

Imperial Parliament.

House of Commons, March 26.

SIR E. CODRINGTON.—EXPLANATION.

SIR R. PEEL rose to make an explanation in answer to the accusations of Sir E. Codrington yesterday. When that gallant officer had without any notice whatever, direct or indirect, for at least three years, charged him with having uttered statements respecting his professional conduct not consistent with fact and equity, he felt it due to the House, to himself, and to the gallant officer himself, to abstain from reply till he had carefully adverted to the facts of the case. He told the gallant officer, that if, on inquiry, he should discover that he had given utterance to any expression calculated to wound, or had spoken of him in a spirit not consistent with strict justice, he should be prepared notwithstanding the lapse of time, to perform that act of tardy justice which he should have been glad to have performed sooner. [hear.] But he felt also, that in the same proportion that he should be prepared to redress an injury and repair an injustice, if it should be found that he had spoken in a spirit of variance with justice and equity—he should be prepared to vindicate and defend to the uttermost his conduct if wrongly questioned. [hear, hear.] The gallant officer told them as a reason for the long delay in bringing forward his case, that he despaired of justice—redress save at the hands of a reformed Parliament. Perhaps it was for this reason also that the gallant officer did not think it necessary to give him any intimation to bring it forward even in a reformed Parliament.

SIR E. CODRINGTON begged to remind the Right Hon. Baronet that he had written to Lord Melville, then First Lord of the Admiralty, the moment he saw in *Galignani's Messenger* the extract from the *Mirror of Parliament* report of the Right Hon. Baronet's speech, contradicting the Right Hon. Baronet's statement, with the understanding that Lord Melville would communicate his contradiction to the Right Hon. Baronet, his colleague. After that he mentioned the circumstance to Mr. William Peel.

SIR R. PEEL.—What time was that.

SIR E. CODRINGTON.—I do not exactly remember the exact time. My impression is, that it is not three years ago; but I cannot speak positively.

SIR R. PEEL appealed to the House whether the impression conveyed by the gallant officer's statement last night was not, that he had communicated with Mr. W. Peel on the subject recently. [hear, and "No."] At least, most certainly, that was his (Sir R. Peel's) impression. Well, the gallant officer had at last brought forward his charge—confident of justice and redress from that reformed Parliament. He could tell the gallant officer that he did not appeal to that reformed Parliament with more confidence than he did. He cared not that the tribunal was a reformed Parliament, for he knew that he was addressing an assembly of English gentlemen who, as such, would be incapable of permitting themselves to be for a moment influenced from dealing out impartial justice—no matter how strenuous might have been his opposition to the reform bill, no matter how opposed their party and political feelings. [hears.] The question then was, not what might have appeared in *Galignani's* paper as his sentiments respecting the gallant officer himself—whether this was not the real point or question at issue between them:—He in the exercise of his duty as a minister of the Crown did make a statement in his place in Parliament inconsistent with fact, and bearing hard upon the gallant officer's professional conduct. [hear, hear.] This was the question between them ("hear," from Sir Edward Codrington), and in discussing it he would dismiss all petty cavils respecting mere verbal expressions. [hear.] The statement alluded to by the gallant officer was made by him on the 3d April, 1828, very nearly five years ago. It was on the face of it not very easy for him to remember the precise words uttered by him on that occasion; and he had no other means of refreshing his recollection, except the contemporary publication of the proceedings in Parliament. He had that morning carefully examined those publications, and indeed had taken more pains to ascertain what he was alleged to have said than on any other occasion within his remembrance. The point simply was, whether he (Sir R. Peel) was or was not a correct interpreter of the sentiments of his Majesty's Government. At an early period of the session the question was raised by the Hon. Member for Westminster (Sir J. Hobhouse), whether the gallant Admiral was entitled to the thanks of Parliament for the battle fought by him at Navarino; and he (Sir R. Peel) was, in the discharge of his duty, obliged to oppose the motion. But he appealed to the House whether he opposed it in a temper that indicated any indisposition on his part to do justice to the gallant Admiral. He placed his opposition to the motion on such grounds that the Right Hon. Baronet, the Member for Westminster, declared that he felt no difficulty in withdrawing it, and he appealed to the testimony of his political opponents, in the perfect confidence that it would confirm his statement, that in opposing the motion he manifested no temper, nor tone, which could warrant the belief that he was actuated by any hostile or illiberal feeling towards the gallant Admiral. [hear, hear.] But on the 3d of April, 1828, a question was put to him by Sir Robert Wilson, his answer to which was the more immediate cause of the observations which the gallant Admiral last night applied to him. About that time a report, which created a great feeling of indignation, reached this country, that the wreck of the Turco-Egyptian fleet had arrived at

