NEW-YORK DAILY TRIBUNE.

BY GREELEY & McELRATH. OFFICE TRIBUNE BUILDINGS. FIVE DOLLARS A YEAR.

VOL. V. NO. 270. NEW-YORK, FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1846. WHOLE NO. 1514.

NEW-YORK TRIBUNE.

THE NEW-YORK DAILY TRIBUNE IS PUBLISHED EVERY MORNING, SUNDAY EXCEPTED, **At the Tribune Buildings, corner of Spruce and Nassau streets, opposite the City Hall,**

And delivered to City Subscribers for NINE CENTS per week, or, when they prefer, they can pay in advance at the Desk for six months or a year at the same rate. Single copies TWO CENTS. Mail subscribers Five Dollars per annum, in advance, and the paper in no case continued beyond the time for which it is paid. Subscriptions taken for six months. Three Dollars in advance required in all exchanges with Country Newspapers. Daily papers received at this office whose terms are higher than those of THE TRIBUNE, are not allowed any difference.

TERMS OF ADVERTISING.

Five Lines, or less—First insertion..........25 cents.
" " each subsequent insertion........12½
or, if in the inside " " 20
Over Five Lines—First insertion.........5 cents a line.
Each subsequent insertion, which may be every day, or once, twice or three times a week, at the option of the advertiser, 2 cents a line.
Inside Advertisements—Five cents a line for the First insertion, and Four cents for each subsequent one.
MARRIAGES, FUNERAL NOTICES &c. *not exceeding five lines*, 25 cents.
☞ All Advertisements inserted in this paper appear both in the Morning and the Evening edition.

THE TRIBUNE.

ONE MONTH LATER FROM EUROPE.

Arrival of the Cambria.

NEWS BY OUR EXTRAORDINARY EXPRESS FROM HALIFAX.

Pacific Indications respecting Oregon.

Queen's Speech. Peel's New Tariff.

PARTIAL AND ULTIMATELY TOTAL

REPEAL OF THE CORN LAWS.

French Minister's Reply to Mr. Polk.

French Disaster in Algiers.

No change in Cotton---Money Market buoyant,

&c. &c. &c.

By our Extraordinary Express from Halifax, in 31 hours to Boston, and thence overland to this City, we have full files of papers by the steamship Cambria, which left Liverpool on the 4th inst.

The news is important. The Queen's Speech, followed by Sir Robert Peel's able and comprehensive exposé, develop the Ministerial plan of Tariff Revision. It is earnest and sweeping. Great Britain (if the Ministerial project is adopted) abandons, partially at present and pretty thoroughly at the expiration of three years, the Corn-Laws and the Protective Policy generally. It is of course believed that the Ministers will carry their bill, and that the reduced Sliding-Scale of Grain Duties will go into effect. That the total repeal will take place in 1849, is quite another affair.

The news from the Continent is of secondary interest. M. Guizot, the French Premier, has replied with dignity and frankness to Mr. Polk's censure of the opposition of France to the Annexation of Texas.

Opening of Parliament.

On Thursday, the 22d of January, Parliament was opened by the Queen in person.

No event has recently excited such intense and general interest in the metropolis, as the anticipated statement of Sir Robert Peel on Tuesday night, developing his measures for the abandonment of the "protective system." As early as one o'clock, "strangers," who had obtained orders of admission to the gallery of the House of Commons, began to assemble at the doors; and, by two o'clock, there were four times as many applicants, holding members' orders, as could be accommodated in the house. Long before four, the lobbies and passages leading to the House of Commons, as well as the street between Great George-st. and Westminster Abbey, were crowded. Many of the members who were recognized, and known to be opponents of the Corn-Laws, were warmly cheered; and the Duke of Wellington, in passing along Palace-yard, on his way to the House of Lords, came in for a full share of popular applause. On the door being opened a few minutes before four, there was a tremendous rush to the Strangers' Gallery, which was speedily filled; and many of those who had congratulated themselves on possessing orders, which they imagined would secure admission, were necessarily excluded.

The interior of the house presented a spectacle widely different from its usual dull and quiet appearance at so early an hour. The seats below the bar, to which strangers are admitted on the personal introduction of members, were crowded by peers and other distinguished individuals; and, on the front seat, immediately behind the sergeant-at-arms, sat Prince Albert, with the Duke of Cambridge and the Earl of Jersey. Indeed, there has not been so full an attendance of members for many years, even during the debates of Sir Robert Peel's Corn-law Bill, in 1842, or the less important discussions on the Tariff. Sir Robert rose at a quarter to five o'clock, and the hum of conversation which had resounded through the house was instantly hushed. The right hon. Baronet spoke in his usual firm and manly tone; but his statement was received with great coolness by the majority of members on his own side, and he was indebted, almost entirely, to the oppositionists for the cheers with which some of his sentiments and declarations were greeted. At the conclusion of Sir Robert's statement, many of the members left the house; and those who remained, relapsed into their usual listless indifference during the brief discussion, or conversation which subsequently took place.

The state coach was drawn by eight cream-colored horses. Her Majesty having passed through the royal gallery, which was much crowded, entered the House of Lords, and after the usual formalities, delivered the following speech:

Queen's Speech.

My Lords and Gentlemen:

It gives me great satisfaction to meet you in Parliament, and to have the opportunity of recurring to your assistance and advice. I continue to receive from my allies, and from other Foreign Powers, the strongest assurance of the desire to cultivate the most friendly relations with this country. I rejoice that in concert with the Emperor of Russia, and through the success of our joint mediation, I have been enabled to adjust the differences which had long prevailed between the Ottoman Porte and the King of Persia, and had seriously endangered the tranquillity of the East. For several years a desolating and sanguinary warfare has afflicted the States of the Rio de la Plata. The commerce of all nations has been interrupted, and acts of barbarity have been committed, unknown to the practice of a civilized people. In conjunction with the King of the French, I am endeavoring to effect a pacification of those States.

The Convention concluded with France, in the course of last year, for the more effectual suppression of the slave trade, is about to be carried into immediate execution by the active coöperation of the two Powers on the coast of Africa. It is my desire that our present union, and the good understanding which so happily exist between us, may always be employed to promote the interests of humanity, and to secure the peace of the world. I regret that the conflicting claims of Great Britain and the United States in respect of the territory on the North Western Coast of America, although they have been made the subject of repeated negotiation, still remain unsettled. You may be assured that no effort consistent with national honor shall be wanting on my part to bring this question to an early and peaceful termination.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The estimates for the year will be laid before you at an early period. Although I am deeply sensible of the importance of enforcing economy in all branches of the expenditure, yet I have been compelled, by a due regard to the exigencies of the public service, and to the state of our Naval and Military Establishments, to propose some increase in the estimates which provide for their efficiency.

My Lords and Gentlemen:

I have observed, with deep regret, the very frequent instances in which the crime of deliberate assassination has been of late committed in Ireland. It will be your duty to consider whether any measures can be devised calculated to give increased protection to life, and to bring to justice the perpetrators of so dreadful a crime. I have to lament that, in consequence of the failure of the potato crop in several parts of the United Kingdom, there will be a deficient supply of an article of food which forms the chief subsistence of great numbers of my people.

The disease by which the plant has been effected has prevailed to the utmost extent in Ireland. I have adopted all such precautions as it was in my power to adopt for the purpose of alleviating the sufferings which may be caused by this calamity, and I shall confidently rely on your coöperation in devising such other means for effecting the same benevolent purpose as may require the sanction of the Legislature. I have had great satisfaction in giving my assent to the measures which you have presented to me from time to time, calculated to extend Commerce, and to stimulate domestic skill and industry, by the repeal of prohibitory, and the relaxation of protective duties.

