

told his Holiness, the conclusion of the English Archbishop—that in a General Council of the West he would give the Pope the first place of order, though not of jurisdiction. It was in his power, he said, to make the Pope's position towards the

at the anniversary of the late Pope's death. The Pope, in reply to questions as to the Pope's position towards the late Pope's death, said that he would give the Pope the first place of order, though not of jurisdiction. It was in his power, he said, to make the Pope's position towards the

The earnestness and energy with which the Pope spoke on the anniversary of the late Pope's death, the importance and solemnity of the occasion which brought him to the Vatican—and, may I add, the fervent prayer which he was offering for the souls of the departed—were all things which I had never before witnessed. I spoke from the heart, and I believe that my words were heard to the heart of the Pope. I spoke from the heart, and I believe that my words were heard to the heart of the Pope. I spoke from the heart, and I believe that my words were heard to the heart of the Pope.

### THE LEGISLATURE.

(From the City Reporter.)

#### HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, Saturday, March 15.

##### MUNICIPAL CORPORATION BILL.

Mr. CHAPMAN moved the postponement of the bill to the next session of the Legislature. Mr. FAIRBANKS rose to second the motion. He considered this the most important bill that had been before the House the present session. He stated that as a Representative from an Agricultural District, and as such felt bound to support the bill if it passed this session. It could not be denied that Municipal Corporations would lead to direct taxation, and as such felt bound to support the bill if it passed this session. It could not be denied that Municipal Corporations would lead to direct taxation, and as such felt bound to support the bill if it passed this session.

Mr. CHANE said indications that the bill would be sustained, although he did not think it would pass in its present shape. He was not opposed to the working of the system, as described by certain hon. members. If the people could manage their own local affairs, he should be very much in favor of it. In that case, if the picture drawn by the hon. and learned members from St. John (Messrs. Ritchie and Needham) could be relied on, the people would manage all the local affairs in the respective Counties, and the Executive authority could manage the rest, and the House would scarcely be wanted at all. At all events they would not be required to meet often, but once in four years just to revise the laws, and then the session need not be extended beyond two or three weeks in duration. They would have, according to their predictions, a perfect Government! Now he could not put that faith in any Government, nor was he disposed to trust them with such very great powers. He held it to be the duty of Government to look into, examine, and recommend what they considered beneficial for the country, and for the House to approve or disapprove. He much feared this Government per se was visionary. He had no doubt but the hon. member for the city (Mr. Needham) was sincere in his notions—that he supposed one could have a Government which would feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and correct all abuses, he would be happy to see it, but he feared he never would. He would like the Committee first to settle the question whether the principles of the bill be approved, and if sustained, he would like to adopt the English principle, and refer the bill to a Select Committee to settle the details.

The hon. Attorney General said he would answer the objections raised to the bill, and should explain himself in accordance with the views he had expressed in his address to his constituents in July last, and in accordance with what he said upon the Consolidation bill last session of the Legislature. He had said, and he still

should explain himself in accordance with the views he had expressed in his address to his constituents in July last, and in accordance with what he said upon the Consolidation bill last session of the Legislature. He had said, and he still

believed some counties were prepared for them, and others were not. At the general election last summer, he and his hon. colleague (Mr. Johnson) held different opinions upon the subject, he had expressed his opinion in favour of those institutions, he was opposed to extending the bill to the whole of the Province. He did not consider this fair, when he had shown that he had on several occasions expressed himself in accord with the principles of the bill. He believed that the system would be generally adopted, and on earlier day if the bill passed in its present shape than it was made coercive. The first hon. member who opposed the bill was the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Gilbert). His objection was mainly, for he was opposed to Municipal Corporations. The next hon. member who opposed it was the hon. and learned member for St. John (Mr. Needham), who had made an eloquent speech against it. That hon. member had held up the bill in the House, declaring that it was a thing and a title another, alleging that there was no connection between the two, and that the Government might as well have brought down the bill in a box. The hon. member thought that the bill had been extended to the different parishes. Now it was clear that the hon. member had applied his attention to the corporation, where the inhabitants were scattered over an area of large extent. This bill provided for the incorporation of parishes; they would be all incorporated with a parish, and when a county was divided into parishes, they would be all incorporated with a parish, and when a county was divided into parishes, they would be all incorporated with a parish.

