

# EUROPE.

ENGLAND.

## Imperial Parliament.

House of Commons, May 24.

### NEGRO SLAVERY.

Lord HOWICK regreted to differ with his Right Hon. Friend Mr. Stanley, but it was a question upon which were at issue, not only the honor of the country, but the happiness of millions. The proposed mode of treating it was pregnant with such fatal results that he must briefly state his reasons for opposing it. It had been said that the first resolution gave the slave the essentials of freedom; but this was attempting to dupe the house with words. The only distinction between the slave and the freeman was the condition on which he gave his labour, and that being the case, how did his Right Hon. Friend seek to get rid of slavery? For three-fourths of his time the negro is to be the apprenticed servant of his master, not by his own free choice but by a contract forced upon him. And what was that contract? That he was to give three-fourths of his time for the food and clothing which he now received. Now in the evidence taken before the House of Lords, it was stated that the value of the supply furnished to each negro was 45s. a-year. So that the negro, for three-fourths of his time, was to give his labour for one-fifth of its value. Was not this a distinct mark of slavery? His labour would not be voluntary, it would be extorted by the fear of punishment. His Right Hon. Friend asked in what respect the apprenticed negro would differ from the labourer in this country? The difference was the greatest in the world—it was neither more nor less than that one contracted voluntarily, the other compulsorily.

Was the plan intended for the benefit of the slaves or their masters? There would be, no doubt, a dispute upon this point. If for the master, he (Lord Howick) most solemnly protested against any part of the system in respect to the pecuniary interests of the master. Whatever were the claims of the master on the slave, he had at least none on the slave. The slaves, on the contrary, had themselves claims for compensation. (Hear.) But his Right Hon. Friend might deny that he intended this measure for the benefit of the master.

He might say he proposed certain parts of the scheme for the benefit of both. If this was the case—if he meant to promote the benefit of the slave as well as that of the master, this should be distinctly shown. But it was difficult to understand how the slave was to be benefited by giving away so large a portion of his labour. Why not allow him to apply it to his own purposes? His Right Hon. Friend said, that there was no difference between the white man and the negro, there was a difference between the character of slave and freeman—that the slave had contracted habits of idleness which he could not readily get rid of. He was not the plan of his Right Hon. Friend calculated to continue that very evil? He said that the negro had been compelled to labour under a system of force, fraud and injustice. Why then continue, for twelve years more, that same system of forcing the negro to labour without the idea of a reward, and solely by the idea of punishment? The necessary tendency of the regulations was to perpetuate that vicious association of ideas which slavery necessarily produced. On the view of the interest of the negro, therefore, he (Lord Howick) was prepared to reject the scheme. But there was another view to be taken of the subject, and one to which some Hon. Gentlemen were likely to give their chief consideration—the interest of the planters. He asked what would be the effect of the regulations on the interest of the masters? Nominally, the planter would have a right to three-fourths of the labour of the slave. But how much would that nominal advantage really produce to the master? It was not to be expected that the slave would voluntarily give up his time to his master. His Right Hon. Friend had truly stated, that men would not labour diligently and strenuously, except under the impulse of some strong stimulus. In this country, in every country where free labour existed, men were induced to work to avoid the pressure of want, and they knew that the reward they would obtain would be in the direct proportion of their diligence and industry. In the case of slaves, they laboured because they knew if they did not, they would be subjected to punishment, and therefore they submitted from a sense of terror to do what was disagreeable to them. Which of these motives could be brought to bear on the apprenticed negro? Had the apprenticed negro any motive to voluntary exertion? His wages were not increased by increasing his exertions. In no respect would he be a greater gainer by work than by idleness. He would do as little as he could, not only from a desire to avoid fatigue, and to reserve his strength for those hours which were at his own disposal, but from a determination to make a contract and bargain unprofitable, which was in the highest degree unjust, and to the advantage of his master. If the plan of his Right Hon. Friend failed to enlist the feelings of the negro, how stood the case on other grounds? He had admitted there must be some stimulus. The planters, and every witness who had spoken upon the subject, concurred in stating that a slave would do twice as much work for himself, in a given time, as the utmost amount of punishment would induce him to do for his master. (Hear, hear, hear.) This was the case even under the present system: with the cart-whip at his back, the negro could not, by any amount of punishment, be forced to give out the full amount of his power. Accordingly, the colonial legislatures had uniformly refused to allow the punishment of slaves to be diminished. The abolition of the whip was one of the first improvements pressed on the colonists. In the debate of 1833 Lord Selworth (then Mr. Ellis) stated that there would be no difficulty whatever in procuring the assent of the planters to this obvious and necessary improvement. He (Lord Howick) was afraid that Lord Selworth was not aware of the real cause by which the labour of his negroes was obtained. The legislature of Jamaica, however, refused to give up the driving system, and the driving system was still in full vigour in Jamaica, (hear,) and in every one of the legislative colonies. The whip had been abolished in the Crown colonies, and he would read the sentiments of a person of great authority, speaking the sentiments of a committee of planters. "It is only through fear of punishment that ill-disposed slaves can be induced to work; and by the orders in council the slave managers are so fettered, that their power is inadequate to compel a proper quantity of work." For "ill-disposed slaves," we might say "slaves in general;" for, so far as regards unwillingness to labour for another, every slave is ill-disposed. (Hear.) His Right Hon. Friend had quoted the number of lashes inflicted in the last three years in Demerara, and had stated, that although there had been a decrease of the slave