Alexandria, having on board a considerable number of Greek slaves, who were taken to the markets of the place and sold. In consequence of the intimation that part of the population of the Morea was to be transported to Egypt having been conveyed to the British Government, orders were sent out from this country, and in consequence of these orders, an officer, who was an honour to his profession, and whose loss his country, as well as his immediate connexions, must deeply deplore,—he meant Captain Spencer,—was despatched to Ibrahim Pacha, with instructions to state, that if Ibrahim Pacha intended to carry on the war in such a barbarous way, England would interfere with a naval force to prevent an act so inconsistent with the principles of common humanity. He (Sir R. Peel) then went on to state—"that instructions had been given to the British Admiral before the battle took place, and these instructions were consequently still in force, by which the British fleet was directed to prevent any movement whatever of the Egyptian army from the Morea, every facility should be afforded for the execution of such an attempt; but it was perfectly understood that the Egyptian forces only were to be removed; and that any attempt at removing any portion of the population of the Morea was to be resisted." Now what period of time elapsed before instructions on this point were conveyed to the gallant Admiral? It must be recollected by the House that no instructions could be sent to the gallant Admiral which were not addressed to the three commanders of the combined fleet; and before that could be done, it was necessary to hold a conference and prepare a protocol. Not having the documents at present in his possession, he did not know whether the Egyptian fleet sailed from Navarino on the 27th December, or whether that was the day on which it arrived at Alexandria, but he found that a conference was held on the 12th of March, doubtless immediately upon the receipt of the intimation of the landing of a portion of the Greek population at Alexandria. At that conference instructions were sent to the admirals commanding the combined squadron in the Levant, expressly referring to the accounts received from Alexandria, and directing them not again to allow the transportation of any portion of the Greek population, to set at liberty any Greek captives they might find on board Turkish vessels, and to send them to some part of Greece, not in the occupation of the enemy. Thus, while vindicating the Government from blame, he also said, that he cast no censure on the Gallant Admiral for not carrying into effect his instructions, because he knew the physical powers of the fleet were cramped by the battle of Navarino. The Gallant Admiral last night complained that he (Sir R. Peel) had stated that despatches were sent out to him immediately after the arrival of the intelligence of the transportation of the Greek population to Egypt. In none of the reports to which he alluded did he find any mention of that circumstance. In *Hansard's Debates* he was reputed to have said "As the intelligence at present stood, the extent of spoilation that had been committed was uncertain. Unfortunately, too those slaves had been landed in Egypt, and sold in the public market. If the ships which contained them had been taken at sea, there could have been no difficulty about their disposal, but now they were probably divided, and the property of private individuals. At present he would go no further than to repeat that within 48 hours after the arrival of the news, the most active inquiry had been entered upon by Government as to all the facts connected with the case. Sufficient information had not yet been received, but the investigation was going on." For the speeches which might have been attributed to him in *Galignani*, and other papers, he was not responsible, but he had no objection to stand by the reports to which he had already alluded. There might be slight variations in those reports, but that did not impeach their general accuracy. An expression might not be heard, or might be misconstrued, and yet the general bearing of the report might be substantially accurate and correct. For instance, he had seen it stated in the papers of this morning that the Gallant Admiral had said that he had made a communication on this subject to Lord Melbourne. Now, the Gallant Admiral had done no such thing, nor did he state that he had. He said that he had made communication to Lord Melville and yet the report in the morning papers was in substance true. He again repeated that the report of the words were attributed to him in 1828, in the papers to which he had before referred, were correct; and they proved that he had made no statement that was inconsistent with facts, that was inconsistent with impartiality, or that was derogatory in the slightest degree to the character of the Gallant Admiral. [Great Cheering.]