Mr. Ritchie.—I would have been of no use; I knew I could not carry it. Hon. Attorney General.—Was that the hon. member's boasted magnanimity? What? not to mention the fact that he had been defeated, he could not carry it? Where was his magnanimity? where his patriotism? where would he not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten? Why, when the hon. Attorney General considered himself right, he would stand up to the point, and he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten? Why, when the hon. Attorney General considered himself right, he would stand up to the point, and he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten?

The hon. and learned member (Mr. Ritchie) had challenged him with his vote yesterday in reference to the motion of appointing the Commissioners of the Maine House in St. John. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten.

There were two modes of opposing a measure: one was the course adopted upon the present occasion by the hon. member (Mr. Ritchie), who opposed the bill because he disliked its principles; the other mode was to profess a liking for the principles, but oppose the bill because it was not the right way to carry them out. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten.

Mr. CHANE said indications that the bill would be sustained, although he did not think it would pass in its present shape. He was not opposed to the working of the system, as described by certain hon. members. If the people could manage their own local affairs, he should be very much in favor of it. In that case, if the picture drawn by the hon. and learned members from St. John (Messrs. Ritchie and Needham) could be relied on, the people would manage all the local affairs in the respective Counties, and the Executive authority could manage the rest, and the House would scarcely be wanted at all. At all events they would not be required to meet often, but once in four years just to revise the laws, and then the session need not be extended beyond two or three weeks in duration. They would have, according to their predictions, a perfect Government! Now he could not put that faith in any Government, nor was he disposed to trust them with such very great powers. He held it to be the duty of Government to look into, examine, and recommend what they considered beneficial for the country, and for the House to approve or disapprove. He much feared this Government per se was visionary. He had no doubt but the hon. member for the city (Mr. Needham) was sincere in his notions—that he supposed one could have a Government which would feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and correct all abuses, he would be happy to see it, but he feared he never would. He would like the Committee first to settle the question whether the principles of the bill be approved, and if sustained, he would like to adopt the English principle, and refer the bill to a Select Committee to settle the details.

The hon. Attorney General said he would answer the objections raised to the bill, and should explain himself in accordance with the views he had expressed in his address to his constituents in July last, and in accordance with what he said upon the Consolidation bill last session of the Legislature. He had said, and he still

believed some counties were prepared for them, and others were not. At the general election last summer, he and his hon. colleague (Mr. Johnson) held different opinions upon the subject, he had expressed his opinion in favour of those institutions, he was opposed to extending the bill to the whole of the Province. He did not consider this fair, when he had shown that he had on several occasions expressed himself in accord with the principles of the bill. He believed that the system would be generally adopted, and on earlier day if the bill passed in its present shape than it was made coercive. The first hon. member who opposed the bill was the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Gilbert). His objection was mainly, for he was opposed to Municipal Corporations. The next hon. member who opposed it was the hon. and learned member for St. John (Mr. Needham), who had made an eloquent speech against it. That hon. member had held up the bill in the House, declaring that it was a thing and a title another, alleging that there was no connection between the two, and that the Government might as well have brought down the bill in a box. The hon. member thought that the bill had been extended to the different parishes. Now it was clear that the hon. member had applied his attention to the corporation, where the inhabitants were scattered over an area of large extent. This bill provided for the incorporation of parishes; they would be all incorporated with a parish, and when a county was divided into parishes, they would be all incorporated with a parish, and when a county was divided into parishes, they would be all incorporated with a parish.

his indignation at the factious opposition—he changed his mode of attack, and came out yesterday with a speech quite mild and moderate in tone. The hon. and learned member deprecating language and allusions of personal

him like me, and I am sure (laughter). The hon. member said, "but I will offer a *personal* opposition" (Mr. Ritchie).—Yes, I said so. Yes, said the hon. member, but he had better have left that for his (hon. Attorney General) to say. He knew that no one else would say it, he would not have said it himself (laughter). He (hon. Attorney General) would not tell the hon. member what his prize was like. Now let them see what this manly opposition was like. The hon. member had taken advantage of his position, and he had been up to the point of confidence in the Government, and in his speech he charged the Government principally with the sins committed last year, when his (Mr. Ritchie's) predecessor was in office. Now the hon. member was in the House last session, and why did he wait until this session to move a vote of want of confidence, why had he not done so last year?

Mr. Ritchie.—I would have been of no use; I knew I could not carry it. Hon. Attorney General.—Was that the hon. member's boasted magnanimity? What? not to mention the fact that he had been defeated, he could not carry it? Where was his magnanimity? where his patriotism? where would he not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten? Why, when the hon. Attorney General considered himself right, he would stand up to the point, and he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten? Why, when the hon. Attorney General considered himself right, he would stand up to the point, and he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten?

