

government." Vol. 4, p. 150. Now, this *ex officio* prosecution has been issued against me for "publishing, or causing to be published," an alleged libel, which was never printed, against Sir Henry and his Executive Council, who are not exactly the "King and his Government," howsoever much they would like to be thought so; and, gentlemen, by the oaths you have this day taken, agreeably to the high authority of Blackstone, you cannot return a verdict of "guilty" against me, in this attempt to realize the fable of the frog and the ox.

Attempts have been made by despotic governors and their sycophantic Executive Councils, to introduce *ex officio* prosecutions into the Colonies; and it would have been strange had some Judges not occasionally been found to sanction the illegal proceedings—proceedings, "few and far between," which have invariably been quashed by the independence of juries. In the old Colonies I only recollect one attempt of the sort, which was in New York—of course, before the revolution, which attempts of that sort always hasten. A Printer of the name of Zenger had printed and published an alleged libel, for which he was prosecuted by *ex officio*, and saved by the jury, who were determined that that unlawful badge of slavery should not be entailed upon their children.

During a residence of 25 years in the Colonies, I have only known three *ex officio* attempts to deprive a person of the benefit of a grand jury upon a criminal charge, of which this is the third, and I believe the first in this Colony. The other two to which I allude were, one in New Brunswick two years ago, against the editor of the *St. John Chronicle*, for an alleged libel printed and published against Sir John Harvey. The crown lawyers, who cannot sometimes see much beyond their noses, thought the "common law" established their right to do so, which was contrary to the opinion of Sir John's best friends. The verdict was unfavourable to Sir John, as almost every body had surmised. The other case occurred many years ago, when I was in the West Indies; and at this distance of time I do not exactly recollect the circumstances of the case; I rather think it occurred in the Island of St. Kitts, but am not positive.—The party prosecuted procured from England the opinions of some of the most eminent lawyers upon the subject, and those opinions being unfavourable to the colonial exercise of *ex officio* power, the prosecution, I heard it said, fell upon that ground alone.

In the stormy political period which preceded and accompanied the late unhappy disturbances in the Canadas, notwithstanding the unbounded scurrility of the opposition press, which even threatened the integrity of the empire; and notwithstanding that the criminal law of England had been transferred to Canada by express statute, yet I never heard of a single *ex officio* being used for political libel in either of the Provinces; and simply because it is unlawful so to do. Nay, so cautious were the Crown lawyers of committing themselves, that Mr. Ogden, the Attorney General, a man of great talent and learning, would not, in any instance, proceed against persons accused even of active sedition, until his hands were fortified with affidavits, just as that eminent lawyer Lord Campbell says the court of Queen's Bench always is in England, before it will grant an information, but which has not been attended to by this court in the present instance. The reasons for muzzling the press and stifling the voice of public opinion by this prosecution, are too well known here for me to enlarge upon; and that the government of this small colony should have so hastily grasped at the royal prerogative, only verifies the saying; that "Fools rush in where angels fear to tread."

I shall now consider the matter of publication. Lord Campbell, in asking for a committee in the House of Lords, to consider the passing of a libel law, describes the existing practice (for you will observe, gentlemen, written law there is none) to be exceedingly unsatisfactory, vague, uncertain and *ineffectual*. Almost any thing, in times long past, has been held to be publication—a person has been accused of publishing a libel by repeating what he had heard, by laughing at, and I am not sure but by listening to, a jest at the expense of Government. Positive statute law upon the subject there is none; and precedents drawn from the decisions of tyrannical judges and ignorant juries may be found in English legal history to consider almost any thing a libel. But precedents, and especially precedents such as those, you will recollect you are not bound by your oath to follow; and in the absence of all positive law upon the subject, how silly, how absurd and how wicked it is, to endeavour to force those opinions into legal practice now-a-days. So daring an attempt to violate British liberty, as the celebrated orator Sheridan said in the House of Commons, would be tantamount to a dissolution of the social compact, and the people might constitutionally proceed to remodel their form of government—it might create revolution in Britain and rebellion in North America. At present, by publication is understood, papers or books printed and circulated among the people; and whatever precedent may be drawn from what is called common law, that only can be considered publication of such a matter as a political libel. So lately as Lord Liverpool's administration, judges held that even to carry letters to a post office would be sufficient to convict; but he it remarked, all those letters alluded to had been printed and circulated among the people; and if any crown prosecution of a recent date can be pointed out which has been entered upon a written document *having been seen only by three persons*, until it, or a copy, fell into the hands of the Attorney General to prosecute upon, like the present action, I shall merely say it is a gross abuse of power.

