...ever since which all that preceded." And although centuries have passed away since the noble Saxon penned these lines, I am persuaded that they give, so far forth, a true picture of Rome at the present hour.

You, Sir, will remember, that on the death of the late Pope Gregory, masses were ordered for the repose of his soul all over the Papal world. In many places, and, no doubt, in the cathedral of your city, these masses were celebrated with great [illegible] staggered myself. The repose of the soul of the vicar of Jesus Christ! of the Holy Pope Gregory! What should disturb the repose of his soul? What did he do to disquiet his spirit, after it shot the gulf which divides time from eternity? "If you will take five minutes walk," said a friend of mine, long a resident of Rome, to me one day, "I will introduce you to two fine young girls, the daughters of the late Pope!" I then fully understood why masses were ordered for the repose of his soul! Perhaps you may not know, Sir, that it is quite a common occurrence for the Popes to leave behind them many "nephews" and "nieces," the names by which their illegitimate offspring are designated. But so it is. Their progeny is not counted by units. And the example set by pontiffs, the cardinals and priests are not slow to copy.

I went one day to the Sistine Chapel to vespers, when the Pope and nearly twenty cardinals were present. He who has once seen there the entrance of the cardinals, each with his servant untwisting his robe—their kneeling before the altar, and their servants adjusting their robes while kneeling—their bowing to the altar and to one another—their taking their seats with their servants at their feet, an assuming a most devotional look—their leaving their seats to salute the Pope, with their scarlet robes trailing behind them, can never forget the sight! O, Sir, how every idea of the infallibility of these persons passes away, like the hoar frost before the sun, on witnessing the silly ceremonies they practise in the Sistine! If you should see twenty children going through these ceremonies, you would conjecture that they were keeping holiday on the 1st of April. I sought to read the cardinals, and I think I did read some of them. "Who," said I, "is that youngish man, with that dark, penetrating, cold-looking eye?" "That," said my guide, "is the Cardinal Secretary of State." I need not name him here. He heads the horrible clique, in whose hands the present Pope is but a puppet, and will be probably his successor. Now and then these men in scarlet turned up their eyes, and moved their lips quite fast, and put up their hands after the manner of little Samuel in the picture; but all was obviously to be seen of men. "What," said I to a friend, who knows them well, "what is the moral character of these cardinals?" His reply astounded me. "It is to me amazing," said he, "that some of these men can keep up even the appearance of devotion in the presence of one another, when each knows that the other keeps three, four, or five mistresses. Some of them are the greatest debauchees in Rome; they go, Sir, from the bed to the altar, and from the altar to the bed. I know what I say. I have mixed and mingled with these persons. I have heard wicked and loose young men talk in my day, but the most loose and lewd conversation I ever heard in my life was from these men." "And is this the general character of priesthood here?" said I. "I am persuaded it is," said he, "except the Pope, who is a pure-minded man, and who would do better, and make others do better, if he could." He then went on to state that the priests are the corrupters of the people, and mainly through the confessional and the women. "Noble Romans," said he, "have told me, with tears, that because of the lewdness of these priests, and their way of ferreting out every thing at the confessional, they have lost confidence in the virtue of their wives, their mothers, their sisters, and their daughters. Domestic love and confidence, as a rule, are unknown in Rome."

So emphatic and terrific was the testimony of this person, that I went away, feeling that something had chafed his temper, and that he condemned all for the known vices of a few; and it was not until I heard his testimony corroborated from all the sources at which I sought information that I could admit it to be true. Like sin and death, confession and seduction follow each other in Rome. The crimes are there the that brought from heaven a rain of fire on Sodom.

While sitting in the veranda of the hotel in Civita Vecchia, waiting for the steamer from Naples to carry us to Genoa, I got into conversation with a most intelligent Italian, who spoke English with fluency. "Why," said I, "do you not drive out these French soldiers?" as a parcel of them marched along to the tap of a drum. He replied, "We are not strong enough to drive out the rascals. But if Louis Napoleon is not elected—if a true republic is set up in France, that will recall these men, then we will have freedom." "You have priests here, too," said I, as half a dozen of them were tripping along beneath us. "Plenty," said he, with excited emphasis, and gritting his teeth. "What good do they do you?" I asked. "Much good," he replied, with a scornful toss of the head; "they eat up a man's own property—they suck his own blood out of him—and they go with his own wife." And this, as far as I heard it, is the unbroken testimony of Italy as to the priest; with one exception, and that was an American doing business in Rome, and he only asserted that the above statements are too strong, and that things are better than they have been. "If we can only get these French away," said my friend in the veranda, "we will show you Americans what we will do." "And what will you do?" said I. He replied in a most energetic under tone, "we will establish an Italian republic, and the first thing we will do will be to kill off these d——d priests, *for they are the enemies of the people, and the spies of despotism!*" The next revolution in Italy will be a terrible one for the priests. The people have a terrible retribution in store for them, and they know it. And hence the tightening of the chains of despotism, from the lines of Sardinia down to the Straits of Messina, and the stealthy meetings between the Pope and his most faithful friend, the King of Naples, the most cold-hearted and villainous despot upon earth, for mutual support, when the sleeping fires burst forth. And burst forth they will.