The prosperous state of the Revenue, the increased demand for labor, and the general improvement which has taken place in the internal condition of the country, are strong testimonies in favor of the course you have pursued. I recommend you to take into your early consideration whether the principles on which you have acted may not with advantage be yet more extensively applied, whether it may not be in your power, after a careful review of the existing duties upon many articles, the produce or manufacture of other countries to make such farther reductions and remissions as may tend to insure the continuance of the great benefits to which I have adverted, and, by enlarging our commercial intercourse, to strengthen the bonds of amity with Foreign Powers.

Any measures which you may adopt for effecting those great objects will, I am convinced, be accompanied by such precautions as shall prevent permanent loss to the Revenue, or injurious results to any of the great interests of the country. I have full reliance on your just and dispassionate consideration of matters so deeply affecting the public welfare. It is my earnest prayer that with the blessings of Divine Providence on your councils, you may be enabled to promote friendly feelings between different classes of my subjects, provide additional security for the continuance of peace, and to maintain contentment and happiness at home, by increasing the comforts of the great body of my people.

The Queen emphasised the portions of the speech which referred to the continuance of peace and to the reduction of the Tariff.

Her Majesty having concluded her address, rose, from the throne, and quitted the House with the same state.

The Earl of Home moved the address in a brief speech, in which he glanced at most of the topics touched upon in the speech from the Throne. He concluded with reading the words of the address, which merely echoed the speech.

Lord De Ros seconded the address, and expressed a hope that our pacific relations with America would not be disturbed by the Oregon dispute.

The Duke of Richmond made an angry attack on the policy of Sir Robert Peel and the conduct of the Anti Corn-law League.

Lord Stanley stated that he left the Cabinet because he thought that the proposed scheme would not give sufficient protection to the agriculturists.

The address was carried without a division.

House of Commons...... JAN. 22.

Sir Robert Peel hoped that, though his course might be deemed unusual in rising at so early a period of the debate, he should be considered as acting in conformity with the ordinary practice of the House in explaining at once the grounds which had led him, and those with whom he had acted, first to tender their resignation of their offices to her Majesty and then to reappear in the House as the Ministers of the Crown.—The immediate cause of their resignation was that great and mysterious calamity which had befallen Europe—the failure of the Potato Crop. But it would be unfair to the House if he were to say that he attached exclusive importance to that particular cause. It had gained, however, additional weight by its forcing an immediate decision upon the laws which governed the importation of grain. He would not deny that his opinions on the subject of protection had undergone great change. He did not feel himself humiliated by making that confession; on the contrary, he asserted and claimed for himself the privilege of yielding to the force of reason and argument, and of acting upon he enlarged experience and upon his more matured conviction. He must confess that a change in his opinions had been forced upon him by the experience of the last three years. During that period he had watched day by day the effect of the relaxation of duties on all the social interests of the country; and the consequence was that he thought that his former arguments were no longer tenable. He did not now think that protection of native industry was in itself right and advantageous, nor did he believe that it was impossible for this country to compete with foreigners because it labored under a heavy debt and severe taxation. During the last three years prices had been low, and yet at no time had wages been higher. During the three previous years prices had been high, and the lowness of wages had produced universal distress among the laboring population. He next proved from statistical returns that the result upon trade of removing protective duties had been a great increase in the foreign exports of the country, and that the result upon the revenue, though in the last four years a reduction had been made in the Customs duties to the amount of £4,000,000 and upward, and in the Excise duties to the amount of £1,000,000, had been equally satisfactory.—He then adverted to considerations which he deemed of more importance than those of either trade or revenue—namely, to considerations of morality; and showed that in 1842, when the high price and high duties were in existence, there had been an alarming increase of crime, but that in 1843 things had taken a favorable turn, and that in 1844 and 1845 the decrease of commitments had been very large; and he inferred from the returns, which he quoted, that low prices and comparative abundance contributed greatly to the promotion of morality. He showed that these advantages had not been purchased by any detriment to the agricultural interest. Protection to that interest had been diminished; and yet it had not suffered any damage in consequence of that diminution. He proved this position by reference to the diminution which had taken place in the duties paid upon foreign flax, foreign wool, foreign cattle, pigs, lard, &c. and to the prices which every one of those commodities was now fetching in the markets of Great Britain. He contended that he was justified in proceeding with the farther removal of protecting duties by the gratifying results which had been produced by the removal of those which he had already repealed. It was right that he should state that, notwithstanding the conviction which was thus forced upon his mind, he had been of opinion that the charge of altering the Corn-Laws ought not to devolve upon him as Minister of the Crown. He felt that with that conviction, which he could not control he could no longer meet the annual motion of Hon Members opposite with a direct negative, and that therefore he could no longer continue the contest on the subject with advantage to those who had hitherto honored him with their confidence. During the course of last Autumn a great calamity had visited the United Kingdom. There was great danger of a scarcity of that article which formed a considerable supply of the food of the country. It was the duty of Government to meet that danger; and the House should now have an opportunity of judging whether, with the information of which the Government was in possession, it was possible for them to maintain in their present integrity the existing Corn-Laws. His opinion was, that it was quite impossible for them to do so. He then described the circumstances which induced him early in November to think that it was necessary to meet the impending evil by a suspension of the duties on the importation of foreign produce; and read consecutively the information which Government had received from various parts of the United Kingdom, and also from abroad, and which he considered as justifying him in the conclusions to which he had come first early in November and afterward early in December. He next read the information which he had received from England, Scotland and Ireland, relative to the failure of the potato crop; and hoped that those who had so precipitately condemned the Government would now make some allowance for its difficult position. The Right Hon. Baronet then entered into a lengthened statement relative to the resignation of the Ministry and their reinstatement in office, and proceeded to state that he had given notice that evening that on an early day next week it was his intention to submit to the House a measure of the greatest importance relative to our commercial policy. He would not anticipate the discussion on it that evening, as he was anxious to disconnect that which was a great national question from any party or personal considerations. After expressing a hope that he had satisfied the House that his motives were honest, even though his conclusions might be erroneous, he proceeded to defend himself against the charge that he had been guilty of treason to the agricultural interest. He had seen it stated over and over again, that the power which had elevated could also displace him, and over and over again he had been menaced with that penalty. Now, he valued not power for its patronage. Personal objects he had none. He had served four Sovereigns, and to each of them he had stated that he required no reward but the assurance that he had served them as a faithful and a loyal subject. Power for personal objects he wanted not—to be relieved from it with perfect honor, so far from being a penalty, would be to him the greatest of boons. He did not wish to be the Prime Minister of England; but, while he was so, he would hold office by no servile tenure. He would hold it by no other obligation than that of serving the public interests. He concluded his speech with an eloquent defence of his own Conservative policy, both at home and abroad, contending that he had put an end to the murmurs of disaffection, and had done his utmost to perform no easy task, namely, that of reconciling the action of an ancient monarchy and a proud aristocracy with that of a reformed House of Commons.

Lord John Russell next rose to give an explanation of his conduct during the recent interregnum in the Ministry—an explanation which he would have postponed to a future day had not Sir Robert Peel informed him that it would be for his convenience if he made it at an early period of the session. He then stated the circumstances under which he had been called upon by her Majesty to form an Administration on the 8th of last December. On the 10th he saw her Majesty on that subject. He should have declined under ordinary circumstances to accept office himself, as his party were in a minority of ninety or a hundred in the House of Commons, and as that fact alone must have led before long to a dissolution of Parliament. When he mentioned to Her Majesty that such was his feeling, she placed in his hand a document signed by Sir Robert Peel, in which he promised to give every facility in his power to his successor, whoever that person might be, for the settlement of the question of the Corn Laws. He then read the letter addressed by him to the Queen, the principal point of which was, that he could not undertake the duties of Prime Minister unless assured of the support of Sir Robert Peel in the immediate repeal of the Corn Laws. The noble Lord then stated at great length the various steps which he afterward took to form a Government on the principle of the immediate repeal of the Corn Laws, and his subsequent failure.

