

Imperial Parliament.



HOUSE OF COMMONS—JULY 25.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

The first question put was, that £112,195 be granted to defray the charges of His Majesty's Consuls and Consuls-general, for 1831; also, superannuations for retired allowances. Agreed to.

The next vote was for £6625, for defraying the civil charge for Nova-Scotia. Mr. Robinson was glad to perceive that there was a reduction of £2147 under this head, as compared with the charge of last year. He thought, however, when he saw a sum of £20,000 appropriated by the colony, out of its own revenues, for local improvements, and £5000 for the encouragement of the fisheries, that the colony might very well dispense with further assistance from Parliament. Grant agreed to.

It was then proposed to grant £4000, to defray the charges of the civil establishment of the Island of Bermuda. Mr. Robinson observed, that the grant now called for was to the same amount as that which had been voted last year. He should be glad to know why the colonial secretary at Bermuda received £800 a-year, while in other colonies of much greater importance the colonial secretary received only £500 or £600 a-year?—Lord Howick said, that the colonial secretary at Bermuda acted also as private secretary to the Governor, and had, in consequence, considerable additional duties to perform. He conceived that £800 a-year was not too high a salary for the situation. The whole matter would, however, undergo a strict revision, and reduction, if necessary. Mr. Robinson could not conceive why the colonial secretary of Bermuda should receive £800, while the colonial secretary at Sierra Leone, that pestilential climate, only received £600 a-year. Grant agreed to.

The next vote was for £3320 to defray the charges of the civil establishment at Prince Edward Island. Agreed to, without observation.

The sum of £11,261 was then proposed for defraying the civil establishment of Newfoundland. Agreed to, after a long debate and much opposition.

Missionary Grants.—Upon the chairman putting the question, that a sum not exceeding £16,182 be granted to defray the expenses of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts:—Mr. Warburton said it was not his intention to divide the committee on this grant, but he felt confident that no vote which Parliament could come to could possibly tend more effectually to alienate the minds of the colonists from the parent country. When the great body of the colonists were of another religion, it was most absurd to be voting money for a forced support of the Anglican Church. Mr. Labouchere had already expressed his decided opposition to these votes, and was convinced that no member who had given any attention to the subject, could come to any other conclusion. He was anxious that the vote should not pass without obtaining from ministers a decided declaration, whether they did or did not intend in future to propose any similar grants. He wished the grant to be altogether abandoned, but gradually, so as not to hurt any individuals who now depend on it. He had in his possession a petition which had been voted unanimously by the House of Assembly in Lower Canada, and which prayed that these grants, and the system that they were intended to support, should be put an end to, for it was unquestionably true that the system did excite against the Church of England feelings of jealousy and suspicion. The Church of England in Canada ought to be put upon the same footing as all other Christian Churches, and until this was done the Church of England would lag behind all other sects. Nothing could be more preposterous than to establish a place of education in Canada upon principles which prevented nine-tenths of the people from availing themselves of the instruction. He wished his Majesty's Ministers to answer him on three points—first, whether they intended in future to continue these votes; secondly, whether they intended to apply themselves to the subject of the clergy reserves; and thirdly, whether the character of the University of Canada was under the consideration of the Colonial Office. Mr. Warburton wished likewise to be informed whether ministers were not in possession of a memorial from the Bishop and Clergy of Quebec, praying that the clergy reserves might not be divided with the Church of Scotland? It had always been understood in that house that the reserves should be divided between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer would answer the four questions on the part of his Majesty's ministers. With respect to the first question, he would say, that ministers did not defend this vote upon principle. The point, the committee were aware, was one of considerable difficulty, as it involved the whole question of the Church establishment of Canada; it was therefore impossible to take any step rapidly, but it did appear to him that it was not fitting that the people of England should be called upon to provide funds for the support of the clergy and church establishment of Canada. It was the intention of Ministers gradually to reduce this grant, and to abolish it as soon as possible. The clergy reserves were highly detrimental to the prosperity of the colony, but he could give no pledge on this subject, which was one of great difficulty. The subject of the college was