If the morals of the clergy in Rome are such as we have described, what must be the morals of the people? Depraved and low, according to all testimony, to the last degree. As by common consent, the marriage vows are disregarded; and while externally everything seems moral and decent yet underneath there is little else than rottenness and putrefaction. I repeat it, Sir, there is no morality in Rome. Instead of being a "holy city," it is a fermenting vat of corruption, and the priests supply the chief ingredients which produce the fermentation. A venerable professor of one of our American universities, with whom I travelled on the Mediterranean, stated that, but a few days previous to my meeting with him, a priest was taken up in Jordina, in Sicily, for having eight women in his harem, three of whom were married persons!

Of course a state of morals like this among the priests, when connected with a grinding despotism, framed and executed mainly by them, must make them and their religion despicable in the eyes of the people. And they are so, as is obvious from the deserted churches that you find every where, and from the unanimous expressions of their sentiments by the people wherever they can whisper them. There is, Sir, not a spot on earth where Romanism is more detested than in Rome—there is not a spot on earth where the Pope and his priests are more supremely contemned. If the people of Rome could only have their way, the Pope would be to-morrow in exile—his priests would be in the dungeons where patriots are now rotting; and the fabled chair of St. Peter would be at the bottom of the muddy Tiber, or ascending to heaven in smoke. And it is one of the most unaccountable anomalies of the day to see men so despised at home so favourably regarded abroad—to see men who can only retain their places at home by the aid of Swiss and French soldiers, claiming a universal dominion over the people and nations of Christendom, and parcelling out kingdoms among their spies and tools for Papal purposes.

Is it, Sir, desirable to have the morals of Rome transferred to New York and Baltimore? If not, is it desirable that the priests, and the system which produce these morals, should be patronized among us? I am far from saying—indeed, I do not believe—that Romish priests in this country are as immoral as they are in Rome. I believe they are worse in Italy than in any other part of the world. But may it not be owing to the fact that the keen eye of Protestantism is upon them? What will be their morals, or ours, when they have all things to their mind? The Chinese say they find here a market for their worst teas—the French for their poorest silks—and the English for their worst manufactures. When fashions are worn out in Europe, they are often in full credit here. Must it be so with its religion also? Is it to the credit of our country that she should be dressing herself up in the old, tawdry, moth-eaten garments of the old whore of Babylon, which even the down-trodden Italians are casting indignantly away? With great respect, yours,

KIRWAN.

[illegible]

The following letter was lately written by Rosa Madiai, from her prison at Lucca, to her husband, imprisoned at Volterra:—

"Oh, that thou couldst know the pleasure the intelligence that thou art better gave me! It was very great, and many were the tears of joy I shed—for two reasons; that God had counted thee worthy to suffer with his beloved Son, and next, that He first has restored thy health. Oh that we might duly prize the contumely we suffer for confessing that there is but One Mediator between God and man!—You tell me, love, that you expect favour; but let me tell you, we have already received great favour, when—our conjugal ties forcibly broken—ourselves dragged from our home—our goods scattered as dust before the wind—and we reduced, to what a low estate thou knowest—and yet, with all that we would not for all the treasures of Pharaoh (as Moses would not), lose the blessed gift which the Holy Spirit has, through great grace, given to us—that of believing in His Divine Word. This I call favour, and great favour. If any star does shine for us, it will be that of justice. We have done no injury to any one; on the contrary, we have suffered injury, having been sold for a few coins. Our accusers are the descendants of Judas. Alas for their poor souls! I pray that God may grant to them to shed tears such as Peter's and not to suffer punishment as Judas, and that they may yet taste that eternal joy which our Lord has purchased. Let us be ready to do the will of the Father, as his Son, our Master, did it. Let us not be troubled. Peter trembled when he walked on the water, fearing the waves of the sea, and forgetting that if the Saviour walked towards him on the same waters, he need not fear; he did fear, and cried 'Lord save me;' the hand of the Saviour succoured him, saying, 'Oh thou of little faith, why didst thou doubt?' It will be shame to us if the waves of this world make us tremble; let us remember the sacred words, '*Though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death I will fear no evil, for thou art with me.*' Rest in the Lord, my beloved, for good is through suffering. All here passes away. Eternity is all important. Be cheerful, and seek to establish thyself.—God bless thee, and cover thee under the shadow of His wings, through the Grace of Jesus Christ our Lord."

COMMUNICATIONS.

[For the Chronicle.]

Sir,—I observe in your paper of the 29th ult. a communication signed "A Traveller," who undertakes to report a case at the Sessions of "a certain County Town, not far from the City of St. John." Although cowardly enough to write anonymously, his penchant for abuse, his false and contorted statements, sufficiently identify the person, for whom it is unfortunate, as a reporter, that he allows this his natural failing to show itself at the very outset of his praiseworthy travels. He enjoys a very unenviable notoriety in his own locality, and elsewhere, and persons at all acquainted with him know precisely what degree of faith to place in any of his statements; or to speak in other words, know enough to believe exactly contrary to his assertions. What shows his production to be original, is, that scarcely a word of truth can be found in it; and I am willing to believe that any such was merely accidental. It would be taking too much notice of his insignificance, were I to occupy so much of your valuable space as would be necessary to expose all his false statements and conclusions, and I shall confine myself principally to his law. I may here remark that he was not so disinterested in the matter as he would wish to be considered, and that he had certain motives beside enlightening the public. His attack on the Bench of Magistrates, and Counsel, *shews a factious feeling.*