The noble Lord proceeded to express his gratitude to her Majesty for the confidence with which she had treated him throughout these transactions and for the facilities which she had given him throughout them. In justice to Sir R. Peel he stated, that there was nothing in his communication which would have rendered his (Lord J. Russell's) task of settling the question of the Corn-Laws more difficult; and in justice to Earl Grey, that his objections to one of his colleagues arose from nothing but public motives. He hoped that on the corn laws the House might soon come to such an agreement as would enable them to settle the question. Famine might come upon the country, and would they have the settlement of the corn-laws deferred till a period when they must submit to a humiliating capitulation? When Sir R. Peel brought forward his measure in lieu of the existing Corn-Law, which he condemned as a failure, though he was the author of it, he (Lord J. Russell) would offer such observations as he might think necessary upon it. At present, however, he would abstain. The noble Lord concluded his speech by expressing his disappointment that Sir R. Peel had not brought forward a comprehensive plan for the pacification of Ireland, and by declaring his intention, whether in or out of office, to give his hearty assent to all measures for the benefit of the country. He hoped that the freedom of industry and commerce might date from the commencement of the present session.

JANUARY 23.

ENGLAND AND THE UNITED STATES.—Mr. Hume, after complimenting Sir Robert Peel upon his proposed liberal policy, said—There was one other point to which he would refer, and it was, to express a hope that the Right Honorable Baronet would continue to maintain the good understanding which, from her Majesty's speech, appeared to prevail between France and England. It was in the power of the British Government, united with that of France, to command the peace of the world. Quarrels might take place between different nations, but those two great nations united would prevent war. There was a paragraph in the speech referring to the state of our relations with the U. States; and he must say that he thought her Majesty's expressions on this subject highly proper and becoming. He thought, too, that the paragraph which recommended an increase in the army and navy estimates, one of the best under the circumstances, in the whole speech, and he saw it with considerable gratification when he found the Chief Magistrate of a great country, from whom he expected better things, venture to set at naught all those rules and regulations which civilized nations observed toward each other. It would be acting contrary to the whole tenor of his life, which had been the most efficient, useful, and proper powers of the Government, not to approve of this part of the speech, and he was sure there was a disposition on the part of the House to place at her Majesty's command those means which would maintain the honor of the country.

Sir Robert Peel.—I never entertained the slightest apprehension that any contrast between the language employed in her Majesty's speech in reference to those unfortunate disputes that still prevail between this country and America, and that which has been used by the Chief Magistrate of the United States, would have been made in this House. I never thought that that could have been mistaken or misrepresented. We have no hesitation in announcing our sincere desire for the interests of this country, for the interests of the United States, and for the interests of the civilized world in continuing to strain every effort which is consistent with national honor, for the purpose of amicably terminating those disputes. I never had any apprehension that our intentions or our language would be misrepresented; and the speech which the Hon. gentleman (Mr. Hume), the uniform and consistent advocate for the strictest economy, has just made, confirms me that my anticipations will not be disappointed. And if any proposal which her Majesty's Government may feel it their duty to make for the maintenance of essential rights, or of the national honor, shall be responded to and supported by this House, then let me not be mistaken. I think it would be the greatest misfortune if a contest about the Oregon between two such powers as England and the United States could not, by the exercise of moderation and good sense, be brought to a perfectly honorable and satisfactory conclusion.

THE OREGON AND RIVER PLATE QUESTIONS.—Lord John Russell said he was not about to allude to those subjects which had been before the House last night, but there were two questions in that part of the speech from the throne which related to our foreign relations which he wished for some explanation upon.—First, with regard to the Oregon Question. He entirely participated in the feelings of the Right Hon. gentleman, both that peace with the United States was most desirable, and that we ought to do nothing that was inconsistant with the honor of this country. But certain statements had been put forth in America, and had been reported to have been made to the Congress of the United States, which made it desirable that some explanation should be given on the subject. He had thought that the President of the United States had last year made declarations to Congress on this subject which were not conformable to the usages of civilized countries, or to the friendly relations of the two States; but it would appear, however, that a proposition for a compromise had been made from the President to her Majesty's Government, and he (Lord John Russell) conceived that that proposition had changed the state of the question.

The proposition itself might be satisfactory or not satisfactory; but, having been made, it did appear to him to require a statement from those in authority in this country of the terms on which they would be satisfied to settle this question. That proposition, as he understood, had not been received by her Majesty's Government, but had been declared to be totally inadmissible by our Minister in America. He (Lord John Russell) confessed he thought that was a hasty proceeding on the part of the representative of her Majesty in the United States. But what he wished to ask was, whether the negotiations had recommenced or were going on? He was not desirous that the papers should be presented to the House; he was willing to leave the negotiation in the hands of her Majesty's Government until they could state that a satisfactory result had been attained, before he asked for any information of the particular state of the negotiations. One word with respect to what had fallen from the Hon. member from Montrose. Her Majesty required the attention of the House to the increase in the estimates which provided for the efficiency of the military and naval services.

He could well understand that, with the increased possessions of this country abroad and the consequently increased demands on the services of our military and naval forces in every part of the world, there might be reasons for the increase of the estimates even at a season of profound peace, and when nothing threatened on any side; and he trusted that it was on these grounds, and not on account of any thing in the aspect of affairs, with reference to the United States, that her Majesty's Government had made this increase. He, for his part, had for some time thought that the efficiency of the military force of this country at its present amount was too much tried, and that too much was demanded from that force. His second question was this: Her Majesty stated that for several years a desolating and sanguinary warfare had afflicted the States of the Rio de la Plata, and it was farther stated that her Majesty was endeavoring to effect the pacification of those States. He (Lord John Russell) understood that the endeavor to effect a pacification had been prosecuted by means of warlike measures, and he somewhat doubted whether that was the right mode of proceeding.

It was true it was stated that the commerce of all nations had been interrupted. But it was farther stated that "acts of great barbarity had been committed unknown to the practice of civilized people." Acts of barbarity were certainly very dreadful things; but he doubted whether it was wise in her Majesty's Government to state that as a ground of a forcible intervention. They had heard—though he would not name the countries in which they had taken place—but they had heard of dreadful acts of barbarity in other parts of the world; and certainly he had not heard it proposed by wise statesman that there should be any intervention in these countries. The question which he had to submit to the Right Hon. baronet was, whether he proposed to lay on the table any papers explanatory of the ground upon which her Majesty's Government thought it necessary to interfere with the warfare which had occurred in the States of the Rio de la Plata?

Sir Robert Peel.—With reference to the question just put by the noble Lord, I beg to say, that not foreseeing that he would put it, I am not at present prepared to give him an answer, and have therefore to crave that he will postpone his question until another time. On the subject of the Oregon Territory, I have to state that a proposition was made by Mr. Buchanan, with the authority of the President of the United States, to Mr. Pakenham, and the proposal so made suggested a division of the Territory. Whether or not that proposal ought to have been accepted I cannot say. Mr. Pakenham thought that the terms proposed were so little likely to be acceptable, that he did not feel himself warranted in transmitting the proposal to the Government at home; and on signifying this to Mr. Buchanan, the latter immediately stated that the proposal was withdrawn. This is the state of the negotiation at present, so far as I am informed, respecting the proposal submitted by Mr. Buchanan. I have the highest opinion of Mr. Pakenham: I have the greatest respect for his talents and the greatest confidence in his judgment, yet I must say that it would have been better had he transmitted that proposal to the Home Government for their consideration, and if found in itself unsatisfactory it might possibly have formed the foundation for a farther proposal. Since that period this country has again repeated to the United States their offer of referring the matter to arbitration, but no answer has yet been received to the proposal so made. With respect to the proposed increase in the naval and military estimates, it is impossible for any one to see the progress of steam navigation, and the continued increase of our colonial possessions, without at the same time seeing the necessity for an increase in our naval and military establishments.