population, there had been a great increase of the number and severity of the punishments. He (Lord Howick) wished he had read the sentiment which followed from the protector of slaves in that colony, in which that able and intelligent officer added—"and three-fourths of the punishments have arisen out of difficulties in respect to work." The same officer said that seven eighths of the whole punishments inflicted in the colony arose, directly or indirectly, from the same source. (Hear.) A still more remarkable fact was, that notwithstanding this vast increase of the number and severity of punishments, the effects they were intended to produce had daily diminished; that there was rapidly increasing difficulty in compelling the negro, by any amount of punishment, to give that degree of labour which he was capable of performing. The colonial legislatures, in rejecting the improvement offered to them, considered that if the present system was to be kept up in full vigour, the power of stimulus must not be diminished. His Right Hon. Friend asked whether there was so much punishment in Jamaica as in Demerara? He (Lord Howick) thought much less, for, as the number of lashes was regulated, they must be made up in intensity (hear,) and this was borne out by the fact, that in no colony was the mortality so great as in Demerara. It might be alleged that he (Lord Howick) was arguing inconsistently with his former opinions, and he admitted that his opinions upon this subject had undergone a very great change; the more he had enquired the more his views of it had enlarged. If the present system was to be maintained, and the negroes were to work by force and not by will, the evil was less where the master was an irresponsible despot. In Jamaica there would be cases of infinitely more cruelty than in Demerara, but the total amount of suffering would be less. A good master in Jamaica need seldom use the whip. The slaves in that island knew that the power of punishment existed, and therefore did not provoke it. But in Demerara the slave knew that there was an amount of flogging beyond which the master could not go, and if he could bear that, he might be as idle as he pleased; practically it was the fact, that such was the feeling of the slaves, and that they acted upon that feeling. If the slave received 25 lashes for being idle to day, he said "I will be worse to-morrow; to day he reached your limit." This was, therefore, a source of struggle and irritation between master and slave, but the punishment was utterly inadequate to enforce a proper degree of labour. If this was the case under the order in council, what might be expected during the hours that the apprentice worked for his master?