The offence charged in the case before the Sessions fell under the 13th Act of the 11th c. of the Act 12 Vic. c. 29, in which act there is no jurisdiction given to the Sessions over the offence: the 14th Act of the 11th c. against cruelty to cattle *expressly* gives a jurisdiction. The "Traveller" by placing these articles together in his report, seems to forget that he is thereby exposing his argument as to jurisdiction. He states the magistrates discharged the accused under the *impression* that the Sessions *had no jurisdiction over a misdemeanor.*—This was not so. But is this assertion probable when the 14th Act above named, and partly copied by the "Traveller," makes cruelty to cattle a *misdemeanor*, and expressly gives the General Sessions jurisdiction to try the offence? He shows ingenuity here, for in copying the 14th Article, he *suppresses* after the word "cattle," under an "*&c.*" the words "shall be guilty of a misdemeanor."—Perhaps he concluded that after asserting the Magistrates were under the above *impression*, then to place the two Articles of the Act *in full*—both describing *misdemeanors*—together, the first *not giving* the jurisdiction, and the next *expressly giving* it, would be tantamount inferentially to an assertion that they could not read, hence his care in *omitting* a part of the 14th Article.

The manner in which he undertakes to *prove incontestibly* that the General Sessions has jurisdiction over a misdemeanor, and that the magistrates could not distinguish between a *felony and misdemeanor*, is somewhat ludicrous viz., because felonies *and three kinds of misdemeanors* are to be dealt with in the Supreme Court, for be it remarked that the other offences besides felonies maintained in the Law he quotes, are according to the Consolidating Act, *misdemeanors*. Again, he states it is evident that they had power to recognise the party, and proceeds to give the latter part of 51st sec. of 30 c. of 12 Vic. This Section provides "that the said Court of General Sessions, *in any case of difficulty* in which a party may be indicted before such Court for any offence under this Act TRIABLE BY SUCH COURT, " whether (at this word "whether" the "Traveller" *begins* to copy) it be a felony or misdemeanor, &c," may admit party to bail &c.—How this makes directly against him: it shows clearly that the Sessions only have the power to bind over for an offence *triable by such Court*. But observe the *caution* of the "Traveller" in *omitting* the first part of the Section containing the above words. He says it "remains a mystery" why the Sessions "came to so hasty a decision." Indeed! I would recommend a consultation to be held by the famous trio, viz., E. the "Plaintiff," the "Complainant" who argued "his own cause," and the "Traveller," who reported it, in order to unravel the mystery. Do they locate near each other?

The proceedings having deservedly dropped, it seems the traveller took this mode to fulminate his splenetive and malicious effusion. It sounds—if I may be allowed the expression—like a [illegible] howl of disappointment.

VERITAS.

CAUTION.

ALL Persons are hereby cautioned not to come in to trespass with the WHARF now sunk at Reed's Point, as in the event of any damage received, they will be prosecuted as the law directs.

JAMES STACKHOUSE,
GRIFFIS STACKHOUSE.

Oct 15, 1852.

Just received.

350 POUNDS boneless BACON, 340 lbs. HAMS, cured with sugar, Nova Scotia; 30 bushels BEANS, 30 bbls Greening APPLES; a good article for shipping; 600 pounds CHEESE; 15 tubs BUTTER. G. M. BURNS.

The Chronicle.

Saint John, January 28, 1853.

THE LAW COMMISSION.

We have noticed of late some remarks on the commission, written in singularly bad taste, and in perfect ignorance of the subject. The *Morning* [illegible] matter, that "we believe that a clever man, who understands the pleadings and *practices* of our courts of justice, can revise and popularize the *laws* in three months." Yet, in the very next sentence we are gravely informed that his republican friends, with all their acknowledged acuteness and spirit of progression, "were *seven years* in talking over and preparing the American Constitution!"

The *News* is a great admirer of Mr. Needham's Bill, which was simply confined to the proceedings and practice of our courts of justice, yet he tells us, that "it should form a platform for the Commission to act upon;" and further on, we are told that this bill, which was simply to attain one object—a reformation in judicial proceedings—was "modelled in such a way as to give simplicity to *the laws*, and to reduce them to common sense, so that every one could understand who might take the trouble to read"!! *Ne sutor ultra crepidam.*

We are happy to inform our readers that the Act of Assembly of 1852, authorising the Commission, empowers the Executive to appoint not less than three, nor more than five commissioners to (in the language of the Act,) "*consolidate, simplify in their language, revise, and arrange in one uniform code the Acts of the Assembly in this Province, incorporating in such revision and arrangement all such alterations and amendments as the said Commissioners shall deem necessary, and to report upon the practice of the proceedings of the Courts of Law and Equity, and to suggest such alterations therein as may appear to the said Commissioners, or a majority of them, best adapted to lessen expense and advance justice, and especially to take into consideration the Law of Evidence, as it at present exists in this Province, and the propriety of altering the same, and to report the result of their doings to the Lieutenant Governor or Administrator of the Government for the time being, in separate reports, embracing in one report the revision and codification of the Acts of Assembly, and in the other, the practice and proceedings of the Courts of Law and Equity,*" &c.