Within the last few months the colony of New Zealand has made a heavy demand upon us in this respect; and the continual drain made upon our troops on account of the necessary relief in our other possessions is so great that it is almost impossible to fill up our regiments. I think that even while we have the utmost confidence in the intentions of foreign powers, we would not be wise to neglect the defences of our country, and to render it secure against any possible contingency.—I say, then, that the proposed increase in the estimate may be entirely justified on purely defensive grounds, and that her Majesty's Government have felt it their duty to propose an increase of the estimates for our Naval, Military, and Ordinance Establishments, without reference to the dispute with the United States.

REPEAL OF THE CORN-LAWS, &c.

Opening of Sir Robert Peel's Budget.

LONDON, Jan. 27th, 1846.

The House of Commons was filled at an early hour. At 20 minutes to 5 o'clock Sir R. Peel moved that the order of the day be read for the House resolving itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the Customs and Corn Importation Acts.

Mr. Miles asked Sir R. Peel whether he intended to take a vote that evening on any part of the complicated financial statement which he was about to make to the House?

Sir R. Peel said that the statement which he was about to make would be extensive and complicated, and commercial rather than financial. It was not his intention to ask for the opinion of the House that night upon any portion of it. His wish was, that his plan should be maturely considered, and that it should not be judged of in detail, but as a whole. He would not, therefore, ask for any opinion either as to the general purport, or even as to the details of the measure, until after the lapse of some days.

The Speaker then left the Chair.

Sir R. Peel said, that in pursuance of the recommendation of the speech from the Throne, he was about to call upon the House to review the duties which applied to many articles the produce and manufacture of other countries. He should proceed on the assumption contained in her Majesty Speech, that the repeal of prohibitory and the relaxation of protective duties was in itself a wise policy—that protective duties abstractedly and in principle were open to objection—and that, though the policy of them might in some cases be defended, it must always be on some special grounds of national interest, or of justice toward individuals. He was also about to act on the presumption, that during the last three years there had been increased productiveness in the revenue, notwithstanding a large remission of taxation; that there had been an increased demand for labor; and that there had also been increased competence, comfort, contentment, and peace among the population.

In advising the continued application of those principles which had produced such salutary results, and which had already been sanctioned by the House, he was not inclined to disregard the necessity of maintaining public credit unimpaired, and he was, therefore, prepared to act with forbearance, in order that he might not prejudice in any respect the permanent interests of the country. It was possible that, owing to the numerous and various interests which his present proposition would affect, an impression might arise that his scheme was a rash one, and ought to be discouraged. It such should be the opinion of the partisans of protection, nothing would be more easy for them than to meet him on an early night with a resolution that protection to domestic industry was in itself a good, and that the principle of it ought to be sanctioned by the House.

It might, on the other hand, be the conclusion of the House, considering all the difficulties of this question, and the nature of the contest which had long existed, and would long continue to exist if there were not a satisfactory adjustment of it—that his proposition, extensive as it was, ought to be accepted as a whole, though there might be objections in detail to parts of it. If that should be the conclusion of the House, he should have confidence in his ultimate success; but if not, the sooner its disapprobation was expressed, the better for all parties. The great principle of the relaxation of protective duties he was not going to apply to any one particular interest; on the contrary, he asked all the interests of the country, manufacturing, commercial, and agricultural, to make the sacrifice, if it were one, of their protection, to the common good. Of late years the whole Tariff had been submitted to the review of the House. In 1842 he had proposed, and in 1845 he had carried out to a very large extent, a plan for remitting the duty on the raw materials constituting the elements of manufacture.

There was at this moment scarcely a duty on the raw material imported from foreign countries which we had not abandoned. He had, therefore, a right to call on the manufacturer to relinquish the protection of which he was now in possession. The only two articles of raw material now subject to duty were tallow and timber.—He intended to reduce the duty on tallow from 3s. 2d. to 1s. 6d. a cwt. and to make a gradual reduction on timber till it reached a point at which it would remain fixed, and which he would definitely describe on a future day. Having given the manufacturers free access to every raw material of manufacture, he called upon such of them as were engaged in making up the three articles, Wool, Linen and Cotton, which formed the clothing of the country, to give a proof of the sincerity of their convictions by relinquishing the protection which was now given to the articles of their manufacture. He made this call upon them the more confidently, because it was the maufacturing, and not the agricultural interest, which first called on the Government for protecting duties.

He then stated that he intended to relinquish all duties upon the importation of the coarser articles of manufactures in wool, linen, and cotton, and to reduce the duties on linen and woolen goods of a finer quality from 20 to 10 per cent. At present there was a duty on silk, which was called 30 per cent., but which was often higher. He proposed to adopt a new principle in the levying of that duty, which was now an encouragement to the smuggler, and not to the British manufacturer, and to impose a duty of 15 per cent., instead of 30 for every £100 value of silk. The Right Hon. Baronet then described at great length the reduction of duties which he intended to make upon the importation of paper-hangings, manufactured metals, dressed hides, boots, shoes, hats, straw plat, carriages, candles, soap, brandy, geneva, sugar, and various other articles—for which we must refer our readers to our report; and then proceeded to review the articles connected with agriculture on which import duties were levied.

He proposed to reduce the duty on all seeds to 5s. per cwt. Indian corn or maize, which was of such importance in the fattening of cattle, he proposed in future to introduce duty free. In removing that duty he was not depriving agriculture of any protection, but absolutely conferring a benefit upon it. He also proposed that buckwheat, and maize, and buckwheat flour, should be admitted duty free. If any gentleman would ascertain the price which had been recently paid by farmers for linseed cake and rape cake, they would agree with him that the removal of the duty on maize was not a disservice to the agricultural interest. The Right Hon. Baronet then described the reduction of duty which he intended to propose on the importation of foreign butter, cheese, hops and cured fish, stating that in each case the duty would be reduced to half its present amount. On all articles of agricultural produce which constituted meat as distinct from corn he proposed an immediate repeal of duty. Every kind of vegetable and animal food would be admitted at once free of duty. All animals from foreign countries would also be introduced on the same terms.

He then proceeded to describe the nature of his proposal with respect to the importation of foreign corn. He had already stated that he intended to exempt some articles now included in the Corn-Laws, as maize, from duty altogether. It might, therefore, be as well for him to inform the House at once, that tho' he did not intend to propose the immediate repeal of the Corn-Laws, yet, in the hope of making a final adjustment of the question, and for the sake of giving time for adjustment to the agricultural interest, he did intend to propose that their continuance should only be temporary. The bill which he should therefore introduce on this subject would contain an enactment that after a certain date grain of all kinds should come in duty free. He proposed, however, that a considerable reduction should be made at once in the existing amount of duty, and that the duty so reduced should be limited to the continuance of three years. His bill would contain a provision that at that period, when the change would be least felt—namely, on the 1st of February, 1849—oats, barley, rye, and wheat, should be only liable to that mere nominal duty which he intended to apply to maize, for the purpose of procuring statistical returns of the quantity imported.