The negro would have no possible interest in the work; he might stand seven hours a-day with his hoe in his hand, and would do as little as he could. An Hon. Member near him reminded him that he had said nothing about the slaves' subsistence. He was glad he had mentioned that circumstance, because he might not perhaps have adverted to the manner in which the slave subsisted in Jamaica. The whole value of the articles the planter gives to each negro was 45s. a year, and the only thing in the shape of provisions was one third of a barrel of herrings, which was not so much food, as seasoning for food. The Noble Lord read an extract from a work entitled *Notices of Jamaica in 1811*, written by a planter of 30 years' experience, who stated that a negro had a lot of land given him, from which he was expected to subsist himself and family. If the provision garden was unproductive or insufficient, the negro was not allowed to obtain a supply from the stores of the planters. Such, with a few exceptions, he said, was the general practice from one end of the island to another. In case of want, brothers were to assist sisters, uncles nieces, and children parents; and the aged and infirm, who had no family, were to have recourse to the charity and benevolence of their neighbours. It was the duty of the negro to provide food for himself and his family and it was his own fault if he did not take the necessary precautions against want. His (Lord Howick's) argument went to show, that if, under the order in council, there was no possibility of extorting from the negro an adequate amount of labour, it was quite impossible to do so under the system proposed by his Right Hon. Friend. The punishment, under this system, was to be left in the hands of the magistrates, and let him ask any Hon. Gentleman who had seen agricultural labour performed, how a magistrate, when a gang of slaves was brought before him for idleness, was to decide the time with the hoe in their hand, that they had done as much as they could, and were sorry they could not do any more; how was the magistrate to decide in such a case? How was it possible to obtain from any labourer the amount of labour they could give? Task-work had been suggested, but it was impracticable here. Suppose it could be adopted, however, how could a magistrate decide a point which depended upon individual strength, upon soil, and upon other points which varied materially? A negro of ordinary strength might work 120 cane-holes a-day, but the accident of dry or wet weather would make a difference. How was the magistrate to enforce labour from the slave—and when he said labour, he meant strenuous, not inefficient, exertion—under these circumstances? It would require a whole army of Magistrates—as many magistrates as planters. But the experiment had been tried, under ten times as advantageous circumstances as it could be under the plan of his Right Hon. Friend proposed; and in the case of white labourers too. The high price of labour in the Australian colonies led to the experiment of sending out indentured servants, who were bound to work for their masters on a specified scale of wages, and the experiment had invariably failed. The reason was obvious. They laboured without any interest; they had no object in their exertions. The masters were driven to resort to compulsion; the servants were punished, and came back more idle and stupid than before. There was, however, in this case, no previous animosity against the master; but the negro apprentices would have money, and many a year of drudgery to lay to the account of their masters, as well as many a raw back. (Hear.) The white men entered voluntarily and by choice into agreement; their situation was improved thereby, and, if gratitude was a sufficient motive, those men ought to have worked. The negroes, on the contrary, instead of a sense of justice, would be stung by a sense of injustice at receiving only a fifteenth part of the value of their labour. Then, whether the interests of the masters or the negroes were considered, the plan proposed by his Right Hon. Friend, if by any accident it should come into operation, could not answer. But how could it come into operation? His Right Hon. Friend said that he should pass the law by the authority of the British Parliament, and that there was no limit to the authority of Parliament to legislate for the colonies except Parliament itself set a limit. With respect to the legal right this might be true, but he considered that, in giving free con-

stitutions to the colonies, this country had, practically at least, given up all right to interfere with the local legislatures, unless there was a strong necessity for such interference. He admitted that there was the strongest possible necessity for interference in this case; but as the right arose from the necessity of the case, it should be limited by it, and we should go no farther than was necessary to do strict justice to slaves in the colonies. But when the people were opposed to a law, it was very difficult to make it operate. How would the people of Jamaica treat this measure? Would the judges, who are planters, hold it good? Would colonial juries convict? His Right Hon. Friend must abrogate in his bill every constitutional privilege in the colonies. (Hear, hear.) It was only extreme necessity that could justify this; but did that necessity exist? He (Lord Howick) believed we could not trust the colonial legislatures to legislate if we allowed them the right over the labour of another, which would be enacting a continuance and perpetuation of slavery. But on a different principle we had a right to act: let us say, that every man [hear, hear, and] to produce of his own labour [profitably employed for his own benefit, and he would allow the colonial legislatures to do what they pleased. (Hear.) His Right Hon. Friend admitted that there was no competition to regulate labour in Jamaica, but unless competition could be introduced we could not bear on the mind of the negro, he could have no notion of free labour. The conclusion to which he (Lord Howick) had been irresistibly led was, that there were only two possible courses to be adopted; we must recognize perfect slavery or perfect freedom; the present scheme was neither. To leave things as they are was an evil which his Right Hon. Friend had argued in a masterly manner. He had correctly stated that the population of Demerara was waning down. Various reasons had been given to account for the diminution of the slave population; but the fact was, that the diminution was in direct proportion to the labour exacted from them, and was regulated by the number of pounds of sugar for each slave. The Noble Lord then read an extract from a sworn return to the Court of Policy, Demerara, "showing this fact. The cultivation of sugar was carried on by hired agents, who had no permanent interest in the welfare of the slaves, and experience showed that their employment depended upon sending home a large crop of sugar, and drawing the smallest remittance. In the Anna Regina estate in Demerara, till the end of 1831, the quantity of sugar raised was small and the number of slaves increasing. In the estate of Reedy Hook the attorney was raising a large crop for the advantage of the proprietor, and to the distress of the slaves. At the end of 1831 Mr. Moss, the proprietor, dismissed the attorney of the Anna Regina estate, and substituted the manager of the Reedy Hook. The result supplied the comment. In six months the negroes on the estate had diminished from 805 to 800. His Right Hon. Friend said it was desirable to get rid of the existing system, but how, he had asked, was it to be safely accomplished? The safest course was by fixing a date, at the earliest possible period, for the absolute and entire termination of slavery. He did not say this was perfectly safe, but it was safer than any other. If we proceeded, on the scheme of his Right Hon. Friend, or any other, we should not bring our views to bear on the mind of the negro. He will be told he is free, yet he will get no benefit from his freedom. Gratuitous labour will be exacted from him under compulsion, and it must be exacted by increased severity. As to the other alternative, he might be told that it was impossible to speculate on free labour. He doubted the accuracy of that opinion. If we allowed to the colonial legislatures encouragement and assistance they would acquiesce. The proprietors in this country, if they choose to exert themselves, and act together, had the means of controlling their agents in the colonies. There might be danger in carrying any measure into effect against the wish of the legislatures, but a greater danger in attempting to carry a complicated plan, which was neither one thing nor the other. It would not satisfy the slave, and would create discontent amongst the masters. What would be the result if emancipation were carried without the consent of the local legislatures? He confessed that only bad consequences were likely to result from it; but he did not anticipate bloodshed. The negro would gain all he wished, and what had he to expect from disorder? It had been suggested that the colonists the power of resistance! How was slavery maintained? It was by our military force; withdraw it, and slavery fell to the ground. (Hear.) He considered his plan infinitely more calculated to benefit every interest of the country than that propounded by the Right Hon. Secretary for the colonies. His earnest and conscientious opinion was, that it might with more safety be adopted, though he did not mean to contend that it, or any plan that could be proposed, was entirely free from danger. Committing, therefore, not without anxiety, the consideration of the House, to propositions which were the result of his humble conviction, he trusted that they would in time and under the will of an overruling Providence, be regarded with favour. The Noble Lord sat down amidst loud cheering.

