingham leaves Kingston for Montreal to-morrow morning, thence to Quebec, Halifax, St. Johns, N. B. and so to New York, where he embarks for England.—He is accompanied in his present tour by Mrs. Buckingham and a son about 17 years of age.—*British Whig.*

ST. JOHN, September 1.

Mr. WHITE, the celebrated Irish Melodist, gave his first Musical Entertainment in this City, last evening, to a very respectable and highly delighted audience; though on account of the unfavourable weather, the house was not as well filled as was anticipated.—The following remarks, furnished by an esteemed correspondent, express so nearly our own sentiments, that we give them in preference to any thing we can say. "We last evening had the pleasure of witnessing the Musical performance of Mr. WHITE; Irish Melodist, for the first time in our lives; and we must in candour acknowledge that the gratification was beyond any thing we expected. Mr. White and his professional abilities being alike unknown to us. Now that we have heard this specimen of his performance, our next visit