As I previously remarked, I do not recollect of the British Government having prosecuted by *ex officio* for alleged libel for the last twenty years; and gentlemen, agreeably to the oath you have this day taken, you cannot conscientiously say that the Resolution was published—that is, made public—because I feel certain that not one of you knew what it was until you entered the jury box. Nay, so far from having been published, you may have seen by a late Herald, that it—a paper which has never taken part against the people—dares not yet venture to enlighten the public upon the subject matter of the prosecution—a political condition worthy of the infamous court of Star Chamber, whence *ex officio* first issued, or of the secret devices of the Spanish Inquisition.

Indeed, in times not very remote, when newspapers were not in the hands of every body, news and information of every sort circulated with extreme slowness among the people, and a smaller degree of publicity might not unreasonably be held to be an offence than at the present day, when the state of society is so much changed; and as Lord Campbell says—"assuredly the common law which existed in the time of Richard the Second was not adapted to the wholly altered circumstances of the nineteenth century." Publication was anciently held to consist in reading to a number of people congregated together. For instance, so lately as James the Second's time, about 150 years ago, (when newspapers were not in general circulation,) when the seven bishops presented their celebrated petition or remonstrance, it was only in the presence of such attendants as a monarch generally has in his private cabinet; and had he allowed it to remain there, he could not, consistently with the ideas even of those times, have prosecuted them for what he was pleased to allege was a libel; but in an evil hour for himself and his family, he called them before his Council, and the Bishops having there admitted the paper to be theirs, that was considered sufficient publicity for him to commence an *ex officio* prosecution upon, which for ever sealed the fate of the unfortunate Stewart dynasty.

Lord Denham, in his speech upon the law of libel, in the House of Lords, on the 19th Feby. last, mentions a case which I presume was prosecuted in the regular way by grand jury indictment. It is as follows:—"In 1798, Mr. J. Johnson, of St. Paul's Churchyard, was convicted of publishing a libel, because his shopman had sold a pamphlet written and published by Mr. Gilbert Wakefield, which pamphlet he had refused to publish, and he had given orders that it should not be sold at his shop. His shopman, however, sold a copy of it, against his express prohibition, by mere accident, and thus a respectable man was sent to prison for eight months, because, in the eye of the law, he was considered the publisher of the libel. This would not be the case at the present time; still it was desirable there should be no doubt or risk upon the subject." Upon this I would remark, that an accidental sale I do not pretend to understand, but it is abundantly clear, that after Wakefield's celebrated pamphlet had been