SIR E. CODRINGTON rose to reply, but the lateness of the hour at which he concluded his speech, (half past 1 o'clock) prevents us from giving any thing but a very brief abstract of a speech delivered with a rapidity which made it indistinct. He commenced by stating that if the Right Hon. Baronet had at any former time been kind enough to say as much in answer to his application for redress as he had said that evening, the House would never have heard of his complaint, and this thing would not have gone further. As it was supposed that he had acted contrary to his orders in not preventing the transportation of Greek slaves to Egypt, he thought it necessary to clear up a matter which was an imputation upon his character. When

he first saw the report in *Galignani*, thinking it important that he should not be supposed to have had the power to prevent the transportation of Greek slaves to Egypt and not to have exercised it, he wrote to the Admiralty, saying that if it was intended that he should prevent the transportation of Greek slaves, he ought to receive orders to that effect, and that he should have great pleasure in carrying them into effect. Now, he never had received such orders during all the time that he was in the Mediterranean, though he had written expressly for them. Whilst there, he had contrived to arrange a treaty with Mohammed Ali, which Colonel Cradock, after using all the influence of this government, had not been able to effect. During the negotiation of that treaty he had used all the address in his power to get the Pacha to give up the slaves whom he had carried from Greece. He had even agreed that the Egyptians should remain in possession of the forts of the Morea, when their army evacuated that country, knowing that it would be safer for us to leave them in the hands of the Turks than in those of the Greeks. He had, however, strenuously resisted giving up to them the Fort of Navarino. "Then," said the Pacha, "there is an end of all the matter." He (Sir E. Codrington) then said to the Pacha "there is one thing which will justify me in the eyes of the people of England for leaving you in possession of the fort of Navarino." "What is that?" said the Pacha, with great anxiety. "Give me up all the Greek slaves which you have brought in to Egypt." "The thing shall be done," said the Pacha. "I'll give you up every one of them directly." Having got possession of these Greek slaves, he went to the British Consul and said to him, "hire a vessel to transport these slaves to Greece, for I take it for granted that you have authority to do so from the government at home." The house would be surprised at hearing the answer which he received from the consul. The consul said, "I have not authority from the British Government to spend a single farthing in the restoration of these Greek slaves to their country." He could not express the astonishment which overwhelmed him on receiving this intelligence. As soon as he recovered from it, he said to the consul, "hire a ship for them at all events, and if the government does not pay you for it, I will." [Great cheering.] He denied that he had any orders to prevent the transportation of Greek slaves from the Morea to Egypt; on the contrary, he was bound by his orders to encourage the passage of ships from the Morea to Egypt, but to prevent their passage from Egypt to Morea. If he had met at sea the Egyptian fleet steering for Egypt, he should have conveyed and assisted them to Alexandria; for such conduct would have been consistent with his orders. If he had insisted upon examining into the contents of their vessels, he would have brought about that very collision which he was so anxious to avoid. He then read a letter which he had written to Mr. Croker when he first saw the observations in *Galignani*, and to which he complained that he had never received any answer. He likewise entered into a statement of the manner in which Lord Goderich had rectified in the House of Lords the erroneous impressions which had gone abroad respecting the orders which he had received on taking the command in the Mediterranean. He contended that in the interval between Sir Harry Neale's receiving his orders and his (Sir Edward Codrington's) succeeding to that officers command not less than 20,000 Greek slaves were openly sold in the Asiatic markets. If orders had been issued to prevent the transportation of the Greeks as slaves from their country, why had this taken place, and why, having taken place, was it not inquired into? He contended that no transportation of Greek slaves had taken place whilst the British fleet was under his command. He next proceeded to inform the House, that upon getting no answer to his letter from Mr. Croker, he had upon his return to England, made a point of going to Lord Melville, then first Lord of the Admiralty, and of complaining of the unjust imputations which the government had cast upon him. Lord Melville had referred to a copy of the Parliamentary debates which were in the admiralty. What debates they were he could not say, but in those debates he saw expressions attributed to the Right Hon. Baronet which he thought he had a right to complain of. He said so to Lord Melville, and desired Lord Melville to mention the subject to the Right Hon. Gentleman.