The main question, then, for the House to consider was this—What is to be the intermediate state of the law? He proposed that there should be an enactment for three years, to this effect—that till the 1st of February, 1849, the following duties should be levied on all Wheat imported into this country from foreign ports. Whenever the average price of Wheat should be under 48s a quarter in this country, the duty should be 10s a quarter; that above 48s and under 49s, it should be 9s a quarter; that above 49s and under 50s, it should be 8s a quarter, and so on till the price reached 54s a quarter, when he intended to impose an invariable duty of 4s a quarter. The enactments which he proposed for all other descriptions of grain would follow the scale of duties upon wheat; but he referred the House for the details of them to certain papers, which he would have printed to-morrow.

There would, therefore, be levied on wheat at its present price a duty of 4s instead of the present duty of 16s a quarter; and every other grain taken out of bond for consumption in the home market would be liable to little more than a nominal duty. Such was the arrangement for the adjustment of this great question which Her Majesty's Government now offered to the House. He intended to accompany that arrangement with other provisions, calculated, he would not say to give compensation to, but to advance the interest of that portion of the community which would be called upon to relinquish protection, with which he was himself more particularly connected, and in the welfare of which the prosperity of England was deeply involved. He then reviewed some of the burdens which fell on the land, and which he thought capable of alleviation by useful reforms, and not by transferring them to other parties. First among these burdens he placed the highway rates.

They were at present administered by 16,000 local authorities distributed throughout the country. Nothing could be more defective than that a highway which united several distinct parishes should not be under the control of one board, but should be under the control of every distinct parish through which it ran. In each parish there was different surveyor of the high roads. The system led of necessity to a lax expenditure, and to very bad reparation of the roads. He proposed to compel parishes to unite themselves into districts for the repair of the roads. Those districts would be generally the same with the Poor Law Unions; and thus the high roads would be under the control of 600 instead of 16,000 different authorities. Another of the burdens grievously, and he thought justly, complained of by the agricultural interest arose out of the law of settlement. Under that law, during manufacturing prosperity, the rural population was encouraged to migrate to the manufacturing towns.

The peasant thus migrating consumed the prime of his life, and gave all the advantage of his strength to the manufacturers. A revulsion took place in trade, and manufactures ceased to prosper. The individual was then sent back to the rural district, and is thus transferred to a new home, where he is not able to obtain a livelihood, from being unused to rural employments.—For the purpose of not merely relieving the land from a burden, but of also protecting an indigent man from injustice, Government intended to propose that the power of removability should be taken away in the case of every laboring man who had had five years' industrial residence in any manufacturing town. He likewise proposed that the children of any person, or the children of his wife, legitimate or illegitimate, under 16, residing with the father or mother, and the wife of any person, should not be removed where the removal of the person himself was prohibited.

Farther he proposed that no widow residing with her husband at the time of his death should be removable for 12 months after his death from the parish in which he resided at the time; and, lastly, that no order of removal should be taken out on the ground of chargeability shown to have been occasioned by accident or sickness, unless the removing magistrates should be satisfied that the effects of the accident or sickness are such as to be permanent and incurable. Here, again, by alteration of the law a great social advantage would be obtained, and the agricultural interest would be relieved from a great burden. He then approached another matter, in which he advised, without any loss to any other interest, a great advantage to the agricultural interest. There was a natural dread in that interest of a very formidable competition on the cessation of its present protection. It was impossible to deny that agricultural science was yet in its infancy; and he, therefore, proposed that the State should give facilities to the improvement of agricultural skill and industry. The Duke of Richmond had collected a mass of interesting evidence to show the great capability of improvement which is inherent to all kinds of land. Much benefit might be effected by increased draining.

Mr. Pusey had proposed several schemes for the improvement of land; but great difficulties occurred, especially among the owners of entailed estates, in raising the funds to carry them into execution. Government proposed that the credit of the State should be employed in enabling those improvements to be made. An advance of Exchequer-bills should be made by way of loan for the purpose of agricultural improvement, security being of course taken to protect the country against loss. The Right Hon. Baronet, after describing at some length the mode in which these advances were to be made and repaid concluded by stating that that another plan by which he hoped to enable the agricultural interest to meet competition with the foreign grower.—With respect to the local burdens pressing on the agriculturist, he must declare at once that he could not advise any alteration in the mode of the assessment of the poor-rates. It had been said that they were a charge upon the land, and that there should be an alteration in the mode of the levy.

In point of fact they were not a charge upon the land. The opposition was between real and personal property. It was real property upon which the poor-rate was levied, as on mines, houses lands and manufactories. If the poor rates were a charge for general objects, it would be just to make personal property contribute; but they were a local charge, and personal property could not be called on for contribution without establishing an inquisition into every man's affairs, which, for the minute objects of a poor-rate raised to relieve local distress, would not be tolerated. The rate on personal property had been abandoned because it could not be levied, and therefore he was not prepared to propose any alteration in the mode of assessment. He would, however, relieve the agricultural interest of the charge of maintaining the prisoners in the county jails, and would provide for that charge by an annual vote of that House.

He also proposed that that portion of the charge for prosecuting felons which was now defrayed in England and Wales out of local rates imposed upon the land, should likewise be transferred to the State. The relief, in point of money, would not be large; but if it enabled you to exercise an increased control over persecutions, it would be a great social advantage. In Ireland the relief would amount to £17,000, and in England to £100,000 a year.—He then proceeded to contend that if there was any part of the United Kingdom likely to suffer from the withdrawal of Protection, it was Ireland; for Ireland had not, as England had, the means of finding employment for her Agricultural population in her Manufacturing districts. Here, again, he would propose no relief from local burdens which was not accompanied by social advantages. In Ireland the Police was paid partly by the Land and partly by the Treasury.

He believed that it would be for the general advantage to place the police entirely under the Treasury, and to vest the control of it in the Executive Government. Such was the recommendation of Lord Devon's Commission; and he, therefore, proposed that all the charge for the rural police in Ireland should hereafter be borne by the public Treasury. Sir Robert then adverted to the subject of the medical relief of the poor in this country. He believed that there was no part of the Poor Law which had given greater or more just dissatisfaction. He proposed to relieve the unions of half of the charge on this score by taking it upon the Government. He estimated that the amount of charge in that case would be £100,000 for England and £15,000 for Scotland. The subject of medical relief in Ireland was under a different system, and would shortly occupy the attention of the other House of Parliament.

He next proceeded to intimate his belief that in the parish workhouses of England the provision for purposes of education was very inadequate. He did not purpose in any way to interfere with the right now vested in the board of guardians to appoint a schoolmaster or schoolmistress to superintend the education of the pauper children; that right of appointment would remain where it now was; but Government in undertaking to provide £30,000 a year for the salaries of schoolmasters and schoolmistresses, for the children of the destitute, would reserve to itself power to inquire into the qualifications of those instructors, and a power of inspecting, and to a certain extent controlling, the schools. Then again as to the auditors of the unions, he proposed that their salaries, like those of the Commissioners and Sub-commissioners, should be defrayed at the public expense.

He called upon the House to recollect that in every compensation which he had proposed for the land, he had also proposed to give to the community great social relief. He, therefore, hoped that, before this law was rejected, both parties, if their immediate views were not accomplished by it, would recollect that it proposed great benefits for society at large. Whether those benefits would be sufficient to induce both parties to give their assent to his proposition, he could not as yet tell; but he wished them to consider it calmly and temperately, and to reflect upon the consequences which might accrue from its rejection.

He concluded with two observations—one connected with our foreign and our commercial policy, and another with our domestic policy. In making these great reductions on the importation of articles the produce or manufacture of foreign countries, he could give the House no guaranty that foreign countries would follow our example. He had resolved to consult our own interests alone, and not to punish other countries and ourselves by continuing high duties, and the necessary concomitant of high duties, smuggling. He could not promise them that foreign countries would exhibit any gratitude for what we were now doing. On the contrary, he might be told that many countries which had benefited by the relaxation of our duties on their commodities had applied a higher rate of duties to our goods.