E. J. Littleton, Esq. M. P. has been appointed Secretary for Ireland in place of Sir J. Cam Hobhouse.

**Jews' Bill.**—On the 23d, Mr. Grant moved the second reading of the Jewish Civil Disabilities Bill, which after a debate, was carried by a majority of 107, the numbers being 159 to 52.

In the House of Commons the Marquis of Chandos having alluded to a report in circulation, that Ministers did not intend to persevere in their plan regarding the West India Colonies, but to get rid of it for the present by a prorogation; Lord Althorp contradicted the report of which, he said, he knew nothing; and stated, that it was the most decided intention of Ministers to persevere in the plan proposed by Mr. Stanley.

The disturbances in Ireland are diminishing; Kilkenny, especially, is improving. The Government makes every effort at conciliation, except, as to the odious fife arrests, which still continue to excite ill feelings and to neutralize their exertions.

The London Times of the 22d announces "that a preliminary treaty was signed yesterday by the Plenipotentiaries of Great Britain, France, and Holland. By this convention the English and French embassies will be taken off Dutch vessels in the ports of England and France, and the interruption of their navigation, on the part of the Dutch Government, will be removed. The services of the English and French united squadrons will thus likewise be dispensed with, and intercourse between the different parties and Holland placed on the same footing as before the French expedition in November last. The Dutch

garrison of Antwerp, now prisoners in France, will by the same arrangement, be sent home. The armistice between Holland and Belgium will be continued till the definitive settlement of a permanent separation, and till that time the navigation of the Scheldt will remain free." The convention was agreed upon with the Dutch Plenipotentiary, and the same day sent off to Holland for ratification.

EDMOND KEAN, Esq. the great Tragedian died on the 15th May, aged 45.

The jury in the case of "Cally," the police officer stabbed in the late riot, has brought in a verdict of "justifiable homicide," in the following words:—"We find a verdict of Justifiable Homicide on these grounds: that no riot act was read, nor any proclamation advising the people to disperse; that the government did not take the proper precautions to prevent the meeting from assembling, and that the conduct of the police was ferocious, brutal, and unprovoked by the people, and we moreover express an anxious hope that the government will in future take better precautions to prevent the recurrence of such disgraceful transactions in the metropolis."

