COLONIAL LEGISLATURE.

House of Assembly, Saturday, April 9, 1853.

NIEL DARRACH'S PETITION.

(Continued.)

House in Committee on the Report of the Special Committee appointed to report on the Petition of Niel Darrach—Hon. Mr. Jardine in the Chair.

Mr. Montgomery The hon. the Treasurer says he has seen Capt. Cumberland's Rent Book, and examined, in it, the statement of Niel Darrach's account. I should like to know how long it is since he did so.

Hon. Mr. Pope. I did so about a week or ten days ago.

Mr. Montgomery. When the Special Committee questioned Capt. Cumberland's Agent concerning the Rent Books, he said they were in England.

It was then explained that although Capt. Cumberland took the original Rent Books with him to England, he left copies of them here with his Agent.

Hon. Mr. Lord. One or two hon. members appear to be extremely anxious to make out a case in favor of Capt. Cumberland; but, the facts are so completely against them, that, with all their ability and ingenuity, great as they are, they must fail in their attempt. I have listened with much patience and attention to the elaborate defence of the proceedings taken against the Petitioner; but it has failed to convince me of their propriety. To me, it appears, that the object in view, from their commencement, was to dispossess the Petitioner of his farm; and nothing that has been advanced, in defence or in explanation of the proceedings taken against the poor man, has, in any way, tended to convince me that it was necessary to institute two actions against him. If he was really indebted to Capt. Cumberland, on account of arrears of Rent, due before the granting of the Lease, and which were recoverable by law, why was he not proceeded against, by one action for the whole amount, instead of being harrassed—first, by one action for £34, and then by a second for a further sum? Such a mode of proceeding, even admitting a certain amount of arrears to have been due and recoverable by law, was certainly most oppressive and unjustifiable. Looking fairly and impartially at the whole case; and particularly considering that the evidence of the Receipts proves that the Petitioner regular in the payment of his Rents, for some years before the granting of the Lease; and that, under the Lease, he has been punctual and exact in discharging his Rent as it accrued; I am quite at a loss to conceive how any man, on a review of the whole matter, can honestly declare that the proceedings taken against him were otherwise than oppressive and unjustifiable. In fact, it appears to me that the poor man has been very cruelly and unjustly dealt with. By his own labour, he has converted a wilderness into a good farm; and, as it seems to me, a design was formed to dispossess him, for the purpose of having an opportunity to re-let the farm at an advanced Rent, so as to include the interest of the value of his improvements; and, by means of the successful prosecution of this design, the Petitioner, at the advanced age of 73 years, has been fleeced of a large amount, and deprived of all that he had realized by a long course of unremitted toil aud care. We have been told that there is reason to suspect that the Special Committee have been actuated by a desire to damage the professional reputation of the lawyers who were connected with the case of the Petitioner; and that some other members of the House appear to be influenced by personal prejudices which incline them to adopt and sustain the views of the Special Committee, without due enquiry into the merits of the case. Such imputations are, however, I think, altogether unwarranted. The Special Committee have done no more than it was incumbent upon them to do: they have duly enquired into the facts of the case, and faithfully reported to the House concerning them. And if, since the House has been engaged in deliberating upon that Reptor, some hon. members have honestly stated their convictions, as arising from the facts of the case which have been broght under their notice, in doing so—how unfavourable soever those convictions may be, either as respects the lawyers or the landlord—in openly declaring them, without hesitation or disguise, they have merely acquitted themselves of a duty which they owe to their constituents. If hon. members are duly influenced by a sense of what they owe to the people, as the chosen guardians of their rights, they will never allow any considerations of private relations, to bias their minds with respect to any enquiries or questions, their investigations or decisions concerning which may directly and seriously affect any individual member or class of the community. The case now before us is one, which—although we knew it to be the only one of the kind which has ever occurred in the Island, —would forcibly demand investigaton at our hands; but which,—when we have reason to believe it to be a mere specimen of the oppressive character of the proceedings which are, too often, had recourse to, for the coercion of tenants in this Colony,—imperatively requires from us, as we regard our obligations of duty to the people, not only a thorough investigation, but a full and undisguised declaration of our sentiments concerning it, to the end that our exposure and condemnation of the proceedings may, on the one hand, make tenants more wary, and, on the other, deter landlords and land agents from the adoption of coercive measures of an arbitary and oppressive character, towards any of their tenants who may, unfortunately, be too much in their power. Something has been said by way of an attempt to shew that towards the close of the proceedings complained of by the Petitioner, some regard was manifested for his interests and those of his family. The fact which has been relied upon for a proof of this regard, is, however, in my opinion, a proof of nothing but the existence of the design, for the accomplishment of which, I conceive the proceedings were at first instituted—I mean the ejection of the poor man from his farm, and the obtaining possession of it, for the landlord, that he might have an opportunity of reletting it, with its improvements, at its enhanced value. The tenant has been ruined by means of two suits at law (instituted on behalf of his landlord,) and the judgments thereon obtained against him, first, through the abandment, by his own Attorney, of the defence which might have been successfully made to the one; and, next, as respects the other, through the unfortunate ignorance of the defendant, which kept him completely in the dark concerning the nature of the process served upon him at its commencement; and the hardship of his case was further increased by nine months imprisonment —imprisonment which terminated only by his relinquishment of his Lease. And yet, although all this is admitted, we are told that more indulgence was extended to him than he deserved; and the proof of such indulgence is that, after he had been ruined and dispossessed of his farm, the Agent, having accomplished his purpose, turned round and said: "You, or at least your son, shall have the farm back at an increase of 50 per cent in the original Rent." I certainly can discover no evidence of indulgence in this offer. It was merely saying to the son, "Now, you shall have the farm which was your father's, if you think proper to purchase the improvements which he has made thereon, or which will amount to the same thing, to pay an increased rent according to the value of the farm enhanced by these improvements." If the father had not been deprived of his farm and its improvements, by the unjustifiable harshness of the proceedings enforced against him, the farm and the improvements would, most likely, have descended, as a leasehold inheritance, at the original rent, to the son. They who can discover lenity or indulgence in this, must surely have very strange conceptions of severity. The case has been very properly brought before the House; and, notwithstanding all that has been advanced to the contrary, by the hon. and learned member for Charlottetown and the Hon. the Treasurer, I am of opinion, and maintain, not only that the House has a right to institute the most searching enquiry into the facts of the case, but that it is their positive duty to do so. I hold—and I am not singular in that respect—that not only have the great body of the people a right to bring before this House, with a view to redress, any general grievance which presses upon them; but that it is also the privilege of every individual amongst them to appeal to us for the rectification of any private wrong, for which no remedy can be obtained by ordinary proceedings in the Courts of Law; and that, with respect to every such case, so brought before us, it is our duty patiently to listen and earnestly to enquire into it, for the purpose of rectifying, if possible, what we may find to be wrong in it; or, if we find that we cannot positively remedy the evil, that we may effect something beneficial by remonstrance, or by a manifestation of our determination to oppose whatever is unjust, whether it may affect the people generally, or merely one class, or one individual amongst them—altogether regardless, in our proceedings, of the position in society of those to whom our censure or condemnation may justly apply.

