List Bill of last year, to provide for the continuance of the Sovereign's title in the Crown Lands of this Colony, shall receive our earliest attention, in order that so important a measure may receive the Royal allowance.

We regret to learn that Her Majesty's Government have not yet seen the necessity of leaving the One-ninth Bill to its operation, inasmuch as further cases have since arisen calling for Legislative interference on the subject of that Bill, and clearly demonstrating the equity and utility of the principle it sought to establish. The inconvenience and difficulty arising from that uncertainty, which cannot fail to be felt in the absence of such a Bill as the One-ninth, might, indeed, have been obviated, had the other Branch of the Legislature, on passing so important a Bill as one to regulate the Currency, also defined, by Statute, the just and equitable provisions so necessary on such an occasion for all the existing contracts and obligations according to the established practice, custom and usage of the Colony, as the House of Assembly were anxious they should do, when the Currency Bill passed this Branch of the Legislature in 1849. The assurance that your Excellency will afford to Her Majesty's Government proof of the necessity for legislating on the principle of the One-ninth Bill, is to us a gratifying guarantee of your Excellency's desire to promote the interests of the Inhabitants of this Colony, and we confidently anticipate that such proof will be the means of the Royal allowance being yet extended to the Bill.

When the Public Accounts shall be laid before us, we make no doubt that the state of the Revenue will afford us much satisfaction, and this satisfaction would, we are sure, have been greatly enhanced, had it not been for the unusually early setting in of the Winter, and closing of the navigation, by which several vessels, laden with dutiable cargoes, were prevented from reaching their places of destination in this Island.

We will cheerfully make suitable provision for the maintenance of the Public Service; and, in doing so, it will be our earnest endeavour to keep the expenditure within the limits of the Public Revenue, so that the Government may be enabled to place its financial operations on a firmer basis than that which has hitherto prevailed.

Our best attention will be given to the consideration of any Bill which your Excellency's Government may submit, having a tendency to improve the operation of the Courts for the recovery of Small Debts.

Fully sensible of the immense advantages which would result to this Colony from Reciprocal Trade with the United States, we feel grateful for the interest which your Excellency evinces on that subject; and we are rejoiced to learn that the correspondence has been renewed, under your Excellency's administration, with Her Majesty's Government, in Britain, with the view of abrogating the Treaty of 1818, which prohibits others than British subjects from prosecuting the Fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, at a less distance from the Shore than three miles, in order that the citizens of the United States, who are fully alive to the value and importance of our Fisheries, may enjoy the unchecked privilege of prosecuting, in common with our own people, that great branch of trade and industry. But whilst thus desirous of strengthening the bonds of amity and friendship between Her Majesty's subjects in this Island and the citizens of the United States, we have a right to expect concessions from the Government of that Country, in respect to a removal of restrictions upon Trade between this Colony and the United States, fully equivalent to the advantages we are disposed to surrender. But should the policy of the American Government be opposed to the granting of any such concessions, and our just and reasonable expectations left unsatisfied, it will then become our duty—and one which we shall labour zealously to discharge—to invite British capital and enterprise to our shores, and to afford them every encouragement and protection in our power, for the purpose of turning to account that immense source of wealth and prosperity which lie hidden in the waters that encircle our young Colony.

In conclusion, we beg to join with your Excellency in the hope, that the blessing of God will attend our joint endeavour to promote the welfare and prosperity of this Colony, and the happiness of its people.

(REPLY:)

Mr. Speaker, and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly;

I thank you for the Address, and feel gratified that you concur with me generally in the views which I considered it necessary to submit for your consideration, at the opening of the Session, on topics of great public importance. It will, I assure you, be no less my inclination, than it is my duty, cordially to cooperate with you in bringing to a favourable termination such measures as may tend to promote the prosperity of the Colony, and the happiness of all classes.

WEDNESDAY 28.

Mr. SPEAKER laid before the house the Impost Accounts for Cascumpec. Referred to Committee on Public Accounts.

The following Bills were read a second time, committed, reported agreed to, without amendments, and ordered to be engrossed:—

Bill to continue the Act relating to the floating of Scantling, Logs, &c., down the rivers and lesser streams of this Island.

Seamen's Bill.

Bill relating to Dogs, and Taxation thereon.

Landlord and Tenant Bill.