SIR R. PEEL.—Lord Melville never spoke to me on the subject. [hear.]

SIR E. CODRINGTON had not said that Lord Melville had spoken to the Right Hon. Gentleman, he only thought it strange that Lord Melville had not. Some time afterwards he met Mr. W. Peel, and told him that he (Sir E. Codrington) thought that his brother (Sir R. Peel) had made statements in Parliament injurious to his character, and requested him to get that injurious statement set right. Still, however, nothing was done. If he had been wanting in courtesy to the Right Hon. Gentlemen yesterday in bringing the question so unexpectedly forward, he was unintentionally so, and tendered his apology for it to the House. He was desirous to preserve courtesy to all men; and if the Right Hon. Baronet would, as a favour, accept from him the copy of a little work which he had published on this matter, and which contained no remarks, but only public documents, he would see from the nature of Lord Dudley's letter, which he read, that he had not in any degree, transgressed his orders. The Right Hon. Baronet might think him too sore upon the point; but he trusted that the Right hon.

Baronet would consider the treatment which he had met with. He had been superseded from his command without a court-martial, when the mere fact of his supersession was a severe reflection upon his conduct. He knew that a change in the politics of the country had occasioned that supersession. That he could understand; but he could not understand why he should have been represented as not acting in obedience to his orders. He would fearlessly assert that neither in spirit nor in letter had he ever disobeyed any orders which he had received as an officer. So far was he from bearing any ill-will to the Right hon. Gentleman, that he would conclude as he began, by declaring that if the Right hon. Gentleman had any previous time said what he had that night said he should have been perfectly satisfied.

SIR R. PEEL said that the only point now at issue between himself and the gallant Admiral was whether there had been any misconstruction of orders on the part of the gallant Admiral. On that point he (Sir R. Peel) had stated his opinion, and therefore need not repeat it. If the gallant officer had placed in his hands the volume of which he (Sir E. Codrington) now promised him a copy, and asked him to read it, and consider whether he (Sir R. Codrington) deserved any imputations which he (Sir R. Peel) might have cast upon him, he should have been most happy to have considered anything which he might have said. It was, however, the suddenness of the attack which the Gallant Admiral had made upon him that made him sore, and made him anxious to address the House that evening in his own vindication. The Gallant Admiral had asked him (Sir R. Peel) to read his (Sir E. Codrington's) book: let him ask the gallant officer in return, to read what he really had said, and then he would see whether he (Sir R. Peel) had done him (Sir E. Codrington) any injustice. In conclusion, he again denied that he had ever received from Lord Melville the communication which the Gallant Officer had intended to send to him.

House of Commons, March 22d.

MR. STANLEY presented a petition praying that the disabilities of the Jews might be removed, inasmuch as they were as industrious and legal as any other class of His Majesty's subjects.

MR. COBBETT, with all deference to the hon. member, begged to ask him in what respect the Jews were industrious. Could the hon. gentleman find him a Jew who did anything beyond getting the money out of the pockets of the people by crafty means? [Laughter.] If he could shew him a Jew who dug, went to plough, or did any thing useful, then, probably, he [Mr. Cobbett] might agree that they were an industrious people.

MR. E. G. STANLEY, on moving that the petition be laid on the table, said that the chief objection of the hon. member for Oldham to the removal of the disabilities of the Jews had seemed to be that the Jews were blasphemers. He, however, hoped that as the hon. member, in the former part of his life, had condemned Thomas Paine as a blasphemer, yet, had lately assisted in a sort of apotheosis to the memory of that individual, by bringing his bones from America to this country, he would change his opinion in regard to the Jews. [hear, and laughter.]