**The Calypso Packet.**—The following is an extract of a letter from Halifax, N.S., dated the 30th of April last:—"It is asserted that the pilot who took out the Calypso from hence, advised Mr. Peton to lay to at night, as there were many icebergs just a head of him, but that he ridiculed the notion, and declared his intention to make all the sail he could. Two, I think, or perhaps three days after, he sailed, and were distinctly heard from this place, and a fisherman who came in stated that he had seen an English barque evidently in distress, surrounded by ice, and firing guns for assistance; that the sea ran so high he could not get near her, but that she looked like a packet. This I certainly heard on the fourth day after the C. had sailed; but it was supposed at the time to be the packet from England (but found to be the C.). It is now concluded to have been the C.—London Paper.

### FRANCE.

**Paris.**—The French papers contain official accounts of the acquittal of the Duchesse de Berri. It appears, that on the morning of the 10th of May, the day on which the infant was born, General Bugeaud, the Commandant of Bayle, summoned the Mayor and the chief authorities of the place to attend as witnesses of the birth, and that they entered her chamber almost immediately after the child was born, when the President of the Tribunal de Premier Instance at Bayle asked in a loud voice who she was, whether the child was hers, and whether it was a boy or a girl? The Duchesse answered these queries, and referred the question to Dr. Deneux, who said that he was authorized to state that the Duchesse de Berri was the lawful wife of Count Hector Lucchesi Palli. The child is to be called Ann Marie Rosalie. The Count Hector Palli has been for nearly twelve months Neapolitan Envoy at the Hague, and some letters from Paris mention that he has consented to accept the appointment of husband to the Duchesse and of father to the child on consideration of receiving a *douleur* of £40,000 sterling. The French papers say that the Duchesse and her infant are to be shipped off to the coast as soon as she is sufficiently recovered.

**Express from Paris, Tuesday, 4 o'clock, P. M.**—The news of the King of Holland's consent to an armistice for an indefinite period, on the conditions proposed by Lord Palmerston and Prince Talleyrand, was received here yesterday; and although fully anticipated, as I informed you in one of my letters, so far back as three weeks ago, it affected the funds in the same way as if the announcement of the armistice had been quite unexpected, and the fact wholly unlooked for. The 3 per Cents rose nearly half per cent, the speculators at the Bourse were more than usually active.

## ROYAL GAZETTE.

FREDERICTON, JULY 17th 1833.

**ALMS HOUSE AND WORK HOUSE.**  
Commissioner for } CHARLES LEE, Esq.  
next week, }

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

### SUPREME COURT.

**Trinity Term in the Fourth Year of the Reign of King William the Fourth.**  
James William Boyd and Nathaniel Merrill Hazen, Esquires, Attorneys of this Honorable Court, are admitted and enrolled as Barristers at Law.  
James Horsfield Peters, Esquire, is admitted and enrolled an Attorney of this Honorable Court.

Abel S. Gore, Esquire to be a Commissioner for taking Affidavits, in the Supreme Court and a Commissioner for taking Bail in the County of Westmorland.  
Pro. Offce.

At an early hour on Wednesday morning last, a Barn belonging to the Rev. Mr. Macawley, accidental took fire, and although the usual exertions of the military and the different fire Companies were conspicuous on the occasion, we regret to say that it was totally consumed. We are requested by the proprietor to offer his thanks to the military and civilians, and particularly to the Fire Company for the promptitude and exertion which they displayed in the protection of his property.

[From the New York Albion.]

**The Birmingham Political Union Meeting,** respecting which so many fears were expressed, passed off very quietly. The multitude assembled did not exceed 60,000 or 80,000 persons, but they adopted some resolutions which indicated a bitter hostility to the Ministry, a copy of which will be found below. The Government fortunately did not take any measures to prevent the meeting, because its objects were constitutional, namely, to petition the King and Parliament for a redress of grievances. The meeting in Cold Bath Fields on the contrary, was for an illegal purpose—that of founding a National Convention, an institution unknown to the laws of the land. So far the Birmingham meeting had the advantage over that of London. It took the precaution, too, to address the King as subjects only, dropped the name and style of Political Union. Statesmen however, may draw a great practical lesson from this meeting. It is just one year ago that the same body met

at the same place, and passed the strongest resolutions in favour of that government which they now seek to overthrow. The Whigs were then described by Mr. Attwood and his friends as the guardian and saviours of the country—now the same persons describe the same Government to be the most wicked and perverse that has ever cursed the nation. There are no half-way censures—no reservations: their rulers must be pulled down from their high places, or the kingdom is at an end! Such is the fleeting nature of popular favour, and from this exemplification of its British Statesmen, we say, may draw an important practical lesson, and we trust they will do so. The following are the resolutions:—