Hon. Mr. COLES presented from Mr. C. B. Bagster, a work entitled 'Historical Essay on Magna Charta,' with a *fac-simile* of Magna Charta, as a present to the Legislative Library. Ordered, that the present be acknowledged by a complimentary Letter from the Clerk to Mr. Bagster.

Mr. CLARK presented a petition from James Gillanders, Teacher, Lot 18. Refered to the Committee appointed to consider the Petitions of unlicensed Teachers.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

Hon. Mr. WARBURTON presented a Petition in favour of Free Education, from Lot 11; and

Mr. FRASER presented a similar one from Oyster Cove. Referred to Committee on Free Education.

Hon. Mr. WARBURTON presented the Impost Accounts for District of Orwell Bay, for quarter ending 31st December, 1851. Referred to Committee on Public Accounts.

REPORTING.

Hon. Mr. COLES, from the Committee appointed to make arrangements in reference to reporting the Debates of the House, presented the following Report:

" That having heard the Reporter, Mr. Irving, on the subject of his duties as Reporter to the House, your Committee are of opinion that Mr. Irving cannot without some assistance, fully report the Debates of the House; and your Committee therefore recommend, that an Assistant Reporter be engaged by the House."

The Report having been read, Hon. Mr. Coles moved that it be received.

Mr. DAVIES moved that the Report be referred back to the Committee, with instructions to receive Tenders for reporting the Debates of this House for the present Session. The question being put on Mr. Davies's amendment, the House divided:

YEAS—Messrs. Davies and Laird.

NAYS—13.

Mr. MOONEY then moved the following amendment:

Resolved, That to report the Debates of this House, at a greater expense than has been granted heretofore, would be a misapplication of the public money.

Hon. Mr. POPE moved that the hon. member, Mr. Mooney, have leave to withdraw his amendment.

The question having been put on Mr. Pope's motion, the House divided thereon:

YEAS—15.

NAYS—Messrs. Mooney and M'Neill.

Mr. Mooney's motion was accordingly withdrawn.

The question being then put on the motion of the Hon. Coles, that the Report of the Committee be agreed to, it was carried.

Mr. HAVILAND then moved—" Resolved, That the powers of the Committee be continued and extended with the view of enabling them to engage an Assistant Reporter." Motion agreed to without opposition.

THURSDAY, 29th.

The House having gone into Committee of Privileges of Election, after some time spent therein, the House was resumed, and the following Resolution proposed and moved in the Committee by Mr. Palmer, was reported and unanimously adopted.

" *Resolved*, That it is the opinion of the Committee, that the Presiding Officer at the Poll held on the ninth day of December last, for the election of a Member of Assembly for Georgetown, having omitted to take the Oath prescribed by the 39th section of the Election Law, in verification of the correctness of the Poll Books; and therefore, that the return made by the Sheriff of King's County, upon the Writ, issued for the said Election, whereby Roderick McAulay, Esquire, was declared duly elected, is not valid in law, and that a new Writ should issue for the return of a Member of Assembly for Georgetown, aforesaid, in place of the said Roderick McAulay, Esquire."

Mr. SPEAKER was then instructed to notify His Excellency of the result of the investigation, that a new Writ might be issued forthwith.

Thursday, January 29.

House in Committee to investigate the allegations contained in the Petition of Martin Byrne, Esquire, against the return of Roderick M'Aulay, Esquire, as Member of Assembly for Georgetown.—Mr. Thornton in the Chair.

