

allowed to be heard either at the table or at the bar, and that the discussion was to be closed without hearing him at all, he looked on it as quite impossible, and beside the question.

Lord Duncannon said that he had been applied to on behalf of his Honourable Friend, Mr. O'Connell, to move that he be heard in support of his claims, but that motion had become unnecessary by the proceeding which had taken place this day.

Mr. Peel then moved that the discussion be postponed till Monday, which was agreed to without a division.

Mr. O'Connell had prepared himself to commence his case *instantly*. He had ten or eleven volumes of the journals of the House, besides several volumes of law books, &c., which all were stationed in the door-way ready for

CANADIAN AFFAIRS.—In the House of Lords on the 14th ult., Lord Goderich said, he held in his hand a petition from a body of persons in Upper Canada, complaining of certain alleged grievances. He should not go into all the variety of topics introduced by the petitioners, but there were some matters which he thought deserved the consideration of the House and the Government. One of the first allegations related to the removal of Mr. Justice Willis, as Puisne Judge of the Court of King's Bench. He had been informed that the law was against Justice Willis, in the position he had seen fit to take; but he thought it fit that the law should be clearly known, and the principles of the mother country followed as nearly as possible, in the administration of justice. The petitioners complained also of the constitution of the Legislative Council, which contained several members holding office, who were not competent to act as impartially as was desirable; and by which several laws agreeable to the people, had been rejected. They complained that they had no controul over the acts of the Executive Council, and that they ought to have the power of impeachment. They also desired some changes respecting trials by jury. He (Lord Goderich) thought the colonies were best able to manage their trials and their other internal concerns for themselves. He adverted to the importance of the colonies to the mother country. He believed the people were well disposed, and were good subjects. He was, however, apprehensive that the petition could not be received, as a passage in it referred to a speech made in the House of Commons last session by Mr. Huskisson, whom it named, and to whom sentiments were attributed which he did not utter. If the orders of the House excluded the petitioners in consequence of its referring to what had been said in Parliament and commenting thereon, he should withdraw it.

The Duke of Wellington concurred with the noble Viscount in his anxiety to attend to the interests of the colonies, and the necessity of preserving a good feeling between them and the mother country. He did not concur in the views of the petitioners, however, as to carrying their recommendations into effect by Government or Parliament. He had seen the petition for a considerable time, it being similar to the one presented to them. He stated the case of Judge Willis, which had been before the Privy Council. The nature of the proceedings there would be explained by Earl Bathurst. His Majesty had approved of the conduct of Sir Petegrine Maitland, in dismissing Justice Willis. As to the desire of the petitioners to have individuals responsible to the House of Assembly, for the acts of the Government, he did not consider that the principles which might suit Great Britain, were suitable to their position in a distant colony. He thought it proper that great landed proprietors should be included in the Legislative Council; and that the Executive Council was necessary to advise Government; and if some of its members also belonged to the Legislative Council, it should not excite jealousy. In the House of Lords there were peers who advised the crown, and others who did not.

Earl Bathurst said that nothing could have been more proper than the dismissal of Mr. Justice Willis. He had thought proper to declare all proceedings in the Court for thirty years, null and void, when the Chief Justice had not been on the bench; and had refused to hold a court without him. His petition to the King had been referred to the Committee of the Council, consisting of the Vice Chancellor, the Chief Baron, and several members of the Privy Council. Counsel had been heard, and the Committee decided that there was no ground for putting such a construction on the statute as Justice Willis had done. The decision of the Lieutenant-Governor had been confirmed. The allusion in the petition to Mr. Huskisson was clearly irregular. Viscount Goderich said he would not press the reception of the petition—he should withdraw it.

In the House of Commons on the same day, a petition to the same effect was presented by Mr. Stanley. The principal grievance complained of, to which he adverted, was the dependence of the Judges on the crown, and the want of a responsible minister. The same allusion was made to Mr. Huskisson which had caused the withdrawal of the petition in the House of Lords. After considerable debate, Mr. Stanley withdrew that offered by him.

INDIA AND CHINA TRADE.—The subject of opening the trade of India and China, was brought before the House of Commons on the 14th May, by Mr. Whitmore, who moved a select committee to inquire into the State of trade between Great Britain and those countries. The motion was resisted by Ministers solely upon the ground of the advanced period of the Session. They thought that the appointment of such a committee early next Session, would be most advisable; and that that Committee should be preceded by the production of such documentary evidence as would be necessary to enable persons to form a full and correct opinion upon the subject. It was stated that the President of the Board of Trade has it in contemplation, before the close of the present Session, to move for the production of such evidence. Mr. Huskisson advocated the appointment of a committee forthwith. In the course of the debate Mr. Baring said;—

“As to the dangers likely to arise from throwing open the trade with China, he was afraid the advantages likely to arise from that measure had been exaggerated. He was himself of opinion that this measure would prove a benefit; but, though the Hon. Member for Bridgenorth treated the subject in a masterly and fair manner, yet any one who heard that statement would carry away exaggerated notions of the danger and distress of the present system. He did not deny that the measure would confer great benefit, but it was a serious question how far a reciprocity could be safely adopted with 200 or 300,000,000 of people. In a prospect of such a trade, preparations would be made in the commercial world to have a hand in this gold mine. But let it be recollected that the trade was already open between China and America, the Dutch and the French, and that all we could expect was a participation in that trade. Possibly terms might be made with the Company to admit of this, and thus all parties would be satisfied. (Hear.) The Hon. Member concluded by saying that he was convinced that no men were more likely to act liberally than the East India Company; and when the question came before the House and the country, justice would be done them for their liberal and just government. In certain respects their administration was excellent, and would bear a comparison with the government of any colony under the Crown.”