published by some other bookseller, he had purchased a supply of it in the common way of trade, and that after Wakefield's imprisonment, he had forbidden the sale. It is evident that had his shopman, for whose acts he was legally responsible, sold a printed copy of it, he would then have been found guilty, and now, agreeably to Lord Denham's express declaration, would not be so, even had his shopman sold one. Therefore, gentlemen, agreeably to this high authority, you cannot, on the oaths you have this day taken, find me guilty for a copy of the resolution being deposited snugly in the *Islander* office. But Lord Denham's quotation applies to my case with double force. Nobody, even in 1798, a dangerous period of the French Revolution, ever dreamed of prosecuting the shopman, the servant who issued the prohibited article against the commands of his master. Now, I am the servant, the paid servant, of my constituents, and carried the Resolution in question to the Printing Offices, while in session, in obedience to the commands of my masters; therefore, if the Attorney General does not choose to bring his prosecution against the principal in the transaction, he should not have meddled with it at all. I would not trespass further on your time, by endeavouring to prove that publication and non-publication are convertible terms; but I cannot omit quoting one instance, where the law officers supposed that the circumstance of a man having an obnoxious political pamphlet in his possession for sale, would warrant a prosecution, because the case powerfully exhibits the dreadful responsibility which must rest upon the heads of that jury which first established a precedent for proceedings so despotic and unconstitutional as *ex officio* informations. It was about the time of Hone's trial for publishing an alleged blasphemous and political libel, that Robert Swindells, a man who had served his country, endeavoured to eke out a scanty subsistence for himself, his wife and two children, by the sale of a few cheap books and pamphlets. In the middle of a bitter winter night, his little cottage was invaded by some brutal hainiff, his little furniture scattered about and injured, and every description of property ransacked and ravaged, in search of the pretended libel. His wife and children were forced, almost naked, into the cold, in order that it might be ascertained that nothing dangerous to the stability of the Government was concealed in the bed—a government, remark you, which had bidden defiance to all the bayonets of Buonaparte, only a very few years previously. The wife and one child died in consequence of the ill-usage, cold and alarm of that night, and the other child was sent to the parish workhouse. He was sent to Chester jail, and, like a felon, loaded with 64 lbs. of irons, and after a long detention, the Attorney General felt constrained to discharge him, without trial, and without compensation for the terrible injuries he had sustained, without venturing to insult a jury by trying to cram down their throats the absurd doctrine that a pamphlet or other work deposited quietly in a shop amounted to publication. About that period, Swindells's was by no means a singular case, but instead of having the desired effect, they only stimulated the people to a more determined opposition. Some of the parties prosecuted were compelled to attend, and thrown into prison, hundreds of miles from their homes, and otherwise ill-treated, and all inflicted under the irresponsible and arbitrary authority of *ex officio* prosecutions, the introduction of which into the Provinces the colonists have so resolutely resisted. And if you do not frown down, by your verdict this day, the audacious attempt now for the first time made in this Colony, by His Excellency Sir Henry Vere Huntley, that capital judge of unfeeling impartiality, and his Executive Council, upon the rights and liberties of the people of this Island, you will earn and merit the deep curse of your fellow colonists for hanging the fetters of Swindells upon their and their children's limbs, and then this colony, compared with the rest, would resemble a crouching slave in the company of erect freemen, or be like a girdled trunk among the vigorous trees of the forest. But, gentlemen, I entertain far too high an opinion of your sense of justice, and what is this day expected from you, as the guardians of the liberties of British subjects, than to suppose, for a single moment, that you would supersede the harmless and beneficial use of the tongue and pen for the knife of the Spaniard or the rifle of the backwoodsman, which must inevitably follow the suppression of free discussion. Upon Hone's trial, it was strongly urged that the prosecutor in a case of alleged political libel should take care that he himself were free from stain. Hone was permitted by Lord Ellenborough (who disliked him and his principles) to address the jury upon that ground. This action, then, is generally understood to have been entered against me by the Lieutenant Governor, acting probably by the interested advice of party or personal malice, but I consider him to be morally responsible. Hone, very reasonably, thought it hard that Mr. Canning, who had written a political parody on the Bible, should be one of a ministry to prosecute him for writing a parody on the Book of Common Prayer, so, gentlemen, I deem it very hard to be prosecuted for obeying my constituents, in the exercise of our undoubted constitutional right, and at what would otherwise have been no more than a bit of waste paper trumped up into a criminal prosecution for libel, while he (Sir Henry), last year, wrote, printed and published a series of libels upon the majority of the late House of Assembly. [Here the Chief Justice interrupted the defendant, stating that species of argument was inadmissible.] Hone was permitted by Lord Ellenborough to make a similar defence, but I do not wish to persist, and will submit to the decision of the court. Gentlemen, I am prepared to prove, that you have to decide upon whether the Resolution be a libel or not, as well as upon the publication; but as that point has been conceded by the Solicitor-General, I shall pass it over. Regarding the truth or falsehood of an alleged libel, I may remark, that the rules of the English Courts, which those of this country pretend to follow, will not allow a criminal prosecution to be filed, if the defendant be enabled by affidavits to establish the truth of his charge, as appears from Lord Campbell's speech in the House of Lords.