MR. COBBETT said that the hon. gentleman had accused him of having formerly represented Thomas Paine a blasphemer, and with having latterly done something which would imply that he (Mr. Cobbett) entertained a very different opinion. Since the time he had first spoken or written of Mr. Paine he had written a hundred volumes, in which he had occasion to mention his name at least three hundred times, but whenever he had spoken in commendation of his writings he (Mr. Cobbett) had always made an exception as to the religious writings of that individual. With regard to what he had done in bringing the remains of Paine to this country, he considered that he had only done that which was his duty, and for the reasons that he had stated at the time, that Paine had written and published books in England and France relative to the pernicious consequences of paper money. Mr. Paine had been his (Mr. Cobbett's) teacher, and if his advice had been followed, this country would have been saved from the difficulties in which it was now placed by the currency.

MR. E. G. STANLEY said, that after what had fallen from the hon. member for Oldham, he hoped in justification of himself to be permitted to read the authority on which he (Mr. Stanley) had made the statement, and which was contained in the publications of the hon. member himself. In one part of those publications he found the following passage:—"In no part of the *Age of Reason* does Paine speak in terms of impious irreverence of God. He praises God, and calls upon his name, and this, too, in a strain of eloquence the equal of which I never heard in any sermon." Vol. 35, p. 789. In vol. 3, p. 725, he found this passage:—"The *Age of Reason* is as despicable as its author, the wretch has all his life been employed in leading fools astray from their duty. His religion is of a piece with his politics; the one inculcates the right of revolting against government, and the other against God." [hear.] In another place he found this passage:—"Though Thomas Paine was no Christian, he was no blasphemer; he offers no indignity to God himself." Vol. 35, p. 725, and in the fourth volume of the hon. gentleman's publication was the following:—"Paine was a cruel, treacherous, and blaspheming ruffian; he was a traitor, and a traitor is the foulest fiend on earth." [hear, hear.] The hon. gen-

tlemen, [Mr. Stanley] was about to offer some observations to the house, when

the SPEAKER said he put it to the hon. member whether he should proceed further, having paired off with the hon. member for Oldham. [hear, and laughter.]

MR. COBBETT subsequently gave notice, that on the 28th of April, he would move that the House address His Majesty, to remove Sir R. Peel from the Privy Council, on account of the Right Honourable Baronet's acts, relating to the currency. This announcement was made amid the general laughter of the House.

ROYAL GAZETTE.

FREDERICTON, MAY 29th 1833.

ALMS HOUSE AND WORK HOUSE. Commissioner for } GEORGE MINCHIN, Esq. next week.

SAVING'S BANK. Trustees for } HENRY G. CLOPPER, Esq. } JAMES TAYLOR, Esq. } MARK NEEDHAM, Esq. next week.

HEAD QUARTERS.

Fredericton, 21st May, 1833.

MILITIA GENERAL ORDERS. The Lieutenant Governor and Commander-in-Chief, has been pleased to order the following arrangement for the General Inspection of the Militia, to be observed the present year, viz:—