"Moved by Mr. Benjamin Hadley, seconded by Mr. D. Whitehouse:—That his Majesty's Ministers—First, by violating the constitution, and destroying the liberties of Ireland. Secondly, by refusing to allow the right of voting by ballot, necessary to their protection in their just and legal franchise. Thirdly, by their denial of general distress amongst the industrious classes, and their refusal of inquiry into the means of its relief. Fourthly, by their refusal to make any preceptible reduction in the present overwhelming load of taxation by their perpetuating the House and Window tax, notwithstanding the relief so imperatively demanded by the present state of trade, and more especially persevering in inflicting on the country the whole of the unjust oppressive Malt Tax, although its partial abolition had been decided on by a deliberate vote of the House of Commons, both of which partial and odious taxes are merely necessary to furnish them with the means of maintaining tyranny in Ireland and misery in England—have betrayed the confidence of the people, and turned their sanguine hopes into despair."

It is asked what have people obtained by reform, and it is well enough answered, that they have gained the bill—the whole bill—and nothing but the bill.

In our last we described the tumultuous meeting in Cold Bath Fields, and the fatal consequences that resulted therefrom in the murder of one of the police-men employed to suppress it. The villain who stabbed the unfortunate man has gained a triumph, for the Coroners' Jury brought in a verdict of justifiable homicide—justifiable, our readers will recollect, not excusable; and with this verdict the jury thought proper to couple censure on the Government. No exostulation on the part of the Coroner against this illegal proceeding had the slightest effect—the Jury stuck to the justification of the murder and censure on the Government with the utmost pertinacity, and the verdict was at last so received. We, ourselves, think that some unnecessary severity was employed to disperse the meeting, and we admit the entire illegality of the avowed object of the assembly, but the decision of the Jury after all, shows in a frightful relief a sign of the times. The Jury knew that the unfortunate deceased was lawfully discharging the duties of his office—they knew that the objects of the meeting was contrary to law—they knew that it is unlawful for Englishmen to carry deadly weapons about their persons, much less to use them—they knew, also, for that was sworn to, that the murderer deliberately drew the dagger from his bosom and plunged it into the body of his victim; and yet this they call justifiable homicide! Truly this is a sad state of things, but what else can be expected! The present ministers have brought it all upon themselves, for they created this spirit among the people to break down and destroy their political opponents, and they are now reaping the bitter rewards of their own system.

We have copied to-day the speeches of Cobbett and Sir Robert Peel, on the occasion of the former moving the Motion to address the King to dismiss the latter from his office as Privy Councillor. They will found quite entertaining; Cobbett's is highly characteristic as well as amusing. It will be seen that the House would not allow any traces of the silly affair to remain on its journals. This is a high compliment to Sir Robert, and a sad rebuff to his opponent.

His Majesty has appointed Mr. Littleton, the member for Staffordshire, Secretary for Ireland. He is a highly worthy and respectable man, although one of the Tory wits gives the following account of him and the prospect he has before him:—

"Edward John Littleton is a pompous, obliging sort of a man, remarkably profound and indefatigable touching that species of legislation called 'Private Bills,' and concerning Ireland, probably knows that it is an island lying from sixty to one hundred miles west of England, made subject to the British Crown in the reign of Henry the Second—a place where population proceeds with most unphilosophical rapidity, and where fun and fury, bloodshed and botheration, blarney and blows, potatoes, patriotism, and Popery, abound in a degree unequalled in any other part of his Majesty's dominions. The knowledge of Ireland possessed by Edward John Littleton, Esquire, hath probably 'this extent—no more'—and we suspect that before he has the affairs of that not very quite or methodical department of the empire in his hands for six weeks, he will find himself in such a maze of perplexity as never had pompous English Squire to deal with before." Mr. O'Connell, it appears, does not object to his appointment!

The motion of Sir Andrew Agnew, for the better observance of the Sabbath day, was disposed of on the 17th May, by a very small majority: the numbers being for the second reading 72; against it 79; majority against the bill, 6. It appeared from the debate that several members who