under the consideration of the colonial department; though he could not give a more satisfactory answer on this point than upon the preceding. With respect to the last question, he was not aware that any such representation had been received in this country.—Mr. Hunt moved merely to follow the example which His Majesty's ministers had set when they were in opposition, for they had then moved that this grant should be diminished by one half, and that it should entirely cease in 1831. They had divided the House on that question, and of the list of the minority which he held in his hand, the first name was that of Lord Althorp, and the last was Lord Howick's. (A laugh.) He should imitate their example, and move that the grant be now reduced to £8000, and that it be abolished in 1832. The subscription altogether to this society had amounted to only £33,340; there had been raised in churches by virtue of King's letters, the sum of £55,859, and Parliament had voted £293,038. This was from 1814, when the society was first established. How was the money spent by the Society? The Bishop of Nova-Scotia had a salary of 2000l. per annum, to which the society added 400l. The Archdeacon received 1500l. a-year; the Society added £280. It was the same with the Archdeacons of the other American Colonies. The society owned two estates in Barbados, with 700 negroes, left to it by Gen. Codrington, and by the labour of these negroes a college was to be supported for the education of the sons of placement. He should persevere in his amendment.—Lord Howick had been the individual who had moved the resolution to which the Hon. Member for Preston had alluded. He had moved the resolution on the ground that the people of England ought not to pay money for any such purpose; but he had expressly stated that it was not his wish to expose any individuals to hardships by a sudden reduction of the grant, and that he made his motion merely as an opportunity for the House to express its opinion that the principle of the grant ought to be abolished. As Ministers had given a pledge to reduce the grant, he trusted that the Hon. Member would withdraw his amendment. Many clergymen were employed in the colonies by the society on salaries merely sufficient for their decent maintenance, and these persons having been sent out on the faith of these salaries, it would be an act of monstrous injustice to recall them. No additional persons ought to be sent out, and thus grants might be gradually abolished, and the society left to support its own missionaries. He believed the society to be of great use, but by calling on Parliament to supply its deficiencies it dried up the sources of private charity.—Mr. R. Gordon thought that the Noble Lord ought to have taken the subject into his consideration eight months ago, when he came into office. By the report of the society, it was evident that they mismanaged their own affairs, and the public money ought not to be entrusted to them; £4,333 was granted to Nova Scotia, and how was this distributed? Whilst the Bishop was allowed £2,000 a year, the Presbyterian clergyman received but £75, and yet the Presbyterians were as three to one compared with the Church of England. But the cry of ministers always was, that every thing was under consideration; but the Noble Lord had been in office eight months, and ought to have considered this question long ago.—Mr. Briscoe said, he was one of the minority alluded to; but he was bound to say, that the Noble Lord's explanation was candid and just, and he recommended the Hon. Member for Preston not to divide the House. Sir R. Inglis, with reference to the cases brought forward by the Hon. Member for Preston, said he could not give credit to them; it was indeed, only assertion against assertion.—Colonel de Lacey Evans said, that it was not the mere vote of £16,000 which was involved, but the expense must be greater. He objected to the vote, as throwing impediments in the way of the colonists themselves, though it was not fair to lower the vote this year. Mr. A. Baring observed, that if half the vote was cut off, now that three quarters of the year was gone, and before information could be communicated to the individuals it would be unjust. He was averse to the grant, and remarked that where it was made, the established Church of England was declining; whereas in the United States where that church was a mere primitive church, it was growing. [Hear.] Experience showed that where there were large salaries and grants, jobs and sinecures soon appeared. He therefore recommended to the Noble Lord (Howick,) between this and the next session, to devise a scheme for the final abolition of the grant.—The committee then divided, when there appeared.—For the amendment, 27; against it, 165; majority for the original resolution, 138.