We can tell the *News* that the consideration of the subject matter embraced in Mr. Needham's Bill will not form a *fiftieth* part—or any thing like it—of the labour required from the Commissioners.

What the Commissioners have been most energetically attending to for some time past, is what is required from them in their first report, that is, a codification and revision of the Acts of Assembly. In this labour they have made considerable progress, and they indulge the hope, that this portion of their duty will be ready for submission to the Legislature at an early period of the next session. In Nova Scotia we are informed, that upwards of two years were occupied in performing about the same amount of service.

Let any intelligent man, capable of the task, examine the condition of our Provincial Statutes, and observe the confusion, contradiction, ambiguity, tautology, &c., which abound therein. Indeed, their *voluminous* condition, by reason of alterations and amendments from time to time, have placed them in such a state of confusion, that it is almost impossible for any other than a lawyer to ascertain in many cases what the law really is. This chaotic mass the Commissioners have boldly encountered, and the time is not distant, when all the laws now contained in almost a wheel barrow load of books, will be revised, codified, and simplified, in such a manner, that either editor of the *News* or *Freeman* can carry our statutory enactments in his great-coat pocket! Such is the case with the Nova Scotia laws, and the work embracing them is there *sold* for 12s. 6d. Ours will not cost more.

But, after having accomplished this achievement so desirable to every law-abiding subject in the Province, the Commissioners will be far, very far, from the end of their labours. Such topics as are entertained in "Mr. Needham's Bill," and very many others, will be handled without gloves, the duty being entrusted to men, who are not only capable but willing to perform it, in such a manner, as when finally completed, it will be found in full accordance with the spirit and just requirements of the age.

The *News* very beautifully and figuratively expresses itself in the following climax; we quote it for the fun of the thing: "Instead of wholesome laws, they may give us a strange piece of Mosaic—some flimsy fret-work—that may contain shreds and patches, divested of the true principles of equity; lots of law under high-sounding titles." We hardly thought it possible that so much flimsy twaddle could be crowded into so small a compass. With regard to the prophecy, there is a vulgar saying, which can be well applied: "Children and fools judge of work before it is half done."

Since writing the above, we learn that the members of the Law Commission have been constantly engaged in the performance of their duties at Fredericton since the 3rd instant, working hard too, from ten until five o'clock every day except Sundays, and very frequently, from six o'clock in the evening until ten at night, and we further understand that there is no doubt entertained of their being enabled to include in their first report a review of the entire laws of the Province from its erection in 1784, down to, and inclusive of, those passed at the session of 1852. This important and useful labour will be hailed as a boon to the country.

Two of the Commissioners, the Hon. the Solicitor General, and J. W. Chandler, Esq., arrived in this City from Fredericton, on Wednesday evening last. Mr. Chandler proceeded to St. Andrews by stage this morning. The Law Commission will meet once more before the assembling of the Legislature, in order to perfect their first report.

These facts will badly accord with the *assertion* in the *News*, that the commissioners "show more aptitude for play than for work." On the contrary, they fully establish the wisdom and sound discretion manifested by the Executive on that occasion when the appointment to the Law Commission was finally acted upon.

Had there not existed "a factious opposition" in the House of Assembly in the session of 1851, opposed alike to all progress and advancement in usefulness, the entire labours of the commissioners would by this time have been nearly, if not wholly, completed.

[*From the Liverpool Courier.*]

The Radical and Romanist journals are boasting of the array of talent presented by Lord Aberdeen's new Cabinet; on much the same principle that induces the "starring" manager to crowd his playbill with names of favourite actors, regardless of their fitness to perform the characters allotted to them. Admitting the extraordinary and unexampled alacrity with which men of high repute as statesmen, and of acknowledged political honour, have consented to abandon all their avowed principles and party associations in order to form a part of this Coalition Ministry, we must yet be allowed to express our conviction that they will ere long supply a startling illustration of the homely old adage, that "too many cooks spoil the broth." Indeed, the Romanist journals already seem to be conscious of the impossibility of preserving the present distribution of power, for we find the *Morning Chronicle*, which, we presume, is still to be the joint organ of the Peelite and Roman Catholic party, hinting at the possibility that ere long there must be changes in the internal arrangements of the Cabinet.

A very slight examination of the constitution of the new Cabinet strengthens the unusually candid doubts of the Romanist organ. On what conceivable principle did Lord Aberdeen proceed in allotting [illegible] the season, [illegible] to write down all the names of the chiefs of the coalescing parties, shake them in a bag, and pick them out, hap-hazard, one by one? Nothing short of such a process can account for such a motley, bizarre, and uncongenial list as that paraded by the *Morning Chronicle* as the authentic one of the new Cabinet.

Now let us begin with the Duke of Newcastle. This nobleman, it will be remembered, was rescued from comparative obscurity by Sir Robert Peel, and placed at the head of the Board of Works where he discharged the not very difficult duties of this office with a respectable application and ability. The Duke of Newcastle is a man overcharged with self-esteem, confident even to conceitedness in his opinions, and arrogant in proportion to his want of practical knowledge. If it had been desired to find a man in the whole body of the Coalitionists more fit than another to carry out Lord Gray's system in Lord Gray's ways, to perpetuate the irritation and remonstrances of the colonists, and ultimately to drive them to resistance, a more fit person than the Duke of Newcastle could not have been fixed upon.