The Chief Justice remarked, that perhaps Mr. Maclean was not aware that there were two methods of proceeding by information; and that when the Attorney General filed an information upon his own responsibility and authority, as he had done in the present instance, affidavits were not required.

Mr. Maclean continued, it might be so, but Lord Campbell makes no distinction. There is no written law or enactment which declares that the truth must not be received in justification, and the present custom of refusing it has rendered the existing law of libel totally inoperative. Common law is merely a reference to previous decisions of Judges and Juries, which bear upon the case in point; but no jury is obliged by the oath they take to receive the opinions of former juries as law upon the subject; and in matters of common law, as it is called, they may therefore follow the dictates of their conscience, without being tied down by statute law to decide agreeably to Act of Parliament. And in so far as the common law of criminal libel is concerned, nearly as many opinions may be quoted in favour of receiving the truth in justification as the reverse; and therefore, if you be satisfied of the truth of the Resolution, you may, agreeably to your oaths, return a verdict of not guilty, upon that ground alone. Upon this subject, Lord Campbell, in the debate before quoted, in the House of Peers, on the 19th Feby. last, says—"The criminal law Commissioners had given it as their opinion, that, in order to make a libel indictable, it must be false as well as libellous. In 1705, Lord Holt laid down the law to the same effect." "In the cases of King v. Fennerty, and in that of Sir F. Burdett, it had been decided that the truth could not be received in mitigation of punishment. By such a rule, the law confounded those who were guilty, and who ought to experience certain punishment, with those who had not incurred any moral guilt, but had only stated what was the truth. Mr. Starke, who was placed at the head of the law commissioners, had, in his admirable treatise on the law of evidence, given it as his opinion that, in the present state of the law, no jury could punish a libeller, except on the supposition that the libel was proved—that is, proved to be false. It is hardly worth while to quote the opinion of Judges before the Revolution of 1688, when their offices were dependent upon the will and caprice of the Government; but it is remarkable,

that upon the trial of the seven Bishops, previously quoted, in James the Second's time, Judge Powell said, to make it a libel, it must be "false and malicious" and declared that, as he saw no falsehood or malice in it, that it was no libel. Therefore, gentlemen, having quoted to you, I believe, quite as many and as high opinions in favour of receiving the truth in justification of alleged libel, as the Solicitor General has done on the contrary side, upon that score alone you cannot do otherwise than bring in a verdict of not guilty, especially as the truth of the charge is tacitly admitted in the information.