He relied on that fact as an encouragement to proceed in our past course. What had been the result of those increased duties on our export trade? Why, that it had flourished in spite of them, because the smuggler of foreign countries had been called in by the inhabitants to our aid. He was convinced that our example would ultimately be followed by foreign countries, and that reason and the common interest of the people and the Government in those countries would induce a relaxation of hostile Tariffs. He instanced this by reference to recent publications in the United States, Naples, Norway, Sweden, Austria, and Hanover. With respect to our domestic policy, he had been asked why he had determined to disturb the prosperity which had now lasted for nearly three years. "It had coëxisted with the Corn Law of 1842—what reason was there to disturb it?" His answer was, that up to October last all those indications of prosperity did exist; but since that time there had been indications of sympathy in the manufacturing districts between employment and the price of provisions. What had occurred since October, 1845, was one of the grounds on which he had determined to bring forward his present proposition.

Such were the proposals he he had to offer for the ultimate adjustment of this great question. He believed that there was at present between the master manufacturers and the operatives a sympathy which did not prevail in 1842, and which led both of them to the conclusion that these laws ought to be altered. But although that was the case, there was nothing but general content, loyalty, and confidence on their part in the wisdom of the Legislature. But because there was calm and no coercion, he entreated hon. gentlemen to bear in mind that the aspect of affairs might be changed. They might have worse harvests, and therefore they ought to avail themselves of an adjustment on this question which must ultimately be made, and which could not be long delayed without endangering the peace and security of the empire.

He recommended his proposition to the calm consideration of the House, in the hope that it would, in the language of Her Majesty's speech, promote friendly feelings between different classes, provide additional security for the continuance of peace, and maintain contentment and happiness at home by increasing the comforts and bettering the condition of the great body of the people. Sir R. Peel concluded his address at five minutes past 8 o'clock, amid loud cheers.

Sir R. Peel rose again to suggest that the discussion on his resolution should be taken on that day week. His measure involved a great remission of taxation, and, therefore, a defalcation of the Revenue. Besides, it incurred an annual charge amounting at least to £600,000.

Mr. S. O'Brien suggested to Sir R. Peel the propriety of considering whether this day fortnight would not be an early day for the consideration of this scheme. The voices of the farmers of England could not reach the House in less than that time.

Mr. Hume hoped that Sir R. Peel would not yield the postponement now required.

Sir R. Peel asked Mr. Hume to allow him to conduct his own affairs. He then suggested that the House should enter on this discussion on Thursday week.

Mr. Miles begged for farther time. Why not take the discussion on Monday week?

Sir R. Peel assented to that suggestion; but informed the House that he should then proceed *de die in diem* with the discussion of this question. He could not exactly declare the loss which the Revenue would experience by the adoption of his proposition. He thought last year that by the alteration in the Excise Duties he should lose One Million; but the Revenue from that source was now as good as it was before the alteration. He expected to lose Four Millions by the reduction of the Customs Duties; but nothing of the kind occurred. He was, therefore, unwilling to make an estimate of the loss which would accrue to the Revenue. The charge which his scheme would impose on the Consolidated Fund would be an annual charge of £513,000.

In answer to a question from Lord John Russell relative to the mode of proceeding in order to obtain a decision of the House on the subject,

Sir R. Peel observed, that he had no objection to bring the resolution on the Corn-Laws first under consideration; but whatever course should appear most advisable to the House, the same would be most convenient to the Government.

A debate of considerable duration then occurred, which our limits will not permit us to copy.

PEEL'S NEW CORN LAW, &c.

In lieu of the duties now payable on the importation of corn, grain, meal, or flour, there shall be paid until the 1st day of February, 1849, the following duties, viz:

If imported from any foreign country—

WHEAT.

Whenever the average price of Wheat, made up and published in the manner required by law, shall be for every quarter

s.		s.				s.	d.
Under 48			the duty shall be for every quarter			10	0
48	—	49	ditto	ditto	....	9	0
49	—	50	ditto	ditto	....	8	0
50	—	51	ditto	ditto	....	7	0
51	—	52	ditto	ditto	....	6	0
52	—	53	ditto	ditto	....	5	0
53 and upward			ditto	ditto	....	4	0

[The duties on *Barley* and *Oats* are to be reduced in proportion.]

PROPOSED REDUCTION OF BRITISH DUTIES ON AMERICAN PRODUCTS.

	Previous duty.	*Reduced to*
Bacon	14s per cwt	Free
Beef, fresh	8s per cwt	Free
salted	8s per cwt	Free
Hay	16s per load	Free
Hides	2d per lb	Free
Meat	8s per cwt	Free
Pork	8s per cwt	Free
Buckwheat	—	1s per quar.
Butter	20s per cwt	10s per cwt
Candles—Tallow	10s per cwt	5s per cwt
Cheese	10s 6d per cwt	5s per cwt
Clocks	20 per cent	10 per cent
Hams	14s per cwt	7s per cwt
Hops	90s per cwt	45s per cwt
Indian Corn	heavy duty	1s per quarter
Rice	6s per cwt	1s per quarter
Tallow	3s 6d per cwt	1s per cwt

France.

In Wednesday's sitting of the Chamber of Deputies, the general debate on the address was resumed, and the Minister of Foreign Affairs replied to M. Thiers's speech respecting the intervention of the Government on the Texas question, and the policy which France ought to observe towards the United States. M. Guizot did not reiterate, in gentle language, most of the arguments he had adduced on the same subject in the Chamber of Peers.

He said that the commercial and political interest of France had alone dictated the course that had been pursued relative to the annexation of Texas. There existed between that State and France a treaty of commerce, and the annexation stripped her from the future advantages her navy and trade might have derived from it. On the other hand, the excessive aggrandizement of the United States was, in a political point of view, by no means desirable.

After absorbing Texas their ambition would be directed to Mexico, and the balance of power, which it was necessary to maintain in the new, just as well as in the old world, would be destroyed. Such were the considerations that had determined the French Government to advise Texas to maintain its independence against the ambitious pretensions of the United States; and the same advice would have been given to Texas had its independence been threatened, not by the American Confederacy, but by England.

The part which France had taken in the affair had, however, been a very limited one; she had confined herself to warning Texas, and abstained from farther interference the moment the Texan people had declared in favor of Annexation. The Washington Cabinet had had no reason to take offence at this conduct, wherein France had done but what she had a right to do, with propriety and moderation.

Although the language used by President Polk in his Message betrayed much irritation, it was to be hoped that so transient a misunderstanding would not impair the friendly relations that existed, and ought always to exist, between the two countries. As regarded the question of the Oregon Territory, M. Guizot added that France had nothing to do with it; she must sincerely wish for the maintenance of peace, but, should the differences unfortunately end in hostilities, France would immediately reap the immense advantages arising from a neutrality.

M. Billault replied at great length to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, but was listened to with much less attention than usual. M. Berryer notified that he should move the insertion of an additional paragraph respecting Texas and the United States, in the way of an amendment to the Address, and the general debate was then closed. The remainder of Wednesday's discussion is scarcely worth mentioning.

Availing himself of the first paragraph of the Address, M. Gustave de Beaumont revived M. Legrand's imputations against the Cabinet respecting sundry electoral intrigues, and entered into various details on the subject, which are of no interest whatever to the English reader. The Minister of the Interior denied their correctness, and postponed a further reply to the following day.

FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES.

M. Guizot's Reply to Mr. Polk.

PARIS, Jan. 20, 21, 1846.

