ly to remark on the slave’s status as affecting credibility. Grenada and Tobago had adopted a similar law; while, in the other colonies of their class, the admission of slave evi­dence was hampered and restricted so much as to make the grant perfectly useless. 5. In the crown colonies the mar­riages of slaves were legalized under certain restrictions ; in all others such marriages were everywhere exposed to harassing impediments. 6. In the crown colonies the separation of families had been peremptorily provided against, the order, however, being somewhat vague as to the de­scription of persons whom it should embrace. In the char­tered colonies the provisions of this kind were universally in­sufficient. 7. The right of acquiring property was conferred on the slaves in the crown colonies; on those in the others it was also conferred, hut under limitations which made the privilege quite illusory. 8. The order in council gave the slaves the right of redeeming themselves and their families, at a fair appraisement, even against the will of the owners ; but it imposed, in reference to this grant, several very harsh conditions. The chartered colonies refused unanimously to introduce any such compulsory manumission. 9. The new order most unfortunately omitted that provision in the Trinidad code, which forbade the master to punish the slave corporally more than once in twenty-four hours; but it li­mited him to twenty-five lashes at a time. This latter en­actment was imitated in two or three of the chartered co­lonies; and in all the rest the old law remained, which al­lowed the master to inflict thirty-nine lashes at once on any slave, of any age, or of either sex, for any offence, or for none; and the same law allowed him to imprison in the stocks or workhouse as long as he pleased. 10. In the crown colonies there was required a return, as well as a re­cord, of arbitrary punishments inflicted on the slaves on the plantations; but no such check was imposed as to any other classes, such as mechanics or domestics. In the other co­lonies there was no return, and no adequate record. 11. By the order in council, the flogging of females was abo­lished; in every one of the chartered colonies it was still permitted and practised. 12. The order forbade, though not in sufficiently explicit terms, the use of the driving-whip in the field. The legislature of the Bahamas did the same thing. The other legislatures retained the old instruments of punishment. 13. Official protectors of the slaves, none of whom could be slave-holders, were appointed in the crown colonies. The chartered colonies all refused to appoint such functionaries; though in some of them the local magistrates (composed of slave-holders) acted in a similar capacity. 14. Another proposed reform was, the providing that no slave­holder should be appointed to any function connected with the administration of the slave-laws. The order in council, though it obeyed this salutary ride in respect to the protec­tor, disregarded it as to his assistants, on whom devolved a great part of his ordinary duty. In the chartered colonies the rule was little attended to, except in the leading ap­pointments made by the crown. 15. It was also proposed that, in cases involving the status of individuals, the legal presumption should be for freedom and against slavery. This rule, adopted in the crown colonies, was also imitated by Tobago and Grenada, but by no other chartered island. 16. For purifying the administration of justice, which called most grievously for amendment, nothing was done in any colony of either class.

ln July 1830, Mr. Brougham brought forward his motion, that the House should resolve, at the earliest possible period in next session, to take into consideration the state of the slaves, in order to the mitigation and final abolition of sla­very, and more especially in order to the amendment of the administration of justice, It was lost by a large majority, in a very thin House. The great changes in the ministry soon came on ; and, during the eventful years 1831 and 1832, the subjects of Great Britain and Ireland hod their own bat­tles to fight at home, instead of extending aid to foreign dependents. The only steps taken in that period were, the issuing of new orders in council by the Whig ministry in 1831, which proved as ineffectual as those of their predeces­sors; and the appointment of committees, both in the Lords and Commons, before both of which a large mass of evi­dence was taken.

At length, after the friends of emancipation had repeat­edly pressed the ministry to redeem their pledge of bring­ing forward a government measure, the ministerial proposi­tion was introduced in May 1833, by Mr. Stanley, then se­cretary for the colonies. The parts of the resolutions on which the emancipationists were most divided were two ; first, the plan of an intermediate state, called an apprentice­ship, into which the slave was to be received on his manu­mission, and which, according to the first draft of the mea­sure, was to last for no less than twelve years ; secondly, the proposal of compensation to the slave-owners, which, brought forward at first hesitatingly, at last developed itself into a grant of twenty millions sterling. On the principle of compensation most men were agreed; there was guilt, it is true, in the very act upon which the claim was grounded, but the nation was a thousand times guiltier than the plant­ers, and it would have ill become us to make the minor of­fenders the only sufferers. The amount and application of the grant were matters less certain. On the question of the apprenticeship there was much more room for doubt; and the most consistent opponents of slavery were decidedly against it. Lord Howick, the under secretary for the colo­nies, threw up his place rather than advocate it; and it was strenuously resisted in the House by him, Mr. Buxton, and Mr. O’Connell, whose opposition, however, was defeated by an overwhelming majority. Among those who advocated the great principle of the resolutions, the most prominent were, besides the members already named, Mr. Buckingham, Dr. Lushington, Admiral Fleming, and Mr. T.B. Macaulay. The opposition, which scarcely amounted to more than exhorta­tions to caution, with insinuations of insurmountable difficul­ties, was headed temperately and skilfully by Sir Robert Peel, whose most decided supporters were, Sir Richard Vyvyan, Mr. Godson, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, and Mr. Hume. No di­vision was attempted on any question involving the principle.

The resolutions, on being communicated to the House of Lords, where they were carried without a vote, were sup­ported by the Earl of Ripon, Lord Suffield, Earl Grey, and Lord Chancellor Brougham, and cautiously opposed by the Duke of Wellington, the Earl of Harewood, Lord Ellenborough, and Lord Wynford.

A bill was next brought forward, founded on the resolu­tions. In the discussion on this bill in the Commons, the most important change effected was, the limitation of the appren­ticeship to the term of six years for the plantation-negroes, and four for all others. In the House of Lords, the amend­ments unsuccessfully proposed by the Duke of Wellington were moderate in themselves, and candidly advocated. On the 28th of August 1833, William the Fourth, giving his royal assent to the act, atoned in some measure for the op­position which, in his early days, he, in common with his whole family, except the Duke of Gloucester, had offered to the abolition of the slave trade. William Wilberforce died while the resolutions preparatory to the bill were at their last stage in the House of Commons.

The leading provisions of the great measure for the abo­lition of slavery were the following.

The act was to take effect on the first day of August 1834, on which day slavery was to cease throughout the British colonies. And, in the first place, all registered slaves, who should at that date be within any of our colo­nies, and should appear to be six years old and upwards, were to become “ apprenticed labourers” to those who bad been their owners in slavery ; while slaves who had been