Whatever may have formerly been the case, every body knows that it is now the proud privilege of British subjects freely to express their opinions of the acts of their rulers, be those opinions right or wrong, true or false; or otherwise, we would be slaves to the public servants, as our public servants are doing their best to render us here this day. It is quite as absurd to make it actionable to discuss the merits or demerits of public servants, as it would be for a thief caught in the fact to sue a man for libel, because he was evidence that he saw him stealing. The circumstance of the Judge not allowing the defendant to prove the truth of the alleged libel, has just had the effect which might have been anticipated. In the absence of all Statute law to the effect that the defendant cannot be allowed to prove the truth of his charge, juries follow the dictates of their consciences, and refuse to find a man guilty, and consign him to punishment, for having *told the truth*; so that, in point of fact, the law of libel which we are acting upon to day has, in England, died a natural death. [Here the defendant read extracts from Lord Campbell's and Lord Brougham's speeches in confirmation of his statement.] I am sorry to say, Gentlemen, there is more of personal feeling in this prosecution than in the public utility. You may have observed that parties in the House of Assembly are 13 and 11. Of the 13, not less than 11 have received appointments—10 of them involving sufficient emolument to render it an object in this poor country; and of the minority, one, for serving his constituents agreeably to his conscience and their expectations, is dragged away from his home, at a considerable loss both of time and money, to answer before you for the most frivolous political prosecution that disgraces the annals of the British Colonies in the present age. The practice in England now is, if a groundless charge be made against the Government, for another press—a supporter of Government—to expose the falsehood of it, and so no harm is done; and if the charge be true, people are just permitted to say so, till the fault be amended, or the subject forgotten for some more exciting topic. The people of England and the Colonies have no written Statute law to enable them to discuss the conduct of Government, but habit has rendered it, by long usage, just as much a constitutional right as any law of the land, and it is a right which cannot be shaken, or with it must be shaken our liberty. Lord Campbell's new libel law seems intended to suppress improper attacks on private character, and to confirm the right of discussing public affairs. He says he "had often been placed in a perplexing situation, when asked, as he had often been by foreigners, by what law were we enabled to discuss the conduct of the Government?" In fact, we did it without any law, but the common law of custom. That the people in the Colonies have an equal right, has been distinctly and wisely avowed only last month by the highest authority in the British Provinces, and to whose opinion we must all defer, when he concedes the rights of the people—I mean our able Governor General, Sir Charles Metcalfe, who stated that "to find fault with the administration of affairs is a right always claimed and freely exercised by British subjects." So, Gentlemen, it appears, upon the authority of the Governor General, that British subjects are everywhere else allowed that "right to find fault with the administration of affairs" which is denied us here; and it is surprising how nearly this prosecution has gone to establish the truth of the Resolution, that this Colony is indeed governed unlike that of every other Colony in British North America. It is by no means clear that the Resolution alludes to the Lieut. Governor and his Executive Council. It seems to be aimed entirely at the undue influence which the people generally understand to be possessed at the Colonial Office by the proprietors.

I may remark in conclusion, that I shall sum up a few reasons for a verdict in my favour; and I beg to state, that the verdict of acquittal and justice which you will record for me, will instantly allay the excessive and unprecedented excitement which at present prevails in the community, by a people justly alarmed for their rights and privileges as British subjects—an excitement wholly caused by this prosecution. This, gentlemen, is the *Islander* of the 17th March, containing the Resolutions passed at the New London meeting, two excepted, which the printer says he "declined to publish," one of the two being that for which I now stand here charged with publishing, although it has never appeared in print; and when you have read other two, one of which requests my colleague and me to present the petition to the House of Assembly, and the other directs that all the Resolutions shall be sent to each of the Newspapers, for publication, I beg of you to say, by the oaths which you have taken this day, if I could have done otherwise than I did, or than each of yourselves would have done, had you been in my place?

Reasons for a verdict in my favour.—That the prosecution is an unconstitutional violation of the rights of British subjects.—That my privilege has been infringed.—That the Government must have intended to infringe upon the privileges of the House of Assembly, otherwise the mover and seconder of the Resolution would have been prosecuted instead of me.—That the *ex officio* mode of proceeding for political libel is discontinued in England, and never has been practised in the Colonies, where it is submitted to be wholly unconstitutional and illegal.—That the alleged libel was never printed or published, in the present acceptance of the term.—That having a right to find fault with the administration of affairs, the Resolution is no libel, but the exercise of a constitutional right.—That it is not seditious.—That the truth of it is not denied.—That no malice has been proved or alleged.

The Attorney General replied, and the Chief Justice having summed up, the Jury retired for about an hour and three quarters, when, as stated in our last, they returned a verdict of "Guilty" against the defendant. As we before stated the defendant is not to be brought up for judgment until the result of his memorial to Lord Stanley on the subject of this prosecution is known.

We shall endeavour to give the Attorney General's reply, and the Chief Justice's address to the Jury in our next.