The Petition having been read, Mr. MACAULAY rose and said—As regarded the Petition itself it might be partly true, but he was positive it was also partly false. That part of the Petition, wherein it was stated that Mr. M'Callum had refused a scrutiny on the second day after the election, was positively false. This statement he made with a perfect consciousness of its truth and with a full assurance that he could prove it to be true. As to other matters, set forth in the Petition in detail, he was not lawyer enough to be able to say whether they would be sufficient, even if substantiated, to invalidate the election. Reference was made to Poll Books in the Petition, and it was stated therein, that they had not been sealed before they were delivered by the Poll Clerks to the Returning Officer, as was required by the Election Law. Now, the fact was, that there was only one Poll Book—not Poll Books. That was sufficient to shew that the Petition had not been drawn up with much attention to accuracy as respected facts. The hon. member then proceeded to observe that he saw around him, on both sides of the House, several gentlemen with whom he had formerly associated in the legislature; and that, from what he knew of them in time past, he was led to expect that uprightness of purpose and wise consideration would characterize their proceedings touching the question then at issue. Whatever steps they should take with respect to it, he was satisfied they would be taken independently of party consideration, and with full independence of judgment. However, he would make one observation with respect to an opposite mode of proceeding: should a dominant party in a Legislature, in which the people had the uncontrolled choice of their representatives, exercise their power to set aside the rights of parties who came before them, from the time of their doing so, they might date the commencement of their downfall. The abuse would work out its own cure, (Hear! from Mr. Douse.) He did not express these sentiments with the intention that they should be applied to any party or individuals in the House; for he believed, that, with respect to the question at issue, every member present would exercise an impartial and independent judgment. Should they however err in their decision their sentence would be revised by the people, who would not fail to assert their privileges. He was not inclined to say much at that stage of the proceedings. He would merely add that he believed he had a constitutional right to the seat which he occupied, because he held it in virtue of the free choice of the people; and that the Petition contained a gross falsehood, inasmuch as it set forth a charge, criminatory of the Returning Officer, for which there was no just foundation whatever. He would leave the matter with the Committee.

Mr. PALMER reviewed the allegations set forth in the Petition. First, he said, it was set forth that the Returning Officer either refused or evaded a compliance with the demand for a scrutiny made by the petitioning candidate, or his friends for him. In the second place, it was alleged that the Returning Officer had omitted to take and subscribe the Oath prescribed by the Election Law, before returning his precept. The third allegation was one of a similar nature. It was that the Poll Clerks had not sealed up the Poll Books before delivering them to the presiding Officer. With respect to the first allegation, he did not think it was in the power of the House to comply with the prayer of the Petition, as urged with reference to it. Under the old Election Law it might have been competent to the House to enter upon a scrutiny; but they had not that power under the present one. The present Election Law prescribes plainly the mode of conducting a scrutiny when demanded by a complaining candidate. It prescribes that the scrutiny shall take place before the sheriff, and it points out the time and place. It constitutes a regular court for the investigation, and appoints the Sheriff the Judge, and only Judge therein. He could easily imagine that the Legislature in constituting such a Court was actuated by reasons founded in good sense. In the case of a scrutiny being demanded at the close of a county election, when there might be four or five hundred votes to be scrutinized, would it not be very improper that it should be taken up and prosecuted by the House, day after day, week after week, or month after month, or it might be for a year: for the time might come when an election might be so carried on that the whole body of the electors, greatly increased beyond their present number, should be polled. That was one good and sound reason why the power was taken from the House and bestowed upon a new authority. The House could not, with any semblance of propriety enter upon the scrutiny; the power was transferred from them to the sheriff, and by nothing short of an Act of the Legislature could it be brought back to them. It was true that the present Election Law prescribed a mode of petitioning the House against a return, the forms of which had been observed in the Petition before the Committee; but it could not properly apply except to cases of great irregularity, or error, directly calculated to render the election altogether void. Many such cases might be enumerated. Two were set forth in the Petition:—the Returning Officer's having omitted to take and subscribe the oath, prescribed by the Law, and the Poll Clerks having omitted to seal the Poll Books before delivering them up to the presiding Officer. These came within the scope of the clause pointing out the mode of petitioning the Assembly. But there was nothing alleged that could warrant the House taking upon itself the duty of prosecuting a scrutiny. He did not object, in the case under consideration, on account of the trouble it would occasion, and the time it would consume, for there were but few votes to be scrutinized; but he objected on principle. If they deviated from the Law then, they would be laying down a precedent, which might entail immense labour upon the Assembly, and occasion enormous expense to the public in future. The duty of conducting the scrutiny was made over to the Sheriff; and the House could have nothing to do with it, without violating the law of the land. So much for the two valid allegations set forth in the Petition. Before he offered any other remarks upon other allegations set forth in the Petition, he would wait to hear what might be advanced with respect to these two. Should the Committee consider these allegations, one at a time, they would be more likely to understand each other. The only thing for them to say, was, he thought whether the omission of the Oath—a very great and serious omission—and the omission to seal up the Poll Books, as directed by the Law, were sufficient to invalidate the Election.