Rideau Canal.—Mr. Rice, in moving the next resolution, said, that when the present Government came into office, they found the expense of the Rideau Canal so formidable, that it appeared to them necessary to bring it specifically under the notice of the house. He had therefore, on the suggestion of his Noble Friend (the Chancellor of the Exchequer,) laid on the table of the house all the papers relating to it. Those papers had been referred to a select committee, and that committee had made a report upon them. On the authority of their report he now moved for a grant of £295,000 to complete the water communication in Canada.—Mr. Robinson complained that although £1,049,000 had been already expended on this Canal, the work was still imperfect; and more money, it appeared, was still required to erect defences against the probable incursions of the Indians. The whole expenditure he could not help considering, under the circumstances, to be a great misapplication of public money, for which his Majesty's late Government, in his opinion, were justly censurable.—Mr. Labouchere referred to the existing discontents in the Canadas and also in Nova-Scotia, to which he begged leave to call the attention of the King's ministers, especially as he had been entrusted with a position of considerable importance on the subject, which he would take an early opportunity of presenting to the House.—The two branches of the legislature, though each unanimous in themselves, he regretted to state, were diametrically opposed to one another; and the division had occasioned so much political jarring and public disquiet, that it became the indispensable duty of Parliament itself to interpose, by an exercise of its own vigorous authority, without further loss of time. The legislative Assembly, he conceived, would never be a complete and satisfactory political system until a spirit of full, free, and fair election should be effectually infused into the whole mass, and they ought to have either a Governor and a House of Assembly without an intermediate body, or if they had the latter, it behooved them at once to introduce the principle of election as Mr. Fox had originally proposed. The next point to which he wished to call the attention of the committee was, to that system by which the Government party engrossed the whole of the offices and places at the disposal of the executive.—Whether a man was popular or not, he was thrust into office provided he was connected with this little oligarchy.—What would be thought in this country if the Sovereign were to strain his prerogative and have only what Ministers he pleased, whether they were pleasing to the house and country or not? The result would be, that the country would be in an uproar from one end to the other.—Yet this mode of selecting public officers hostile to the feelings of the public was the practice in the Canadas for the last ten or fifteen years. With all this, he must say that the people of Canada were attached to British Government and British connexion, but that was an additional reason why they should expect and obtain justice at our hands.—Sir G. Murray defended the system adopted towards the Canadas by the late Government.—The whole of the works undertaken were, while they tended to strengthen British power in that quarter, also calculated for the great local advantage of the colonists.—For his own part, he would say, that the policy of the Colonial Office was to discourage as much as possible party dissensions. One great object which he had endeavoured to impress on the Government in the Canadas was to increase the members of the Legislative Council, by introducing into it a large number of efficient persons. It was also recommended that Government should be careful to avoid giving one part of the Legislature a triumph over the other, which was the foundation of much discontent and heart burnings in the Colony. With respect to the expense of (we understood) the Rideau Canal, it was necessary not only as a line of defence, but was of the utmost utility, as it concerned the local advantages of the colony.—Col. Evans said, that we should look to the Canadas as a possession on which we could not count permanently, and he did not see the policy of keeping up such a line of defence as was between the Upper and Lower Canadas. Sir G. Murray said, that it would be impossible to retain the Lower Canadas, if we lost the Upper. As to the expenditure he must say that none was directed by the colonial department directly. All expenditure of this kind received, in the first instance, the sanction of the Treasury.—Mr. Warburton asked whether there was any document in the Treasury to show that the colonial department was authorized to expend money on the Canadas without first applying to Parliament. Mr. S. Rice said that there was no document to show that what he considered the objectionable part of the grant was (as we understand) sanctioned by the Treasury.—After a few words from Mr. Hunt, who said that if the committee divided, he would vote against the grant, the motion was put and carried without a division.

HOUSE OF LORDS—JULY 26.

SPEECH OF THE KING OF THE FRENCH.

The Earl of Aberdeen said he would be much astonished if the speech of the King of France to his Parliament did not excite surprise in the breast of every lover of England. He had lately called the attention of Government to the treaties existing between this country and Portugal—engagements unparalleled in the history of other countries. The war he then anticipated had now arrived. To the noble Lords opposite it might perhaps be agreeable to know that a Gallic fleet rode triumphant in the Tagus; but men with English hearts would expect Government to lay before them papers explaining the origin of this war, and what had been done by England to prevent her oldest and most faithful ally from lying at the mercy of the King of the French; and to be made the subject of his triumph? Another subject in the same speech was equally important and astounding. Fortresses raised at so vast a cost of treasure, and so dread a waste of blood in absolute and politic foresight of events now existing in France, and to guard against the too probable consequences of that event were now it seems to be demolished, for the mere triumph of France, and Belgium was to be protected for the future—by what? By the bare recognition of its neutrality! He hoped the Noble Lord would not object to lay on the table the diplomatic act, which provided for this destruction after fifteen years of supposed necessity; and by the concur-

rence of all Europe. [hear hear.]