On the other hand, Sir William Molesworth, however little we admire his Radical principles, has at least devoted his best years and his superior talents to a thorough study of our colonial affairs, and a comprehension of the principles on which they ought to be conducted. His presence at the Colonial-office would have been regarded as a guarantee that the liberal system commenced by Sir John Pakington would be continued, and thus one of the rocks in the way of the new administration would have been avoided. Yet what do we find? Why, that Sir William Molesworth, whose sympathies and associations are with the colonies, is put at the head of the Board of Works, of which he knows nothing, while the Duke of Newcastle, a good Chief Commissioner of Works, is preposterously lifted to the Colonial-office!

Mr. Gladstone's qualifications for the Chancellorship of the Exchequer no one will deny; but he happens to have committed himself in the late debates to opinions on taxation which must interfere with any satisfactory revisions. Perhaps, indeed, we are premature in assuming what his opinions are; for we find that, in a speech which he delivered in the House of Commons, in the month of June, 1851, he "advocated the resource of a fair house tax. Disclaiming the duty, on the part of those not connected with the government, of suggesting details, he thought that members ought to proceed on the principle laid down by Mr Disraeli, and *lay on a house tax constructed on a broad basis.* He was not prepared to state that basis, whether it should fall on owner or occupier, follow the franchise or otherwise; but *upon the general principle he had no doubt.*" Coupling this with Mr. Gladstone's speech and vote, on Friday week, *against the house tax*, it is hard to say what his views may be by the time he is prepared to bring forward his own budget.

What does Sir Charles Wood know about the complicated relations of our Indian affairs, that the East India Company should be insulted with his presence at the Board of Control? If Lord Aberdeen really thinks that our mouths are to be shut because the same office was given by the late Premier to a dowager Chancellor of the Exchequer, we can tell that Mr. Herries ranked as high above Sir Charles Wood in his practical knowledge of Indian affairs as he did in his qualification for a Finance Minister. Why the genius of the Duke of Argyll should have bidden under the objectless formalities of the Privy Seal, can only be accounted for on the rule of unreason which seems to have dictated these appointments; nor is it possible to comprehend what conceivable claim a nobleman like Earl Granville can have to the Presidency of the Council, an office so lately illustrated by the experience and wisdom of Lord Lansdowne.

But the worst is yet to come. It was with feelings of shame that we read the authoritative announcement of Lord Palmerston's having been coaxed or cajoled into taking office under the man whose political life has been spent in frustrating his foreign policy and undermining his reputation. Those feelings were promoted by a respect for the noble lord, and a regret that he should so have committed himself; but still greater is our astonishment that the interests of the country have so far been forgotten that Lord Palmerston, the arch-diplomatist and master of the foreign policy of the empire in the widest and most comprehensive sense of the term, should have been placed at the Home-office, where he has had no experience whatever, while Lord John Russell (O, what a fall is there, my countrymen!) takes the department of Foreign Affairs, for which he has no qualifications, and is not permitted to have the Home Secretaryship, for which his experience fully fits him.

Is it possible to justify such a mad *bouleversement* of all antecedents, on any conceivable principle of common sense?

[*From the Liverpool Mail.*]

To the amazement of the whole country, Lord Aberdeen sits in the place of Lord Derby! We have had no surprise so unexpected as this since Lord Palmerston was dismissed by Lord John Russell. Lord Derby's ministry was, it seems, too honest and independent for the factions in the House of Commons, and they determined either to disgrace or overthrow it. The former they failed to do, the latter they accomplished.

The members of the late administration came into office with clean hands, and pure intentions, resolved to act in the spirit of fairness towards all the great interests of the country. This was an offence in the estimation of the red-tapists, the fags of former ministries,—the exhausted but needy and disconsolate Whigs. They saw tolerably clear indications that the measures of the Earl of Derby would give satisfaction to the country, improve its financial condition, repair former errors, reform the law courts effectually, purify the sources of justice, re-distribute more equally the pressure of taxation among all classes of the people, and by these means strengthen and consolidate the government, and they could not endure it. The prospect of a settled ministry was agonising—to many of them it was like a sentence of death. The Peelites had nothing to lose—not even a party. The Whigs were desperate and poor, and without any reputation that could be additionally damaged. The Radicals, as usual, were full of hope, encouraged for a moment only to be disappointed. The Irish Papists cheered on the heretics for the sake of fun and mischief according to their native habits. They all joined in one of the most infamous cabals that ever was witnessed by the people of England—all gave one vote—every vote for a different reason, or no reason at all—in order to oust the ministry, and they succeeded.