Hon. Mr. COLES argued that the allegations set forth in the Petition were sufficient to warrant the prosecution of a scrutiny by the House. The Petition, he observed did not say that the Returning Officer had refused a scrutiny, but that he had advised that the matter should be brought before the Assembly by petition. In so doing, he advised well: for the voters having been all sworn, he would have been very awkwardly circumstanced, had he proceeded to pronounce any of them guilty of perjury. He properly stated that he could not proceed to institute a scrutiny, unless it were objected that some electors had voted twice, or out of their District, and that was not the case. With respect to the omission of the oath, the law was express. The omission was of itself sufficient to invalidate the Return. With respect to the sealing of the Poll Books, the law was equally express. That omission, if proved, was likewise, of itself, sufficient to set aside the whole proceedings. It would be best, he thought, to take up the matter in a Committee of Privileges, and if prosecuted and decided therein, without favour or affection, their proceedings would give satisfaction to the friends of both parties.

Mr. HAVILAND observed that the House had no original power to take up a scrutiny. The Sheriff's having said that he had no power to prosecute it, could not confer it upon the House. The House was merely a Court of Appeal. The initiative rested with the Sheriff. But the omission of the oath and the neglecting to seal the Poll books were allegations of serious import, and required to be duly investigated.

Hon. Mr. POPE was of opinion that sufficient had transpired to warrant a scrutiny. The three allegations set forth in the Petition were very weighty and important ones,—and, if found true, they would not only invalidate the election, but deeply criminate the Sheriff, who is always supposed to know his duty. The law, he observed, was singularly ambiguous and deficient concerning the right to demand, and the propriety of instituting a scrutiny. It seemed, in one particular, to contemplate a positive absurdity—the Sheriff scrutinizing his own acts. The hon. and learned member for Georgetown had said that the House had no original jurisdiction in the matter of a scrutiny,—but he (Hon. Mr. P.) would observe that the constitution had thrown around the elective franchise safe guards, which were independent of the mere legal interpretation of a law,—and, in a case like that under consideration, it was the duty of the House to judge with due regard to all the circumstances connected with it. If a doubt arose, it ought to be given in favour of the party entitled to vote. If the allegations set forth in the Petition should not be substantiated, the petitioner would be liable to be mulcted in the amount of the expenses consequent upon the enquiry. It might, therefore, be inferred that he at least, is fully persuaded they are true,—and he (Mr. P.) would never consent that a party who felt himself aggrieved, should be debarred a hearing and hopes of redress, on account of any doubt arising out of any ambiguity in the law.

Mr. HAVILAND agreed that it would be very unjust for the House to debar the complaining candidate from a fair hearing, and to deny him the means of redress, if these means had been withheld from him through the misconduct of the Returning Officer,—and he admitted that the allegations against that officer, contained in the Petition, were quite sufficient, if true, to set aside the Election.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The omission of the oath was, in itself, sufficient to invalidate the election. That single circumstance ought to be held conclusive against the return.

Mr. PALMER said he would defy any one to shew by the Act, that the House ought to do what the Sheriff had improperly omitted to do. All that they had power to say was, that he had not done his duty,—and that, consequently the election was void. The hon. and learned member then proceeded to read the 40th section of the Election Law, and commented upon it to shew that the kind of votes of which that section contemplates the scrutiny, are such as may be alleged to have been polled twice, or out of their proper district. He next proceeded to shew that two sections after, the mode of conducting a general scrutiny was clearly pointed out, taken away from the House and conferred upon the Sheriff,—and that, therefore, it would be directly contrary, both to the letter and spirit of the Act to allow a complaining candidate to refuse to trust to the Sheriff's scrutiny, and compel the House to go through it. If they should consent to lay down such a precedent, they would have to follow it, or to act very inconsistently and partially. With respect to the allegations setting forth the omission of the Oath by the Presiding Officer, and the neglecting to seal the Poll-books, he admitted that either of them, if true, was sufficient to invalidate the election,—and, with respect to the last of them, he freely admitted that what Mr. Coles had said was quite correct, for, if the Poll-books were in the possession of the Returning Officer, unsealed, for ever so short a time, a falsification of them was possible.

Hon. Mr. POPE observed, that the Elective franchise was especially under the protection of the House. The omission of the oath, and the Poll Books not having been sealed, affected the electors more than the candidates,—and if established as facts, the one or the other was quite sufficient to invalidate the election.