The hon. and learned member (Mr. Ritchie) had challenged him with his vote yesterday in reference to the motion of appointing the Commissioners of the Maine House in St. John. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten.

There were two modes of opposing a measure: one was the course adopted upon the present occasion by the hon. member (Mr. Ritchie), who opposed the bill because he disliked its principles; the other mode was to profess a liking for the principles, but oppose the bill because it was not the right way to carry them out. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten.

Mr. CHANE said indications that the bill would be sustained, although he did not think it would pass in its present shape. He was not opposed to the working of the system, as described by certain hon. members. If the people could manage their own local affairs, he should be very much in favor of it. In that case, if the picture drawn by the hon. and learned members from St. John (Messrs. Ritchie and Needham) could be relied on, the people would manage all the local affairs in the respective Counties, and the Executive authority could manage the rest, and the House would scarcely be wanted at all. At all events they would not be required to meet often, but once in four years just to revise the laws, and then the session need not be extended beyond two or three weeks in duration. They would have, according to their predictions, a perfect Government! Now he could not put that faith in any Government, nor was he disposed to trust them with such very great powers. He held it to be the duty of Government to look into, examine, and recommend what they considered beneficial for the country, and for the House to approve or disapprove. He much feared this Government per se was visionary. He had no doubt but the hon. member for the city (Mr. Needham) was sincere in his notions—that he supposed one could have a Government which would feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and correct all abuses, he would be happy to see it, but he feared he never would. He would like the Committee first to settle the question whether the principles of the bill be approved, and if sustained, he would like to adopt the English principle, and refer the bill to a Select Committee to settle the details.

The hon. Attorney General said he would answer the objections raised to the bill, and should explain himself in accordance with the views he had expressed in his address to his constituents in July last, and in accordance with what he said upon the Consolidation bill last session of the Legislature. He had said, and he still

believed some counties were prepared for them, and others were not. At the general election last summer, he and his hon. colleague (Mr. Johnson) held different opinions upon the subject, he had expressed his opinion in favour of those institutions, he was opposed to extending the bill to the whole of the Province. He did not consider this fair, when he had shown that he had on several occasions expressed himself in accord with the principles of the bill. He believed that the system would be generally adopted, and on earlier day if the bill passed in its present shape than it was made coercive. The first hon. member who opposed the bill was the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Gilbert). His objection was mainly, for he was opposed to Municipal Corporations. The next hon. member who opposed it was the hon. and learned member for St. John (Mr. Needham), who had made an eloquent speech against it. That hon. member had held up the bill in the House, declaring that it was a thing and a title another, alleging that there was no connection between the two, and that the Government might as well have brought down the bill in a box. The hon. member thought that the bill had been extended to the different parishes. Now it was clear that the hon. member had applied his attention to the corporation, where the inhabitants were scattered over an area of large extent. This bill provided for the incorporation of parishes; they would be all incorporated with a parish, and when a county was divided into parishes, they would be all incorporated with a parish, and when a county was divided into parishes, they would be all incorporated with a parish.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—No one can doubt the hon. member's sincerity. He is apt to be sincere. The other day, when his House the Speaker stated that he paid taxes to the amount of one hundred pounds a year; when he jumped the

the common-sense of the hon. member (much laughter). No one for a moment doubted the hon. member's sincerity (renewed laughter). He said the hon. member was equally sincere when he insisted that he would then be a *Proteccionist* General better than him (hon. Mr. Ritchie). It was not the hon. member's love to lack confidence in himself, but notwithstanding the hon. member's sincerity and the eloquence he could bring to bear in support of the Government, he begged leave to decline tendering his resignation in favour of the hon. member's judgment (laughter). He would think that the hon. member's sincerity and the eloquence he could bring to bear in support of the Government, he begged leave to decline tendering his resignation in favour of the hon. member's judgment (laughter).

Mr. Ritchie.—I would have been of no use; I knew I could not carry it. Hon. Attorney General.—Was that the hon. member's boasted magnanimity? What? not to mention the fact that he had been defeated, he could not carry it? Where was his magnanimity? where his patriotism? where would he not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten? Why, when the hon. Attorney General considered himself right, he would stand up to the point, and he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten? Why, when the hon. Attorney General considered himself right, he would stand up to the point, and he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten?

The hon. and learned member (Mr. Ritchie) had challenged him with his vote yesterday in reference to the motion of appointing the Commissioners of the Maine House in St. John. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten.