THE REVOLT IN CUBA.—On the night of March 27, about 400 negroes, belonging to the several sugar plantations in the Bembo district, rose to execute a plan which they had conceived of killing the masters and burning their habitations. The slaughter was commenced in the Penalves plantation, at 1 o'clock in the morning, by the murder of three persons, viz., the English engineer and his two assistants. It was the moment of relieving the watchmen, and the alarm being given, the great bulk of the persons employed got safe off. The insurgents immediately made for the Louisa plantation, where they expected to be joined by other slaves; but the alarm had been given there also, and only three persons perished. Thence they advanced in military order, clad in their holiday clothes, with colours flying, and holding leather shields to keep off the balls. They thus proceeded to the Aquilar property, all the inhabitants of which were proscribed. They were saved by the presence of mind of a faithful negress, who came out and persuaded the insurgents that they would lose their time in going farther, as her master had fled. They then turned aside, and dispersed themselves through the surrounding country, pillaging and burning all the plantations. As soon as the first burst of terror had passed over, the inhabitants, who had fled, armed such of their negroes as had remained faithful, and repaired in small troops towards Bembo, where in a short time about 150 men were assembled. The insurgents soon came to the place, singing songs of triumph, and when they had advanced tolerably close to the village, the whites although imperfectly armed, charged them. The insurgents resisted the shock, and in their turn making a dash forced the whites to retreat. The latter again attacked, but were repulsed with loss. The insurgents then obtained possession of the village, and set fire to some of the houses. The whites, ashamed of

such a termination to their attack, determined to try another charge; and this time they held together so firmly, that the slaves were at first shaken, and finally routed. They fled in every direction, leaving 50 dead. This advantage was decisive, for in a few hours the insurgents had lost all appearance of organization, and the day was spent in hunting them down. The next day everything appeared at an end, when intelligence was brought that 150 negroes from the Cardinal railroad were advancing, spreading fire and destruction on their passage. They were easily dispersed, and 63 of them killed. After these defeats, the wood and sugar-cane fields were filled with fugitive negroes, against whom an active pursuit was instituted. By a strange calculation, the inhabitants endeavoured to screen them as much as possible from the search that was made, offering them an asylum and pardon. Tranquillity was soon restored in the Bembo district, but new insurrections were spoken of in the direction of Manriquez, where a number of the fugitives had collected. The Governor of Matanzas went there with a detachment of Dragoons. Out of 550 negroes engaged in the revolt, 150 or 200 were either killed or put an end to themselves in the woods. About 100 more were made prisoners.

A DOG KILLED BY A RAT.—In May last Mr. William Moore, at Colne-bridge, caught two large rats in a trap, and took them to Mr. France, a neighbouring publican, who keeps a rat-dog for the destruction of such vermin. When one of them was let out into a room the dog made a "grab" at it, but missed his mark, and the rat turning round, bit the dog on the tongue, which immediately swelled to a great extent, and the dog died almost directly! Our Colne correspondent adds—"This is an actual fact! and can be verified! and I think it will rank among the marvellous things which happen in Yorkshire."

RAILWAY SPEED.—The returns given in the report of the officers of the Railway Department, Board of Trade, show the average speed upon the various lines, exclusive of stoppage, as follows:—London and Birmingham, 27 miles per hour; Great Western, 33; Northern and Eastern, 36; North Midland, 29; Midland Counties, 28; Birmingham and Derby, 29; Manchester and Birmingham, 25; Newcastle and North Shields, 30; and Chester and Birkenhead, 28.

SCOTCH CHURCH. THE FREE ASSEMBLY, MAY 19. Interim reports were severally given in by Mr. Dnnlop, Dr. Candlish, and Dr. Chalmers, from the architectural, statistical, and financial sections of committees.