Mr. MONTGOMERY observed, that the sitting member could not but know whether the allegations were correct; and, if he knew them to be so, and would acknowledge their correctness, there could be no reason to prolong the discussion, for, if true, they were certainly quite sufficient to invalidate the election. The question might then be settled at once, and all the expenses, which the summoning of witnesses would occasion to the parties, be avoided.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—If the Poll Books prove the allegations to be true, the House will have sufficient evidence to justify their declaring the election void

Mr. DOUSE wished to do justice to both sides, and he would do it—at least so far as his voice went. He agreed with those hon. members who had just spoken, that the matter ought to be set at rest as speedily as possible; but as the Sheriff was deeply implicated, he thought it ought not to be decided before he had been heard by the House. The decision mainly affected the electors, and it ought not to be pronounced without full previous enquiry. The expense would be nothing when weighed against the satisfaction due to the electors.

Mr. FRASER then submitted the following Resolution, which was unanimously agreed to:

" RESOLVED, As the opinion of this Committee, that the allegations set forth in the Petition of Martin Byrne, Esq. against the return of Roderick Macaulay, Esq. as member of Assembly for Georgetown and Royalty, are sufficient to authorise the House to enter into an investigation as to the legality of the said Petition."

The House was then resumed, and the Resolution having been submitted by the hon. Speaker, and agreed to—and the hon. Colonial Secretary having presented the Poll Books—on motion, by the hon. Mr. Coles, the House went into

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGES OF ELECTION—Mr. Davies in the chair.

The members of the Committee were then sworn by the Clerk, Mr. Macneill, ' to enquire diligently, and without fear and favour, or partiality, into the facts relative to this order of reference, and to make a true and faithful report of the Inquest by them to be taken, and of their opinion thereon.'

On motion by the hon. Mr. Coles, Mr. Macneill was appointed clerk to the committee, and he was then also sworn by Mr. Speaker.

The Poll Books were then carefully examined, by several members of the Committee, to ascertain whether they afford any traces or evidence of the Oath which the Returning Officer ought to have taken and subscribed, but no such evidence or traces were found. The hon. Colonial Secretary having satisfied the Committee that the veritable Writ and the veritable Return were laid before them; the positive declaration of Mr. Thornton that he had no doubt on his mind that the Oath had never been annexed to the Return; and the statement of Mr. Wightman, to the effect that he was satisfied that the actual Poll Book, and other genuine documents, were before the Committee, put an end to the enquiry concerning the alleged omission of the Oath; and all were convinced that the Affidavit required by the Law had never been made. But with respect to the Poll Books having been left unsealed by the Poll Clerks, the Committee concurred with Mr. Thornton in his opinion that there was no evidence that such was the fact. The discussion would then have terminated had not Mr. Douse continued to insist upon the propriety of the Committee postponing their decision until after they had examined the Returning Officer with respect to the allegations set forth in the Petition, and as to whether the documents before the Committee were authentic or not. He (Mr. D.) maintained that the Returning Officer ought to be examined before the decision of the Committee; and that it would be very unjust not to allow him an opportunity for explanation touching allegations by which he was so deeply implicated. Mr. HAVILAND observed that if the Returning Officer were there then, it would not be in his power to supply the defect in his Return by putting in the Oath. Mr. MOONEY said the Returning Officer would find himself there soon enough—sooner than he would like, when he should find he would have to pay the penalty of £200, imposed by the Act for neglect of duty, and would also be liable for the expenses of both the Candidates.

The following Resolution, prepared and moved by Mr. Palmer, was then submitted and agreed to unanimously.

" RESOLVED, That it is the opinion of the Committee, that the Presiding Officer at the Poll held on the ninth day of December last, for the election of a Member of Assembly for Georgetown, having omitted to take the Oath prescribed by the 39th section of the Election Law in verification of the correctness of the Poll Books; and therefore that the return made by the Sheriff of King's County, upon the Writ issued for the said Election, whereby Roderick McAulay, Esquire, was declared duly elected, is not valid in law, and that a new Writ should issue for the return of a Member of Assembly for Georgetown aforesaid, in place of the said Roderick McAulay, Esquire."