When we see Lord Aberdeen placed at the head of a ministry, the members of which are not only the worn-out and moth-eaten fragments of former ministries, but one and all of them *favourable to Popish aggression*, we cannot help looking upon the selection with suspicion and alarm. The time chosen is ominous enough. There is at present a conspiracy among the monarchies of Europe against the Protestantism of the British empire. Austria will not allow the Bible to be read in her dominions. The English missionaries have been expelled from Hungary. The Grand Duke of Tuscany punishes scripture reading with imprisonment in a dungeon. Spain has just issued a decree prohibiting the exercise of any religious worship except the Popish in that kingdom. The Jesuits rule supreme in degraded France, with Louis Napoleon for their imperial head. Coming nearer home need we ask what the Sovereign Pontiff and Cardinal Wiseman are doing in these islands?

Considering all these circumstances or coincidences, is it not remarkable that the Aberdeen Ministry should contain so much of the Romish element? The noble earl himself has long been a favourite at the Court of Vienna. For many years he was the English instrument of European absolutism. And it is hardly [illegible] Lord Palmerston so [illegible] thanklessly expelled from the Russell cabinet? Sir James Graham, perhaps, knows the reason why; at any rate, Lord Malmesbury does, and so does Mr. Disraeli. It is not for us to decide whether British associations have the right to circulate the Holy Scriptures in the Roman Catholic countries of Europe, printed in the vernacular of those countries; but considering what England has done and suffered for Austria, it is not respectful nor dutiful for Austria to say that she will not assist us in repelling any invasion from France, unless we oblige her by suppressing our Bible Societies and missionary associations. Whatever Lord Aberdeen may think, we are satisfied that the people of England will say to Germany, what the late Daniel O'Connell used to say, etc.—"thank you for nothing!" England seeks no dishonouring alliance. She fears no invasion from France. She wants no aid from Austria—[illegible] defend itself."

[illegible] new Ministry. We can only judge of that, at present, from its "real and merits." We may, however, notice its humiliations and antipathies. Let us mark one peculiar feature. Lord John Russell is the Foreign Secretary under Lord Aberdeen. The author of the famous letter to the Bishop of Durham is, under Lord Aberdeen, the correspondent of the Imperial Cabinet of Vienna! Lord John Russell, who dismissed Lord Palmerston in the go-about-your-business style used towards charwomen, and this to oblige foreign courts, is to take his place! Lord Palmerston, at the Home office, is to complete and regulate that body of militia, which Lord John Russell quitted office rather than accept!! In short, Lord John Russell must either carry out Lord Palmerston's foreign policy or reverse it; and Lord Palmerston must carry out Lord John's home reforms, according to his pledges, or—leave them alone! What sad humiliations! What awkward predicaments! How can these two men sit in the same cabinet and look each other in the face, after such painful antecedents?

The chief plotter and conspirator in this anti-Protestant Ministry, his fingers still smelling of the sealing-wax of the Post Office, and poor Mazzini's ravaged letters, is Sir James Graham. Lord Derby shows in his speech in the House of Lords, in the presence of Lord Aberdeen, as we did in our last, that Sir James Graham, having returned to his "old love" of radicalism, at Carlisle, was the first to declare open war with the late Administration, before any intimation or any programme of its intended policy had appeared. He came to London, did this old-love Radical, immediately on his election, and waited upon Lord Aberdeen with his proposals of embarrassment. He next paid his court to Lord John Russell. He followed Mr. Wm. Gladstone, and discussed with that mystic many delectable and conservative axioms; and, to crown all, he consulted Sir Wm. Molesworth on his views of the ballot, and approved of all his ready-made constitutions for all the colonies of the empire, but kindly suggested the suspension of their Parliamentary consideration to a more convenient season, which the virtuous and patriotic representative of the unwashed of Southwark condescended to do.

For these services, Sir James Graham, a landsman, and a successful grower of oats by means of official manure, is placed at the head of the Admiralty, in the room of the Duke of Northumberland, an able and zealous naval officer. If the public do not stare at this appointment—the patron of Capt. [illegible], of Arctic renown, succeeded by the purloiner of the Italian's letters—their sympathy for the marvellous, and their indignation for the unjust, must be greatly changed. But this is not all. Sir James Graham, the declared and reconverted radical—reconverted for the sake of a seat, office, and pay—takes this high post under Lord Aberdeen's Administration as a *Conservative*, for the noble earl states that his Government must be carried on on Conservative principles.

Lord Cranworth displaces Lord St. Leonards, as Lord High Chancellor, to the unfeigned regret of every law reformer, and every intelligent man of property in the country. Lord St. Germans displaces Lord Eglinton, as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and one Keogh, a Papist, returned by the priests, whose tool he is, is to be Attorney or Solicitor General. The Duke of Newcastle gets the Colonies—poor man! It would have been a better appointment had the office been given to Joseph Hume. Mr. Cardwell, who was turned out of Liverpool, and rejected by Ayrshire, at the last election, is to preside over the Board of Trade. The office will suit him admirably. He can produce any quantity of figures that may be required.

On personal grounds, the most indecent aggression upon office is that of Mr. Wm. Gladstone, who succeeds Mr. Disraeli as Chancellor of the Exchequer. After his late most invidious and insulting speech, to which he took care there should be no reply—and that reply will yet come from the ablest man in the House of Commons—Mr. Gladstone will find that he has lowered his position by accepting such an office. With the exception of his friend, Sir James Graham, none but a Gladstone could have performed this jesuitical and dirty trick. He shall have his reward some of these days. Oxford must be sadly fallen from its first estate, if it tolerate such conduct in any one of its representatives. Oxford chose Lord Derby for its Chancellor unsolicited: its representative combined to expel the Chancellor from his high office under the Crown! This must not be forgotten.