The motion was negatived. The Morning Herald is opposed to the project.

“Government (it says) will pause before they throw open the China trade, for this reason—they derive a revenue of £3,000,000 a year from the Company in the shape of duties, without trouble and without risk. If the trade was thrown open, the smuggling of tea, with a duty of 100 per cent. upon it, would be carried on to a great extent, and we have no doubt that the revenue would suffer very considerably.” Again:—“With respect to the tea trade, it should be recollected that the only persons allowed to sell teas in China are the Hong Merchants, who, like the East India Company, are monopolists;—they are twelve in number, and, like the East India Company, too, with respect to the English Government, they are the guaranties to the China Government, for the payment of the duties.—These Hong Merchants give the choice of all their teas to the Company. Thus they are enabled, and actually do, import the best teas that are imported either into Europe or America.”

The East India Company is £70,000,000 in debt, equal to 3,108,000,000 dollars!!!

EXTRACT FROM THE QUARTERLY REVIEW.—With regard to Jamaica, and some other of the West-India Islands, which have their House of Assembly, their systematic opposition to every measure proposed by the King's government, considering the precarious situation in which they stand, appears to us to be little short of insanity. They seem not to know that they are tottering on the very brink of a volcano—which the first blast of a trumpet from St. Domingo would cause to explode, and bury in one common ruin, man, woman, and child. As it is, nothing but the king's armed force preserves them from destruction. And yet these silly people have been so unwise as to refuse to continue the supplies which they are bound to furnish to the troops who protect them; nay, even to throw out something in the shape of a threat to se-

ver themselves from the mother country, and seek for protection elsewhere. Is it possible that these people can, for a moment, forget that England protects them and their sugars at the expense of her other colonies?—Do they not know that if she were to admit the sugars of the East Indies and the Mauritius on the payment of equal duties, or still more effectually, if she were to levy a discriminating duty on West India sugars, the sum of their prosperity would immediately set?—Let the House of Assembly look at these things, and desist in time from using or abusing its little authority by a vexatious opposition to His Majesty's government.

The following remarkable anecdote is extracted from *An Essay on the Science of Acting*:—In the town of North Walsham, Norfolk, in 1788, the *Fair Penitent* was performed. In the last act, where Calista lays her hand on the skull, a Mrs. Barry, who played the part, was seized with an involuntary shuddering, and fell on the stage; during the night her illness continued; but the following day, when sufficiently recovered to converse, she sent for the stage-keeper, and anxiously inquired whence he procured the skull; he replied, “from the sexton, who informed him it was the skull of one Norris, a player, who twelve years before was buried in the churchyard.” That same Norris was her first husband; she never recovered the shock, and died in six weeks.

Letters from Rome state that the new Pope has restored to the Jews and the Christian dissenters from the Church of Rome, the privileges of which they were deprived by his predecessor, and is disposed to act with liberality.

A Hamburg paper of the 5th May, says:—It is reported in Bavaria that the new Pope intends to abolish the *Celibacy of the clergy*.

United States.

Mr. Gallatin, Judge Preble, with Mr. Gallatin, jr. are at Washington prosecuting the objects of the commission some time since instituted for the defence of the state of Maine in its claim to the disputed territory bordering on the province of New-Brunswick. They have collected all the testimony in the case, and are now engaged in furnishing a statement for the consideration of the arbitrator between the parties (the King of the Netherlands.) This statement will, by arrangement, be furnished the British authorities, by the 1st of January next, when the case will be finally submitted. It seems to be quite as tedious an affair as some of the chancery proceedings in England.

UNITED STATES AND TERRITORIES.—The National Journal has an interesting article on the public lands of the United States, elicited by a report of the Committee of the House of Representatives, to whom the subject was referred. From the article, we have condensed into a tabular form the extent in square miles of each state and territory, with their estimated population in 1830.

	Square miles.	Population a sq. m.	Estimated pop. 1830.
1. Virginia,	64,000	18	1,180,000
2. Missouri,	64,000	2	130,000
3. Georgia,	58,000	7	410,000
4. Illinois,	56,000	2½	130,000
5. Florida,	54,500	1	40,000
6. Alabama,	53,100	7	380,000
7. Louisiana,	49,000	6	300,000
8. Mississippi,	46,325	3	130,000
9. New-York,	46,000	43	2,000,000
10. Arkansas,	55,309	1	35,000
11. Pennsylvania,	44,930	32	1,390,000
12. N. Carolina,	43,800	16	720,000
13. Tennessee,	41,300	14½	600,000
14. Kentucky,	39,000	15½	65,000
15. Michigan,	39,000	1	35,000
16. Ohio,	38,300	25½	1,000,000
17. Indiana,	35,100	11½	400,000
18. Maine,	32,000	13	420,000
19. S. Carolina,	20,080	20	600,000
20. Maryland,	10,300	41	450,000
21. Vermont,	10,212	27½	280,000
22. N. Hampshire,	9,280	32	300,000
23. Massachusetts,	7,800	74	580,000
24. New Jersey,	6,900	48	330,000
25. Connecticut,	4,694	62	290,000
26. Delaware,	2,068	39	80,000
27. Rhode Island,	1,360	66	90,000
28. Dist. of Colum.	100	500	50,000

It is estimated that the aggregate population in 1830 will be thirteen millions, and in 1860, thirty-two millions.