Mr. Yeo. Although I was, at first, inclined to think, that the Special Committee had, as respects the proceedings on the part of the Plaintiffs in this case, taken a more unfavourable view of the whole affair, than a full and impartial investigation of facts could justify, I am now satisfied that their Report is fully sustained by undeniable evidence; and, although I am not favourable to our throwing open a door for the admission of a representation of every real or imaginary private grievance—for, if we did, our labours in that way would be endless—I am now, I freely confess, very glad that this case has been brought before us. I think the proceedings altogether are the most tyrannical and unjustifiable of the kind that have ever been brought to light in the Island. Indeed, I do not think that a more harsh and unfeeling thing was ever done by a landlord to a tenant in any country. I myself do not know much of Capt. Cumberland personally; but I understand that, although thought to be somewhat eccentric in his ways, he is generally accounted a man of a very generous disposition. The proceedings however, in this case, taken on his behalf against a poor man upwards of seventy years of age, are such as no man of common humanity or conscience could adopt: and they may serve to shew the tenantry what treatment they may expect to receive when, by their own refractory spirit, they drive out of the country landlords who would deal leniently with them, if encouraged to do so by a willing compliance, according to circumstances, with their fair demands on account of Rent. With respect to the alleged arrears of Rent in this case, admitting them to have been due, it was most cruel to attempt the enforcement of their payment in the way pursued; and, all things considered, no man of any conscience would have done it. The affair would not have had quite so bad a look if it had been proposed to the poor old man to forgive him one half of the arrears, on condition that he would agree to pay the other half, as I believe landlords very often do: but altogether, it shews what some people would do if they had power. (*To be continued.*)

R. B. Irving, Reporter.

GLEANINGS FROM LATE PAPERS.

A TEMPEST IN PARLIAMENT.