Corps to be inspected by Lieut. Col. Turner.
1st Batt. King's County.
1st division at Seely's Point on Friday the 5th July.
2nd do. at Kennebunk on Saturday 6th do.
3rd Batt. King's County.
At Hampton Ferry on Tuesday the 9th July.
2nd Batt. King's County.
At Sussex Vale on Thursday the 11th July.
1st Batt. Westmorland.
1st division at Pittfield's on Friday 12th July.
2nd do. at the Bend on Saturday 13th do.
3rd do. at Shadac on Monday 15th do.
2nd Batt. Kent.
At Bouctouche on Tuesday 16th July.
1st Batt. Kent.
At Richibucto on Thursday 18th July.
2nd Batt. Westmorland.
1st division at Charlotters near Memramcook bridge on Monday the 22d July.
2nd do. at Sackville on Wednesday 24th July.
4th Batt. Westmorland.
At Bay Verts on Friday 26th July.
3rd Batt. Westmorland.
At Hopewell on Monday 28th July.
2nd Batt. Charlotte.
At Magaguadavic on Thursday 29th August.
1st Batt. Charlotte.
At Saint Andrews on Saturday 31st August.
4th Batt. Charlotte.
At St. Stephen on Monday 2nd September.
3rd Batt. Charlotte.
1st division at Indian Island on Thursday the 5th September.
2nd do. at Grand Manan on Saturday 7th do.
1st Batt. Saint John City.
At Saint John on the Sands on Saturday the 14th September.
2nd Batt. St. John City.
On the Sands on Monday 16th September.
1st Batt. Saint John County.
At Manawagonish on Monday 14th October.
2nd Batt. Saint John County.
1st division at Loch Lomond on Wednesday 16th October.
2nd do. at Quaco on Friday 18th do.
Corps to be inspected by Lieut. Col. Allen.
2nd Batt. Northumberland.
1st division at A. Moore's (Ludlow) on Saturday 29th June.
2nd do. near Capt. Fiddes's, (N. W. Branch) on Monday 1st July.
1st Batt. Northumberland.
1st division at Saint Andrews Point on Tuesday 2nd July.
2nd do. at Glenelg at Capt. McDonald's Farm on Thursday 4th July.
3rd do. at Burnt Church (Alpwick) on Friday 5th July.

1st Batt. Gloucester.
1st division at Dalhousie on Wednesday 10th July.
2nd do. at Bathurst on Friday 12th do.
2nd Batt. Gloucester.
At Caraquet on Monday the 15th July.
1st Batt. Queens.
1st division at Nepoos on Saturday the 14th Sept.
2nd do. at Gagetown on Monday 16th do.
2nd Batt. Queens.
1st division at John Ferrie's Point (Grand Lake) on Tuesday 17th Sept.
2nd do. at O'Leary's Farm (Salmon River) on Thursday 19th do.
3rd do. at New Canaan on Saturday 21st Sept.
Sunbury Regt.
Near Capt. George Miles [Maugerville] on Monday 23rd September.
1st Batt. York.
At Fredericton on Wednesday 25th Sept.
5th Batt. York.
1st division at Mill's on the Nashua on Thursday the 26th September.
2nd do. at Captain Clements on Friday 27th Sept.
3rd Batt. York.
1st division at Upper French Village on Tuesday 1st October.
2nd do. at Nackawick on Wednesday 2nd do.
3rd do. at Wicklow near McMullin's on Friday 4th do.
2nd do. at Restook river on Saturday 5th do.
4th Batt. York.
At Green River [Madawaska] on Monday 7th October.

PROMOTIONS, &c.

1st Batt. Westmorland Militia.
To be Captains.
Lieut. Robert Stiles, 21st May 1833.
" Daniel Harrington, 21st do.
" Alex. Carr, 23d do.
To be Lieutenants.
Ensign John Scott, vice Stiles, 21st May
" Joseph Harrington, vice D. 23d do.
" Harrington, 23d do.
" John Boyd, vice Carr, 24th do.
Robert Dobson, Gent. 25th do.
George Harrington, do.
To be Ensigns.
George Cochran, Gent. vice J. Scott, 21st May
Charles Holsted, 22d do.
David Field, 23d do.
Oliver Cole, vice C. Smith, removed 24th do.
from the County.
George Harper, Gent. vice J. Harrington, 25th do.
James Welling, do. 26th do.

1st Batt. Kent.
To be Major.
Captain David McAlmon, dated 21st May
To be Captains.
Lieut. Colin Rankine vice S. Whetton, 21st May
who resigns.
" Samuel Girvan, vice McAlmon, 22d do.
" William Brait, vice Power left the county, 23d do.
" Hugh McKay, vice S. C. Hawes left the Province, 24th do.