The House was then resumed, and the Resolution having been adopted by the House, the hon. Speaker was instructed to notify His Excellency of the result of the investigation that a new Writ might be issued forthwith.

REPORTER'S NOTE.—In condensing the Report of the Debate on the Address in answer to His Excellency's Speech, the Reporter has accidentally omitted a sentence, in one of the speeches of the Hon. Mr. POPE. In consequence of this omission the following words appear to have a *personal* application and connexion, quite foreign to the intentions of that honorable gentleman: " He would maintain that no man who had any sense of justice could act in that way. He who did so was in fact a robber." The sentence omitted, being supplied, will, in connexion with the above, read as follows; and give to the whole the *general* application which the honorable Speaker intended it should have:

" Proprietors or their agents, had not unfrequently, by gross deception, inveigled individuals into the accepting of Leases for lands at " one shilling British sterling per acre," explaining to them that it meant no more than that sum in currency, with one-ninth added; and had not afterwards, hesitated to enforce the payment of such rents at the rate of £7 10, currency, for £5 sterling. He (Mr. Pope), would maintain, that no man who had any sense of justice could act in that way. He who did so was in fact a robber."

ERRATUM.—In a Speech of the Hon. Mr. Pope's, published in our last. The honorable gentleman is made to say, he had heard Mr. Yeo observe that the Agents could not collect enough to pay " the Landlord." It should have been " the land-tax."

From papers by the last Mail.

THE REVOLUTION IN FRANCE.

Correspondence between the Governments of England and France—Explanations required by the British Cabinet.

Soon after the *coup d' etat* of the 2d inst., a communication was made in the name of the British Cabinet to the French Government, in which, while any irritating expression or comment appeared to be avoided, explanations were asked as to whether it was contemplated to completely abandon the liberal and constitutional policy which had previously formed the bond of alliance between the two countries. The President of the Republic was reminded, that England and France, connected as they had so long been, by the similarity—so far as the difference of character of the two people permitted—of their respective institutions, were at the head of European civilization; that both still enjoyed with the necessary modifications, the advantages of representative government, freedom of the tribune, and liberty of the press; that a suspension or a cessation of such grantees for public liberty would necessarily imply an abandonment on the part of France, of those political advantages, and would necessarily diminish, in a considerable degree, the sympathies entertained in England for a system like the present, so widely different from its own; that a *coup d' etat* which abrogated the Constitution, annihilated the Legislature, and destroyed the liberty of the press, was, and must be, distasteful to the people of England, so remarkable for its enthusiastic attachment to all those institutions; and the French Government was earnestly called upon to give some explanation of its intentions, or of what it proposed doing, so soon as the embarrassment of the present situation had disappeared, or been materially diminished.—The note was at considerable length; and its tone was, though not irritating, at all events decided and energetic. The answer is stated to be what, perhaps, might be guessed under the circumstances. It purported to repudiate all intention of abandoning a liberal policy—it spoke of the President as having no desire to establish a despotic authority, it alleged the difficulties of his situation; the dangers that had threatened not only France but the European continent, from the rapid and fearful progress of Socialist ideas; and it repeated the arguments so often put forward in excuse of the act of the 2d inst. This answer, though of equal length with the original communications, was not considered as sufficiently satisfactory; there were not found in it assurance of a positive nature—sufficiently so to satisfy the parties to whom it was addressed. A second communication was made, less of an official than a personal kind, and in the name of one of the most prominent members of the English Cabinet—*not* the Foreign Minister, and addressed not to a member of the French Government, but to a personage who, nevertheless, possesses no inconsiderable share of influence. This second communication was also replied to; but the answer, entering as it did into still greater detail, and repeating with more force the arguments made use of in the first, was not considered as more categorical than the first, nor did it produce any greater satisfaction. It had been urged on the part of the noble Lord referred to, that it was absolutely necessary to give explanations of a still more precise kind; that public opinion in England required them: that the momentous events which had just taken place in France, would, no doubt, be commented on in the English Parliament, as they had been in the press of the same country, and that it would be not merely satisfactory, but absolutely indispensable for the British Cabinet to have some *data*, some assurances, something positive, in fact; to present to Parliament when, as would certainly be the case, explanations were demanded, and that it was scarcely necessary to say these explanations ought to be of a satisfactory kind. In addition to the reply to this second note, it was decided that a person should be sent to London, to confer with Lord Palmerston, and give explanations which, it was hoped, would be satisfactory. The party in question, however, is said to have declined the mission, on the ground of not being able to give positive assurances, or an explanation of the intentions of the Government of that precise nature which it was evidently the desire of the English Cabinet to possess. Such is the situation of affairs.