M. THIERS, leader of the 'Dynastic' Opposition, late Prime Minister, opened the discussion on the Annexation of Texas and conduct of France in relation thereto. He thought the Ministry had done wrong in uniting with England to oppose Annexation, thereby alienating the United States and unfitting France to act as a mediator between the United States and Great Britain in case of a violent collision on Oregon. M. M. Berryer (old Royalist) and Billault (Opposition) took similar views. They thought France should rather aid any change calculated to impair the power of England. In reply,

M. GUIZOT, the Minister for Foreign Affairs, having ascended the tribune, said that M. Thiers, on the previous evening, had appealed to the impressions and instincts of the Chamber; he would appeal to its calm and reflecting judgment; and he hoped to convince it that the advice he had given the Crown, and the line of policy he had pursued, were the most conducive to the interests of the country. On the invitation of the Texan Government and of its Minister of Paris, he had advised Texas to maintain her independence, and Mexico to recognize it. He had always proclaimed that the Texans were free to adopt whatever course they pleased, and that, when once they should have pronounced, France had nothing to say.—This had been the case; when the Annexation was agreed to by the Texan people France entered into no protest; she accepted the fact when accomplished; she raised no discussion on the subject with the United States, nor even addressed a single observation to that Government. M. Guizot had accordingly felt surprized at the language used by the President in his Message, and he had considered it his duty to claim in reply for France an entire independence of action. He next examined the commercial reasons which had induced France to recognize the independence of Texas in 1838, and rendered her anxious to maintain it in 1845. The political considerations had been of a still greater weight. There were at present, he said, three powerful nations intent on aggrandizing beyond measure their territories—England, Russia and the United States. France was not extending her dominions. In Africa she had made a conquest it was her honor and her interest to preserve, but the bounds of which she would not overstep. It was of the highest importance to France that those three nations should balance each other's power, and that none of them should obtain a preponderating influence. She was consequently interested in protecting the independence of the American States. M. Guizot then proceeded to explain the nature of the relations existing between England and France. They were placed, he said, on the most intimate footing, and he was happy and proud to declare it. The alliance of the two countries, their good understanding, their intimacy, were necessary for the general peace. Their indifference toward each other would endanger its continuation. That intimacy had not impaired in the least the independence of the policy of France. For the last five years it had existed entire, and it was only those utterly ignorant of the facts who could contest it. On every part of the globe where the policy of France and England had been at variance—in Africa, Spain, and Greece—France had freely and boldly followed the course pointed out by her interests, without compromising in the least the friendly relations between the two Governments—thanks to their intimacy. M. Thiers had declared that the two countries were displeased with each other. (Here M. Thiers interrupted M. Guizot, and endeavored to modify that expression.) M. Guizot contended that the two countries, so far from being displeased and irritated against each other, entertained, on the contrary, the most friendly feelings toward one another. (Some murmurs here arose on the Opposition benches, when M. Guizot, turning toward the Left, exclaimed, "You are not the country.") He then proceeded to enumerate the difficulties between England and France, which had been amicably adjusted, contrary to the expectation of the Opposition, amidst the applause of his friends in the Centre. M. Guizot then, reverting to American affairs, described the endeavors made by France to maintain peace. But (said he) if war should break out, the sole equitable, and useful policy, the only one conformable to the national interests, was that of neutrality. That policy would be beneficial to the cause of civilization, and it would secure to France the blessings of peace and procure for her immense commercial and political advantages. The conduct of France had been in no wise hostile to the United States; she had taken no part against them; she had evinced a determination to remain neutral; and would persist in that determination, because he considered it the most profitable, the wisest, the most honorable, and the best calculated to put a period to the war.

M. Billault having asked M. Guizot what he should have done had Texas given herself to England.

M. Guizot replied that he should have held the same language, followed the same conduct, given the same advice, and stopped at the same point.

He begged permission to refer to the remarks of the President's Message on the general relations of France with the United States and of the general policy of the United States toward France and Europe. He would himself not have opened such a discussion, and it was not either in the interest or the necessity of the two countries to have opened it; but, since it was opened, he had no hesitation to say his entire thoughts about it. They entertained the same good sentiments in the same good relations to the United States as they had always done, and they meant to maintain them. They meant to be always for the United States old and sincere friends. But the United States are not what they were sixty years ago. Then they were just created, badly constituted, and needed support—paternal support. Now they have grown and prospered, and taken their places among the powerful of the earth. Far from regretting, they applauded and rejoiced at this prosperity and grandeur; and not only did they rejoice at their present grandeur, but at their great destinies in the future. Opinions might differ as to the merits of their social organization and their political institutions; but it was impossible not to recognize in that society, and by consequence in its influence, principles of justice, of humanity, of well-being for men, which have been wanting in the greater part of the States, which have become great and powerful in the world. There was reason to hope that, in spite of all the imperfections, all the chances, all the obscurities of the future of this great people, it will exercise its influence in a manner more moral and more useful than many other great people. They were, therefore, far from complaining of, or being alarmed at the present and future greatness of the United States. But they were obliged to take into serious consideration, and regard with a vigilant, not distrustful eye, their greatness and strength; and nobody could be surprised that, in the interest of their country, they should maintain the independence of their policy toward the United States great and powerful in quite a different manner than they had done toward the U. S. newly-born, and hardly sure to live. Even if the simplest common sense do not teach them that conduct, the Message of the President of the U. S. indicated it clearly. It was not for him to say that the words of the President were either opportune or measured; but they were frank, explicit, and honorable. He had read them attentively, and had sought, in the interests of his country, the policy they conveyed. He found two things which appeared to him excessively grave. The first was that the U. S. have not taken and will not take part for or against any one in the affairs of Europe. They profess they practice a perfectly isolated policy with regard to Europe—independent neutrality. He did not blame them. He would go farther, and say, it was their interest, well understood, and that interest was good policy. "But then (pray mark these words, they are of vast importance,) the United States cannot be astonished that we do the same—they cannot be astonished that the policy of France will be, with respect to the United States, as independent, as purely attached to the national interest, as are the United States themselves. What they practice—what they are right to practice—is as good a rule of policy for us as for them. We ought to guard the same independence—we ought to seek equally in all the questions in which we may be engaged the national interest, without sacrificing to it any tradition, to any scrivener, to any view of an alliance which cannot exist according to the terms even of the President of the United States." That was the first thing that struck him in the Message. The second was that the United States could not permit any European action on the North American continent, and that what in Europe is called the balance of power could not be applied either. The maxim, he said, was strange. The United States were not the only nation of North America. There were other States—he would only name Mexico—with the same rights, the same independence, the same liberty to seek or refuse alliances, to form political combinations in accordance with their interest, as the United States. The neighborhood, the existence of the United States, could not restrain in any fashion their independence and their rights. Well, with those States France had treaties, and they had the right to conclude and maintain treaties; and would any one say that in so doing they injured the right of the United States? There was nothing in all that they could not do again, and the States with which France was in relation could also do the same. The language to which he alluded, if the sense it appeared to have were attributed to it would far exceed the limit of the rights that can be recognized in foreign Governments, however great they may be. The ties which bound them to other States of the North-American Continent, the relations they had with them, that they were in the right to contract with them—all these interests, commercial, political, territorial, even, in certain cases, should be maintained without any sentiment of hostility to the United States, but with the same sentiments of friendship as had always been shown toward them—they should all be maintained without giving to the United States any great cause of complaint, but without regarding any illegitimate pretension. For this the United States themselves had given them a striking example. At the time of the French Revolution, Washington had steadily resisted the popular clamor to engage in the conflicts it created in Europe—choosing to maintain a strict independence toward all European States—to be the ally of none, France or any others. He thought that Washington in so doing was right, and thereby rendered an immense service to his country. They were not now in similar circumstances, but he hesitated not to say, that the fundamental principle of the policy of Washington at that time, since become that of his country, ought to govern that of France. And for his part, as long as he had, or should have, the honor to sit in the councils of the crown, he—the friend as sincere and affectionate as any one of the great society, of the great Government of the United States, accepting willingly their present greatness and their future greatness—he would maintain not the less in all the questions great and little which may arise in the new world as in the old—he would maintain not the less the full independence of the policy of his country—he would practice not the less what appeared to him conformable to the interest of France. "And," he added in conclusion, "I am sure that in doing that we shall be understood and approved even in the United States. I know the power of popular errors. I know the empire of popular passions; but I know also that the modern free States, whatever be the form of their Government, Monarchic or Republican—whatever be their social organization, Aristocratic or Democratic—repose always on this conviction. I will say willingly on this faith, that, whatever be the error of the moment, after a long and free examination by the empire of discussion, and of liberty, truth, justice, reason, good sense finish by prevailing, and by directing public affairs. It is this hope, this faith, which makes the existence and the safety of modern free States. It will not be the United States which will give to this salutary and sublime faith a painful denial."