There were two modes of opposing a measure: one was the course adopted upon the present occasion by the hon. member (Mr. Ritchie), who opposed the bill because he disliked its principles; the other mode was to profess a liking for the principles, but oppose the bill because it was not the right way to carry them out. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten. The hon. member had said that he would not move a vote of want of confidence because he feared being beaten.

Mr. CHANE said indications that the bill would be sustained, although he did not think it would pass in its present shape. He was not opposed to the working of the system, as described by certain hon. members. If the people could manage their own local affairs, he should be very much in favor of it. In that case, if the picture drawn by the hon. and learned members from St. John (Messrs. Ritchie and Needham) could be relied on, the people would manage all the local affairs in the respective Counties, and the Executive authority could manage the rest, and the House would scarcely be wanted at all. At all events they would not be required to meet often, but once in four years just to revise the laws, and then the session need not be extended beyond two or three weeks in duration. They would have, according to their predictions, a perfect Government! Now he could not put that faith in any Government, nor was he disposed to trust them with such very great powers. He held it to be the duty of Government to look into, examine, and recommend what they considered beneficial for the country, and for the House to approve or disapprove. He much feared this Government per se was visionary. He had no doubt but the hon. member for the city (Mr. Needham) was sincere in his notions—that he supposed one could have a Government which would feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and correct all abuses, he would be happy to see it, but he feared he never would. He would like the Committee first to settle the question whether the principles of the bill be approved, and if sustained, he would like to adopt the English principle, and refer the bill to a Select Committee to settle the details.

The hon. Attorney General said he would answer the objections raised to the bill, and should explain himself in accordance with the views he had expressed in his address to his constituents in July last, and in accordance with what he said upon the Consolidation bill last session of the Legislature. He had said, and he still

believed some counties were prepared for them, and others were not. At the general election last summer, he and his hon. colleague (Mr. Johnson) held different opinions upon the subject, he had expressed his opinion in favour of those institutions, he was opposed to extending the bill to the whole of the Province. He did not consider this fair, when he had shown that he had on several occasions expressed himself in accord with the principles of the bill. He believed that the system would be generally adopted, and on earlier day if the bill passed in its present shape than it was made coercive. The first hon. member who opposed the bill was the hon. member for Queen's (Mr. Gilbert). His objection was mainly, for he was opposed to Municipal Corporations. The next hon. member who opposed it was the hon. and learned member for St. John (Mr. Needham), who had made an eloquent speech against it. That hon. member had held up the bill in the House, declaring that it was a thing and a title another, alleging that there was no connection between the two, and that the Government might as well have brought down the bill in a box. The hon. member thought that the bill had been extended to the different parishes. Now it was clear that the hon. member had applied his attention to the corporation, where the inhabitants were scattered over an area of large extent. This bill provided for the incorporation of parishes; they would be all incorporated with a parish, and when a county was divided into parishes, they would be all incorporated with a parish, and when a county was divided into parishes, they would be all incorporated with a parish.

### THE CHRONICLE.

SAINT JOHN, MARCH 21, 1851.

By the *And*, at New York, we have intelligence down to the 1st instant.

The formation of a new and Protectionist Ministry—such however is not the case. Lord STANLEY to whom was entrusted the charge of forming a ministry, has failed, inasmuch as he could not find a sufficient number of men to take the place of the Protectionist interest, the very party by whom he was to be supported. He was to be supported by a future coalition to be pursued by Government, to warrant him in being their leader. From the language of Her Majesty's Speech, as well as from her entrusting Lord Stanley to select her future advisers, it is abundantly apparent that she is quite satisfied to be guided by the Protectionist party. That Lord John Russell shall again assume the reins of government seems out of the question, as he was defeated not by his opponents, but by the Protectionist party, by the very party by whom he had been so long sustained. The fact is, that such is the deranged state of affairs, produced by Whig expediency, and such the risk and responsibility that will rest on the shoulders of the party coming into office, that few are disposed to risk their political reputation on such a precarious footing. Sir JAS. GUTHRIE was also applied to, for the purpose of forming a Cabinet, but he declined the honor of doing so. The *DEAR OF WELLINGTON* is now spoken of as the probable person to take the Premiership. Of what kind of materials he will form his Cabinet is problematical. We trust however it will not be a coalition. His Grace has now reached his 81st year, and is scarcely fit to manage the affairs of the State. The Ship of State, when she is on a lee shore, stranded, and all but a total wreck. That a set of men of any party or parties, out of which to form a Cabinet, can be found in the present Parliament, we very much doubt; the only feasible means that suggests itself to us for a satisfactory arrangement for the Country, is to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

abundant in Nova Scotia will neither be overlooked nor neglected. Among these none are more important than our matchless fisheries, which have hitherto suffered to an incalculable extent for want of adequate protection. It is true the fault does not wholly belong to the Provincial Legislature.