Mr. DUNLOP detailed the progress that had been made regarding the arrangements for church building. He said that several different plans of churches had been agreed on as applicable to different circumstances and localities; for instance, buildings of brick and wood, of which the new erection in Lothian-road is a specimen, and of stone in some districts where that material is cheap, and where the climate is too moist for using any other material. It had been resolved to adhere to these plans in every locality, whether poor or rich, and not to erect more expensive or ornamental buildings anywhere, at least till once there should be a church in every place where one was needed. But owing to the opposition of the lairds in some parishes no stance for a free church could be obtained, and to meet such cases it was proposed to build moveable tents, not weighing above four cwt., which might contain 400 or 500 sitters, and be shifted from place to place, as need might be. Even this expedient could not be adopted in some places where no footing on the land could be found for free ministers and congregations. Still they would not be shipped even in such cases. It was proposed to procure old ships, or smaller decked vessels, which might be anchored in the docks and rivers, where the gospel might be preached to the people. Many ministers would be obliged to leave the parishes in which they had been located for want of a stationary place of worship, and to move about with their families in yachts from Island to Island, and from shore to shore, preaching to the people, who might otherwise never hear the message of salvation.

THE COLONIAL HERALD can be had, every Saturday, immediately after publication, at the Store of Mr. Geo. F. Cooper, Queen Street—Price, 4d. each.

The Colonial Herald. SATURDAY, JULY 8, 1843.

We subjoin a few articles of intelligence received by the English Mail, which came by way of Georgetown, in addition to those which appeared in our Extra of Tuesday last:

LONDON, June 19. FACTORY BILL.—On the 16th inst. Sir James Graham announced to the House of Commons his intention to abandon the educational clauses of the Factory Bill.

CANADA CORN BILL.—On the same evening Lord Stanley moved the third reading of the Canada Flour Bill. After some unimportant observations, the House divided, when there appeared for the third reading 150, against it 75; majority 75.

The state of Ireland is, if anything, less critical than it was a few days ago, and Mr. O'Connell appears to feel less inclined to hazard any very strong opposition to the Government, seeing that it is determined to act with energy and promptitude, should circumstances call for its interference.

The revenue of the Customs at Liverpool continues to improve. The receipts, in May, exceeded by £30,000 those of the corresponding month last year.

DR. CHALMERS.—Dr. Chalmers has sent in his resignation of the office of Professor of Theology in the University of Edinburgh. The late unhappy secession from the established church of Scotland has led to this step on the part of Dr. Chalmers, who states in his letter of resignation that in the altered position of affairs he can no longer retain the office which he has held for 15 years.

The Repeal Association of Dublin has declined to have any connection with, or assistance from, the London Chartists and Feargus O'Connor, who tendered their services to them.

A large bag, supposed to contain the English mail for Miramichi, having been put on board the Georgetown Packet at Pictou, on her last trip, and from Georgetown forwarded to the Post Office in Charlottetown, the Directors of the Steam Boat Company, to prevent any inconvenience that might arise from its detention, dispatched the *St. George* yesterday morning to Miramichi, for the express purpose of landing the mail at that place. It is not, however, from this, to be inferred, that the Directors have any intention of altering their previous resolution to withdraw her from the Miramichi voyage, after the service in which she is now engaged is performed. It is intended, we believe, that she shall ply twice a week between Charlottetown and Pictou for the remainder of the season.

We copy the following remarks from the *Miramichi Gleaner* of the 30th ult.—"The Steamer *St. George* arrived this morning at half past seven o'clock. It will be seen by an advertisement in another column, that this is to be her last trip. The Directors having received a communication from the Lieutenant Governor of this Province, stating that the Attorney and Solicitor Generals have given it as their opinion, that 'the Company has neither a legal or equitable claim to any support from the Government of New Brunswick, for the services she has performed,' have therefore come to the decision to take the boat off the line. Both these learned gentlemen took a very warm part in the debate which originated in the Council last session, on a Resolution having passed the Assembly, granting a sum of money for the time the *St. George* was occupied on the route last year; and to the hostility of these gentlemen, we understood at the time, the loss of the grant was mainly to be attributed; but, notwithstanding, from the efficiency of the boat, and the regular and satisfactory manner in which all her engagements have been fulfilled,—which these gentlemen could not