We do not confine ourselves to the objection that Mr. William Gladstone is totally unfit for the office he has so rashly and so indecently aspired to and accepted, for we go further, and assert that he is not trustworthy in any office whatever. It is the nature of the man to be impracticable, for he has no fixed principles—no clear rules of action—no confidence in his own convictions, which are perpetually conflicting and at war with each other. His faculties, such as they are, are constantly, if we may use the word, in a state of fusion, and his ideas are dissolving views: what is bright to-day is dull to-morrow, and what is faith in the morning is infidelity at night. This weakness in Mr. Gladstone's character is concealed in a cautious distribution of unmeaning or contradictory phrases. His aim and object are apparently concealed, at least, he thinks so: but they are not. The devil is too adroit for this small Jesuit, and he guides his hand when he little thinks it, gives to his words a savour which he does not taste, and to his flowers a tint which he is unable to perceive. It requires some study to comprehend Mr. Gladstone. But he is understood. He is in the House of Commons what his less educated brother Robertson is among the financial drapers and cheap-rag chapmen of Compton-house in Liverpool.

Having, therefore, in this brief and necessarily hurried manner, dissected, or rather carefully examined, the materials of this new Ministry, called into wondrous existence by a kind of legerdemain, the actual workers of the machinery being still in the dark, we ask our readers how is it possible that such a government can have more than a few weeks' existence? We implore them to lay to heart a most momentous question. It was understood that Lord Derby intended to correct the abuses of priestly tyranny in Ireland, and give the people the uncontrolled benefit of their political franchise; and had he been allowed to do so, he would have conferred an inestimable favour and blessing upon that country. We deeply lament to say that influences, hostile to this generous policy, were brought to bear against him, from what quarter we will not say. But such is the fact. We declare it; we *know* it to be a fact. Lord Derby would not degrade the proud name he bears—would not compromise his principles—would not Romanise his convictions—would not attempt to drag his honourable colleagues with him through the kennel of Germanising concessions and latitudinarian importunities; and hence his fall. But it is a fall which the Protestants of Great Britain will deeply and for ever regret if they do not stand up for their religion, for truth, for private judgment, for civil and religious liberty, in opposition to the prevailing maxims of the Courts of Europe. We have now a government, with Lord Aberdeen at its head, a Presbyterian in Scotland, and a Papist in Vienna; the Duke of Argyle something of the same sort; Mr. Gladstone, who sees in the beggarly Free Kirk of Scotland some approximation to Popery and the desired separation of the Church from the State; in Lord John Russell an artful hypocrite; in Sir James Graham, the champion of the Irish priests; in Mr. Sydney Herbert a sort of [illegible] woman for Rome; in Mr. Keogh, the Pope's solicitor; in the Duke of Newcastle and Sir Charles Wood, the salt that Rome loves to mix—in the whole of them a confederated band of characterless politicians, who have sacrificed every principle of independence and consistency, and who have agreed to sink all convictions, all foregone conclusions, all resolutions and maxims—all faith, all individuality, all self-respect, and all the professed rules of action during their lives—[illegible]

Our readers must be pleased to answer the question themselves. We have only dealt with indications. They are the fittest to apply them.

The Hon. Miss Stapleton, sister of Lord Beaumont, has renounced the errors of Popery. She received the sacrament at Carlton Church on Christmas day.—*Leeds Intelligencer.*

THE NEW MINISTRY.

The following remarks on the new Ministry, we extract from our valuable conservative exchange, the *Waterford Mail*:

That the only object in view, is apparent to any one who will look over the names of the Ministry, and the places assigned them; thus Lord Palmerston, who so long acted as Foreign Secretary, is deemed incapable of filling that post, but gets the Home Department; while Lord John, who was formerly supposed to have capacity enough for Prime [illegible] Secretaryship. Sir Charles Wood, the old Chancellor of the Exchequer, with all his financial experience, is deemed unfit for that post, and he gets the Board of Control; while Sir James Graham, who, under Sir Robert Peel, had the important post of home Secretary gets shelved at the Admiralty. We might advert to the other important appointments, showing "*prima facie*," that these are not fit for the offices they formerly held; or that the offices have been given away on the principle of "take what you get or take nothing."

When Lord Derby succeeded to office, he was met with the cry that his Ministry were new untried men, who were not fitted for their posts, and yet the new administration, with all their talents, have offered the important offices of Lord Chancellor of England and Lord Chancellor of Ireland to those who had been kindly selected by Lord Derby, thus shewing the untruth of the assertions made as to their incapacity. Mr. D'Israeli has shewn eminent adaptation for his onerous office; and the other members of the late government have shewn the country that they possessed high administrative talent. We have no such complaints from the Colonies since Sir John Packington held the seals, as were of frequent occurrence under Lord Grey.

The Whig journals may congratulate themselves on the many great names that appear in the present Ministry, but to us each of them assumes power, under the sentence that they are not now capable of filling the offices they formerly held. The appointment of Brewster and Keogh to the highest legal offices in Ireland is a lamentable contrast to the statesmanlike and legal acquirements of Napier and Whiteside, the former of whom has shewn rare intelligence and persevering industry in his endeavour to settle the *Land Question*.