Coast and even in some of our Rivers, far more advantage than our own fishermen can. Now we would hold that to be a grievance which calls loudly for a remedy, and to our Legislature the people of Nova Scotia have a right to look for, if not a vigorous attempt to effect it. We think the duty of the Provincial Legislature to address the House Government, claiming as a constitutional right, the repeal of all existing regulations between Britain and the United States, respecting our fisheries and all other local affairs. That this is our Constitutional right cannot be doubted by any who peruse Earl Grey's despatches of 1847, concerning Nova Scotia the Centre of all her local affairs. If, then, all these be placed under our own control, why do we eagerly allow resources of the greatest importance to remain subject to the regulation of treaties which operate so often as we please, but it will be like a man tossing restlessly in a fever, continually changing the place but keeping the pain. We say, then, that the people of Nova Scotia have no legitimate means to get actual control of their own resources and then they will be in a position to take for themselves with the United States respecting our fisheries, and we do not hesitate to say that under judicious management they could be turned to such account as would place us in a position more advantageous than is held by any State in the Union, as that, in commercial relations, we should soon bring the Americans to our own terms, instead of meekly submitting, as we have hitherto done, to theirs. The law of policy respecting the fisheries which ought to be adopted after consulting them will form the subject of future remarks.

Mr. JAMES MESSENGER.—A letter from this gentleman, dated 11th ult., states, that the Rail Road question has been for some time past occupying the time and attention of Her Majesty's Government, but that no conclusion had at that time been arrived at, or he would have started that day on his return to Nova Scotia. He does not however hold out much prospect of any thing will be done by Government, rather by way of compromise or expedient, yet he concludes with the following assurance, which must be highly satisfactory to our friends:—

It will be satisfactory to our friends to be informed that, whatever may be the decision of the Government and Parliament, I shall be prepared to submit the propositions of parties of the highest respectability, and who are in the best position to carry out the measures which are necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

"CITY PAPERS."—These were to the beautiful Election Card of Mr. several of our Contemporaries on the request. For our part, it is a still due.

On Monday last, (St. Patrick's Day) a Volunteer Fire Company tried (which has lately been undergoing repairs) a new engine. The engine was a fine specimen of modern machinery, and the result proved that we have a community who are not inferior, and working hard, to any in the States. After the trial, the Company of town, and dined at the house where they were treated in good style, and returned home in excellent humor.

The Quebec Morning Chronicle, a statement of the loss of the ship, the Eckin Oiler, having drifted into the bay of St. John's, and describing the way of Naval Architecture, would be gratifying to us to see a vessel of such a size, and of such a value, so completely wrecked. The ship was a fine specimen of modern machinery, and the result proved that we have a community who are not inferior, and working hard, to any in the States. After the trial, the Company of town, and dined at the house where they were treated in good style, and returned home in excellent humor.

Mr. JAMES MESSENGER.—A letter from this gentleman, dated 11th ult., states, that the Rail Road question has been for some time past occupying the time and attention of Her Majesty's Government, but that no conclusion had at that time been arrived at, or he would have started that day on his return to Nova Scotia. He does not however hold out much prospect of any thing will be done by Government, rather by way of compromise or expedient, yet he concludes with the following assurance, which must be highly satisfactory to our friends:—

It will be satisfactory to our friends to be informed that, whatever may be the decision of the Government and Parliament, I shall be prepared to submit the propositions of parties of the highest respectability, and who are in the best position to carry out the measures which are necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—

He said that at his first interview with Her Majesty he had advised that an attempt be made to form a Ministry by a coalition between the supporters of the late Ministry and the followers of Sir R. Peel. He believed that the cause of the country would be best served by such a coalition, and that the Ministry would be able to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country. He had earnestly made an attempt, but having failed to obtain the cooperation of the leaders of the Peelite party, he was convinced that the only way to carry out the measures which were necessary for the good of the country, was to dissolve the Parliament, and let the constituency speak for themselves. Then and not till then, will Lord Stanley find kindred and confident spirits, to introduce a new order of things, and eschewing Whig policy, produce for the Country its former state of happiness and prosperity. In the House of Lords, Feb. 28th, Lord Stanley gave the following explanation:—