(From the Halifax British North American, Jan. 15.)

STATE OF EUROPE.—PROBABILITY OF WAR!

The state of Europe, just now, presents great cause for uneasiness and disquietude. That we are on the eve of a mighty convulsion between despots on the one side, and the spirit of Republicanism, animating the millions of that quarter of the earth, no man can scarcely doubt. The *Coup d' etat* of Louis Napoleon may have been successful, backed up, as he no doubt is, by the secret influences of the Emperors of Austria and Russia; but there is a universal spread of Republican spirit throughout the masses of the Continent, which will be ready to show itself at the first outbreak; and inasmuch as that spirit of Liberty is reflected back from England and the United States, so will the men panting for freedom look to those nations for help, and so will the Despots arm themselves against those Asylums of freedom.

France, Russia, and Austria, against England and the United States! The storm is brewing; but if the Emperors know when they are well off, they will pause and well consider. They will not only have against them the two mightiest nations on earth, whose relations have been of the most fraternal kind during the past few years, and whose people speak the same language; but they also have in their own bowels the spirit of insurrection, republicanism, laid broad and deep, and the issue, though bloody, cannot but result in the triumph and extension of human liberty. The embers of an outbreak are slumbering, and may burst into flame sooner than we may imagine.

MANIFESTO OF THE FRENCH REFUGEES.

A proclamation, of which the following is a translation, has been sent to Paris by the French refugees whose names are subscribed to it—

To the people, the refugees in London whose names are subscribed.

Will you be debased? Will you be enslaved? Will you become henceforth an object of eternal contempt and ridicule to the oppressed people who awaited their deliverance at your hands?

Louis Bonaparte has just crowded into a few hours, more crimes than it would have been thought possible to include in the life of a man.

Like a thief, he has seized upon the liberties of his country by a nocturnal surprise—a vulgar artifice which certain people have been rash enough to call courage.

He has audaciously trifled with the sanctity of the domestic hearth.

By the help of his swaggering soldiery and police he has silenced every mouth in Paris except his own.

At one blow he has suppressed all the journals, and has cast forth into the streets of Paris, without bread, those of our brethren, whom the press supported.

He has outraged, and stricken down, and trampled under foot, that national representation, not only in the persons of your enemies, but also in that of Greppo, the energetic and loyal representative of the workmen of Lyons, and in that of Nadaud, the mason, who has so often and so nobly defended your interests in the tribune.

Do you want to have a master? And do you wish that that master should be Louis Bonaparte? You have seen the air with which he traversed the streets of Paris, hedged in by soldiers, covered by cannon, and causing himself to be borne in triumph by his staff, adding to the crime of high treason the insolence of a conqueror, and treating France as a conquered country—he whose military annals can boast of nothing except the opprobrium of the Roman expedition!

That the members of the majority are expiating the ill which they have done—that the Constitution which they have violated in them—that they are undergoing the chastisement through that universal suffrage which they have destroyed—that they who have made a portion of France pass under the yoke in the state of siege now feel upon themselves the full weight of the state of siege—that they who have sanctioned the transportation of our brethren *en masse* without judgment, now find force where they sought justice, is a lesson not more hard than merited. It is the penalty of retribution which is inflicted on them, and it is not for us to complain.

But what it concerns us to understand now is, whether you are in the mood for a change of tyrants.

For does this crime belong to that Assembly of which he was the inspirer and accomplice?

Was it not he who, by the Ministers, proposed and passed that odious law of May, against which he now rises up, because the candidature of Joinville has made him afraid?

Is not he still, more than the Assembly, charged with the responsibility of having drowned the Italian Republic in the blood of Romans, mingled with that of the French soldiers.

Among so many shameful and liberticide measures, let one be mentioned, a single one which did not exhibit, Louis Bonaparte acting in concert with the Assembly.

As soon as his ambition was threatened by the Assembly, he became the enemy of their body. But forget not, that he has been its accomplice so long as it acted to oppress you.

He now comes forward to tell you that the people is sovereign,