We have looked at the names, predilections of the Ministry to discover what would probably be their conduct, on the great constitutional question that must engage the attention of parliament. Are they favorable to progress? to advancement? or are they inimical thereto? We look back to Luther's time, and see in it the greatest effort at progress that has been made since the introduction of Christianity—that movement was a *great Reformation*; it unshackled both the mind and conscience. We consider the tendency of many in this day towards Puseyism, Tractarianism, or Popery, as reactionary tendencies; as steps towards the thraldom of mind, and the trammelling of conscience—we regard them as the reverse of progress, and deem them to be departures from the enlightened principles of the British constitution, towards despotism and enslavement, and we therefore fear for the cause of civil and religious freedom for the advancement of the nation, when we find nearly a majority of the Cabinet are Puseyites—there being as proved that personally they have *gone back from the Reformation*, and adopted, in part, the obsolete system which our forefathers reformed. One of our London contemporaries says that there are two Presbyterians, six Puseyites in the Cabinet; and that, as to the religious convictions of the other, it would not like to give an opinion; one, at least, has earned unenviable notoriety as the publisher and editor of Hobbs' Atheistical Works—surely this is a pretty Cabinet Minister for a Christian people.

We hope the most active steps will be taken to defeat Mr. Gladstone at Oxford, Lord John Russell at London, Sir C. Wood at Halifax, and Sir James Graham at Carlisle—such a course would evince that the people of England were not indifferent as to character and qualifications of the members of the Cabinet. We can see no similarity of views between the different members of the Cabinet; on sentiment held in common; on principle to which they are attached; no great measure which they promise to carry. We see nothing but a fear that Lord Derby would, by good measures, establish himself so fully in the affections of the people, that they could not drive him from office; and thus they would languish in hopeless opposition. The only point of union of the present Ministry is place and power, and from that we expect to see them dislodged in a few months, and worthier men in their stead.

BRITISH NORTH AMERICAN RAILWAYS.

Alexander M. Ross, Esq., the eminent engineer of the Quebec and Richmond Railway, and who accompanied Mr. Jackson on his visit to this City, in September last, has recently addressed a letter to William Chapman, Esq., and which we find in the Liverpool *Mail* of the 1st instant. This communication is of a semi-official character, and principally treats of that line of railroad, incidentally, however of others, in which we in New Brunswick are more directly and immediately interested. In speaking of the Richmond Railway, Mr. Ross thus remarks:

"The present position and future prospects of this railway may be described briefly as follows: Its length is one hundred miles, forming the most important link in the projected great chain of communication through the whole length of the Canadas, New-Brunswick, and Nova Scotia, in short, from the port of Halifax, on the Atlantic, to Detroit, on Lake Huron, a distance of fourteen hundred and fifty miles. Placed as it is in the centre of this route, the provincial government of Canada have adopted this railway as part of the main trunk line above described.

The surveys for the above one hundred miles have been recently completed, and upon these a contract for the construction of a single line of railway, with suitable sidings, has been undertaken by the well-known contractors, Messrs. Peto, Brassey, Betts, and Jackson. Such contract, including terminal and intermediate stations, rolling stock of every description, engine stables and workshops, as also a deep water wharf and landing place on the river St. Lawrence, at Quebec; including also the purchase of land, and every description of property required for the line and stations, and every contingent expense in the preparation of plans surveys, its completion, for the total sum of £ [illegible],000 sterling, being at the rate of £ [illegible]500 per mile."

In order to show the magnitude and great extent of the works now contemplated, we quote the following:

"The extension of the main trunk line from Montreal to Toronto, (343 miles) will soon be in course of construction, by the same contractors now engaged on the Quebec and Richmond line, as also that portion of the chain through New Brunswick (140 miles), bills for which have already passed the legislative assemblies of these provinces. These important links, together with that already in hand and near completion, west of Toronto to Detroit, will leave but an inconsiderable portion undone, arrangements for the immediate prosecution of which are already in progress."

This able engineer from personal observation is enabled to make a faithful comparison between the manner of constructing railroads in the United States, and that which is intended to prevail in the anticipated colonial lines, to be built under the happier auspices of Messrs. Jackson & Co. He thus remarks on this subject:

"As to the character of the works of construction, in the United States these are generally (indeed almost without exception) of a very inefficient and temporary kind, so much so, as to deter any travelling beyond twenty miles per hour, and even at this speed a journey is rarely performed without some accident or mishap, owing to the imperfect state of the road, the consequences of which are apparent in the cost of working; and in every instance in which I have been [illegible] established, it is more than double the cost of what is common to railways in this country, and with loads not reaching one quarter the extent they do here, besides the liability, (frequently occurring) of the large timber structures with which they cross the rivers taking fire, and causing a complete cessation of travel until the damage is repaired.

These drawbacks will be obviated in the construction of the Quebec and Richmond railway.—The line will be properly ballasted and drained and the large structures usually constructed of timber in that country will be made of wrought iron [illegible] manufactured in this country, thus insuring against rapid decay, as well as casualties,