Earl Grey would not permit himself to be provoked by the sneers of the Noble Earl. [Cheers from the opposition.] On him who mooted such questions lay the responsibility of disclosures, which ought to be avoided. The Noble Earl (Grey) acknowledged to the treaties binding England to Portugal, but denied that she was bound thereby to defend the yet unrecognised Government of Portugal—[cheers from the opposition]—from a war brought on by its refusal to comply with the just demands of a third power. At present he thought the papers demanded were unnecessary; and that they could not be produced without detriment to the public service; and that he should, therefore, resist their production. As to his supposed gratification at the triumphant position of France, he disclaimed the insinuation. He could tell the Noble Lords [hear.] He could tell the Noble Lords on that side of the House that not one of them felt more warmly than he for the honour of England. [hear, hear.] The destruction of the fortresses was, in the eyes of every statesman, a necessary consequence of the separation of the Kingdom of Holland and Belgium. He was challenged to produce the diplomatic act which sanctioned this destruction. He did not object to this. The Noble Earl then read part of a protocol of conference stating that the plenipotentiaries of Austria, Russia, Prussia, and Great Britain, had found that Belgium entered into a new state of existence, which they were about to guarantee; that France had guaranteed the neutrality of Belgium; that the fortresses were too numerous for Belgium to retain, and that, therefore, it was necessary to raze some of them. It was, therefore, decided that as soon as a government was established in Belgium, a negotiation was to be set on foot to procure its concurrence to the demolition of these fortresses. This protocol was forwarded to the French envoy on the 14th July. Further than this he would not permit himself to go. More explicit communication might injure pending negotiations. At the proper time he would be ready to justify the government.

The Duke of Wellington having been chiefly concerned in the erection of these fortresses, felt that the country would expect him to declare himself on this occasion. He would not do any thing, however, to embarrass the government. The Kingdom of the Netherlands was created in consequence of the late war. The Kings of England and Holland determined to erect a barrier in Belgium to protect the north of Europe. Austria, Russia, and Prussia, afterwards concurred, and gave to England their portions of the French contributions or indemnity towards defraying this expense. France had no share in them, she paid nothing. At the revolution of 1830, the King of the French bound himself to the treaties already existing, and in virtue of that bond was admitted of the conference. The separation of Holland from Belgium concerned only themselves. The neutrality of Belgium was a proper arrangement, and France was thereby secured from invasion by the powers of Europe. She ought not to have called for the destruction of those fortresses. With the assent of Holland (but not without,) England, Austria, Russia, and Prussia might agree to the demolition of their fortresses, but in case of war there was no barrier for the north of Europe against France. As to the neutrality without the power to defend it, it was nothing. He had said this much to show that these fortresses were reared only to prevent aggression on the part of France. As to Portugal, he confessed that he felt shame and humiliation when he read that the tricoloured flag waved in Lisbon—[hear, hear.]—not as a British officer, for the actions of the British army in Portugal were imperishable—[loud cheering]—but as an Englishman to think his Government had not preserved Portugal from the state into which she had been permitted to fall. [Loud cheering.] The only pretext for attack was the trial of two persons before the legal tribunals of the country. The complaint had been prosecuted at greater expense than the complaint was worth, and England ought to have used her influence to obtain from Portugal peaceful satisfaction where France was aggrieved, and with France to preserve Portugal from the arm of the strong unmercifully wielded. Portugal was bound to England by the oldest alliance in the history of nations: she was the scene of England's greatest glories: she had been four times saved by the arms of England, and was now given up to their enemy! [Cheers.] Nay, we might yet be called upon to interfere, and no defect in the title of the reigning Sovereign would hold us excused—[hear]—for the British Government in a few months had enforced on Portugal its claims under the very treaty which empowered Portugal to demand British assistance in case of need. So much for justice; and as to policy, the independence of Portugal was of the utmost consequence to the prosperity of Britain, no country with whom our alliance was so essential to our welfare. With a bill before the house to destroy the commercial treaties between the countries, we had, by infraction of the political treaties, left Portugal to her enemy. Might she not, therefore, refuse our protection when it became politic for us to offer it? And if Portugal should say "nothing is to be expected from England, save when her immediate interests are concerned; we will put ourselves under the protection of France"—[hear]—is it likely that France would not embrace the opportunity? [Loud cheers.]