ALGIERS—THE FRENCH DISASTER.

Another disaster has befallen the French in Algeria. General Levasseur, *ad interim* Commandant of Constantina, had marched from that place in order to put down an insurrection in the district of Belezona. It had been already partly quelled by Colonel Herbillon, who was stationed at Batna, and a tribe called the Ouled-Sillams, at whose head was Si-Saad-El-Tabbani, an Arab of the Ouled-Tebban tribe, alone held out.

General Lavasseur, who had left Constantina with 1200 men, effected his junction with Colonel Herbillon, and a battalion come from Setif, whereby his column amounted to about 2500 infantry and cavalry. His first operation was an unjust and cruel one. Although the Ouled-Sellamo had obtained the "aman" from Colonel Herbillon, and even already paid the fine to which they had been condemned for their rebellion, General Levasseur, rejecting their prayers for mercy, charged and put a hundred of them to the sword.

On the 25th of December he turned his wrath on the Ouled-Tebbans, their villages were plundered and burnt without their offering any resistance, or the French losing a man. On the 1st of January the native village of Si-Saad-Ben-Tebbani shared the same fate, and the troops composing the column had now but to return to their respective garrisons. The weather had hitherto been favorable, but, on the 2d of January, snow began to fall in such abundance that the ground was soon covered with it, and the roads became impassable.

The French column was but a short distance from the plains, but, according to a letter, it entered a defile in which the snow had gathered in large quantities. For two days and two nights together the troops were without either shelter or fuel, exposed to the horrors of cold and hunger, the guides being unable to find their way in the protracted snow-storm. On the second night despair spread among the men, large numbers of whom would appear to have perished.

The *Moniteur* publishes an official despatch from General Levasseur, detailing this occurrence. It is dated Setif, the 10th January, and, although he professes to report with entire veracity "a catastrophe for which he feels the deepest sorrow," he has probably considerably palliated it.

After describing the weather as fearful, he admits that "on the cruel 3d of January his column experienced *de bien regrettables pertes*, and that his route was marked by the corpses of unfortunate soldiers whom the cold had killed." But he adds "in the terrible trial they had just undergone the troops have displayed admirable *morale* and discipline. The composure of the officers and patience of the soldiers has not for a moment been disturbed.

Many men have entered the hospital in consequence of the cold or fatigue, but I can assure you that, according to the opinion of the medical department, there are very few serious cases. A large number of men have come in, and more who had lost their way in the snow, are daily returning. This circumstance prevents my reckoning as yet the number of the dead."

The *Marseilles Semaphore*, which publishes a long narrative of the disaster, reckons but at about a hundred men the loss sustained on the occasion. Two letters, quoted by the *National*, state that eight hundred men have remained buried under the snow; other advices say six hundred, and that all the baggage, with provisions enough for above ten days, have been lost. The *Algérie*, which has also received private advices, has the following:

"Thirty officers have had their hands and feet frozen. Five men and several horses of the detachment of African Chasseurs have died of cold; fifteen out of eighty men of the wagon-train have perished. A grenadier company of the 43d has almost wholly disappeared. Almost all the native muleteers lost their lives on that terrible day. This unfortunate affair, of which we do not yet know the extent, has been duly construed by the Arabs to our detriment; they have seen the hand of God in it. We never shall cease saying that General Levasseur's sortie cannot be excused."

According to the *Moniteur Algérien*, Abd-el-Kader, being closely pursued by Gen. Lamoriciere, at the moment he was moving towards the Yacoubia, had retired to the south-west, by the Flittas and Soamas country.

Ireland.

Mr. Blackburne has been sworn in as Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench. The Solicitor-Generalship is still vacant, but Barrister Brewster is working hard for the office. [Dublin Evening Post of Saturday.

The Irish Board of Education are about to build thirty-two model schools, for training teachers, in the several counties of Ireland.

The Repeal rent for the week announced at the meeting on Monday se'nnight was £367 3s. 11d.

Another dreadful murder has taken place in Tipperary. The victim was named Patrick Crotty, and was a servant to Thomas Fennessy, of Woodroffe. He was shot through the left breast, the ball coming out through his hip.

The state of the county of Limerick is represented as most alarming; two murders had been perpetrated under circumstances of the most fearful outrage; the cause, in each instance, being connected with the letting of land. The robbery of fire arms, the posting of rockite notices, and attacks by armed parties are rife. Colonel Mansel, commanding the garrison at Limerick, had been obliged to send out a strong force to disperse the insurgents, who had assembled armed and in great numbers, on the lands of Knocksentry, near Castleconnell.

MEETING OF IRISH MEMBERS.—On Friday, in accordance with a resolution passed at the Conciliation Hall on the previous Monday, a meeting of the Irish members took place at Radley's. Mr. O'Connell inquired if any individual appeared to represent the opinions put forward so often in the Mail and other Conservative papers, as to the formation of an Irish party. No such person appearing, the hon. and learned gentleman declared his determination to attend in Parliament to vote for free trade in corn, which was an open question, and to advocate measures of justice to Ireland. Mr. Smith O'Brien, M. P., Mr. Callaghan, M. P., Mr. Dillon Browne, M. P. and Mr. John O'Connell, M. P. also addressed the meeting, and ultimately the following resolution, proposed by Mr John O'Connell, was adopted unanimously:—That the Irish Members here present, who purpose attending Parliament this session, do hereby pledge themselves to offer the utmost opposition to any measure brought forward under the pretext of preventing and punishing agrarian outrages that shall not be either preceded by, or accompanied, *pari passu*, by real and extensive measures of relief to the Irish people from the heavy grievances under which they are laboring."

MEETING OF MAGISTRATES IN LIMERICK.—A meeting of magistrates, convened by Lord Guillamore, Vice-Lieutenant, who presided, was held in Limerick on Wednesday. A considerable number of magistrates attended. The press was excluded from the meeting; the *Limerick Chronicle*, however, gives the following notice of the proceedings:—On taking the chair, Lord Guillamore read a letter from the Lord Lieutenant, expressive of his excellency's desire to sustain the laws and suppress outrage in the disturbed districts of the county, requesting his Lordship would convene a meeting of his brother magistrates, to consult as to the most salutary course to be adopted to effect the same, and undertake to co-operate in carrying out the suggestions of the magistrates. A committee of nine was then appointed to frame resolutions, which were subsequently agreed to unanimously, recapitulating the frightful extent of murder and outrage in the several districts—stating that the existing laws are inadequate to put down crime—that extraordinary stringent measures should be had recourse to for this purpose—condemning the mal-operation of the Arms Bill in Ireland—representing the danger of withdrawing the police from country stations to attend