Earl Grey confessed the advantage over him which the Noble Duke held on this subject, while he was restrained from all the negotiations now in progress, but

he hoped the country would not share in the humiliation felt by the Noble Duke at the events in Portugal. He confessed that he regretted these events. [hear.] It was not the importance of the original injury that caused these events; but France felt her national honour of more importance than her interest. [hear, hear.] From the opposition.] Satisfaction had been refused and demanded to the last moment. At length the satisfaction was given, and there the matter rested. He felt the disadvantage he laboured under, but felt assured he would yet be able to refute the imputations cast upon the Government. With regard to the bill touching the commercial treaties with Portugal, it did not materially affect the interest of that country, and was of essential advantage to England. As to the fortresses in Belgium, they could not be very gratifying to the French people, although meant only for protection, and although the neutrality of the soil was an advantage to France. He thought the guarantee of neutrality equivalent to the fortresses. If war had broken out, his conviction was that these fortresses would have been French in a single week. His opinion was that the line chosen for these fortresses was injudicious. The questions for the House to consider when the matter was fully stated would be, whether the demolition of the fortresses was not a natural consequence of the separation between Holland and Belgium, and whether the arrangement was not better than that of 1815.

The conversation was allowed to drop (after a brief consultation on the opposition bench,) and the house adjourned.

BELGIAN FORTRESSES.

PROTOCOL OF A CONFERENCE HELD AT THE FOREIGN OFFICE THE 17TH OF APRIL, 1831.

Present.—The Plenipotentiaries of Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia.

"The Plenipotentiaries of Austria, of Great Britain, of Prussia, and of Russia, having met, having directed their attention to the fortresses constructed since the year 1815 in the Kingdom of the Netherlands, at the expense of the Four Courts; and to the determinations which it would become necessary to take with respect to these fortresses, when the separation of Belgium from Holland shall have been definitively effected.

"Having carefully examined this question, the Plenipotentiaries of the Four Courts were unanimously of opinion;—that the new situation in which Belgium would be placed, with her neutrality acknowledged and guaranteed by France, ought to change the system of military defence which had been adopted for the Kingdom of the Netherlands;—that the fortresses in question would be too numerous not to make it difficult for the Belgians to provide for their maintenance and defence;—that, moreover, the unanimously admitted inviolability of the Belgian territory offered a security which did not previously exist;—finally, that a part of these fortresses, constructed under different circumstances, might at present be razed.

"In consequence the Plenipotentiaries have fully decided that, as soon as a Government shall exist in Belgium recognized by the Powers taking part in the conferences of London, a negotiation shall be set on foot between the Four Powers and that Government, for the purpose of selecting such of the said fortresses, as should be demolished. (Signed) Esterhazy, Palmerston, Bulow, Lieven, Wessenberg, Matuszewick.

"No. 2."

"Foreign-Office, July 14, 1831." "The undersigned, Plenipotentiaries of the Courts of Austria, of Great Britain, of Prussia, and of Russia, being desirous to give a further proof of the reliance which they place on the disposition shown by the Government of his Majesty the King of the French for the maintenance of the general peace, think it their duty to communicate to the Prince de Talleyrand the annexed copy of a Protocol which they have issued upon the subject of the fortresses erected since the year 1815 in the kingdom of the Netherlands.

"The undersigned see no objection to giving the same publicity to this protocol as may be given to the other acts of the negotiations which have taken place since the month of November, 1830, on the affairs of Belgium.

"They take this opportunity to renew, &c. (Signed) Esterhazy, Palmerston, Bulow, Lieven. Matuszewick."

NOTICE.

THE Co-partnership heretofore existing between the Subscribers, under the firm of Langen & Robertson, is this day dissolved by mutual consent. All persons who are indebted to said firm, are requested to call and settle the same; and those who have demands, will please render them forthwith to either of the Subscribers.

T. L. LANGEN.
T. R. ROBERTSON.
Frederickton, 16th August, 1831.

The Subscriber begs leave to acquaint the public, that he will continue to transact business as the Store formerly occupied by Langen & Robertson, and will be happy to supply his friends with any article in his way, either for cash or country produce.

T. R. ROBERTSON.

Frederickton, 31st May 1831.

THE SUBSCRIBER.

GRATEFUL for the favours already received, and hopes by his strict attention to business to merit a continuance of Public Patronage. He still intends carrying on the various branches of his Profession, viz.—Carriage, Sleigh, Wagon, Cart, and Plough making, and all other complements of husbandry, at his residence, corner of King's and Regent's Streets.

JOHN RISTEN.