'Tis a long time since the ordinary gravity and decorm of the debates in Parliament have been interrupted by any of those heats of temper, explosions of spleen, or violances of personality, with which men even of the steadiest temperament, and most reverend demeanour, are occasionally hurried, when they engage in the strife of argument, and the conflict of discussion. For months and months the diliberations of the Legislature have been conducted with unbroken order, and unmitigated dulness. Not so much as a joke even has escaped the lips of any Member of either House, to relieve the heavy monotony of the strict propriety which reigned aronnd. A solemn sobriety has governed the tongues of every speaker, and a drowsy correctness has marked the progress of every discussion. A few evenings ago, however, all this became suddenly changed, and the House of Commons, from being the temple of all the Gravities and all the Proprieties, was in a moment converted into a scene rivalling and discord and confusion, any think that ever was enacted upon the classic sod of Donnybrook Fair. Such a flourish of shillelaghs has not been witnessed for many a day, either in or out of Parliament. In a word, there was a genuine Irish row.

It arose in this way. The House was in committee on Ways and Means, and was engaged in discussing the Government proposal for extending the Income-tax to Ireland. Several Irish Members had taken part in the debate, and had declared themselves for or against the proposition, according to the estimate which they were led to form of its policy or impolicy. At length Mr. Duffy rose, and after expressing himself warmly and energetically against the extension of the tax to Ireland, he went on to say, "I don't know how so many Irish Members have been persuaded to vote in favour of the measure. Some few of them I dare say voted from conscientious motives; but I will say, on the other hand, without any hesitation, that short as my experience of Parliament has been, I don't think in the worst days of Walpole and Pelham more scandalous corruption existed than I have seen with my own eyes practised upon Irish Members." Here the fray began. These words were no sooner uttered than every Irish Member sprang to his feet, and in tones of passionate indignation called upon the Member for New Ross (Mr. Duffy,) to name the parties to whom he intended his imputation to apply. A scene of indescribable confusion ensued, in the midst of which Mr. Duffy vainly essayed to make himself heard. At last, when his voice was allowed to become audible, he said: "If the Chairman tells me on the part of the House that it is the wish of the House that I should name the persons to whom I have alluded, I shall do so." Upon this Mr. Vincent Scully rose to order, and hotly demanded to be informed whether such language as Mr. Duffy had used was to be tolerated. No answer being returned to this interrogation, Mr. J. Ball, the Member for Carlow, moved in the midst of the general roar which by this time had extended itself to all parts of the House, that the words used by the Member for New Ross "be taken down." This proposition was at once received with shouts of approbation. Mr. Duffy again essayed to speak, but was instantly assailed with passionate cries of "name, name." "I will name," at length he was heard to say "if the Chairman calls upon me to do so." There was now a general cry of "Chair, Chair." The Chairman accordingly rose and inquired of Mr. J. Ball whether he intended to press his motion that Mr. Duffy's words be taken down. "Certainly I do," replied the irate Ball. "What then are the words?" said the Chairman. The apparent simplicity of this question was too much for the gravity of the House, and elicited a shout of laughter. "The words," said Mr. Ball, "were these, I will write them down—'that the grossest corruption ever practised in the days of the Walpoles and the Pelhams had been practised under his own eyes upon the Irish Members of the House'—those, sir, were the words or the substance of the words used by the Member for New Ross, and having now written them on this slip of paper, I beg to place them in your hands, and to move that they be formally 'taken down.'" The Chairman having read the words from the chair, in the midst of loud and general cheering, inquired of Mr. Duffy whether he admitted that those were the words he had used. Mr. Duffy replied "they are not identically the words, but they are so near that I do not quarrel with them." The idea of *his* having any quarrel with the words was again more than the gravity of the House could endure, and roar upon roar of laughter resounded from every quarter. "The question, then, that I have to put" said the Chairman, "is, that these words be taken down." The position of the member for New Ross was now becoming formidable; because, if his own words were taken down, he would immediately become amenable to the most stringent of those laws by which the House preserves the order and decorum of its proceedings. An attempt was strongly made to effect a restoration of peace by means of concession and conciliation.

Sir D. Norreys rose to express his conviction that the offensive words had only escaped the Member for New Ross in the heat of debate, and that they were not deliberately designed to insult any of the Members of the House. He trusted, therefore, that the hon. gentleman would see the propriety of withdrawing them. To this well meant appeal Mr. Duffy turned a deaf ear—he remained silent and innexorable. The confusion of the scene was now probably at its height, and it was in no degree diminished when Lord John Russell, after a brief review of the circumstances under which the words had been used, said: "I own it seems to me that the committee in general, and the Irish Members in particular, have a right to consider that the hon. Member for New Ross has introduced words into the debate whch he is totally unable to prove, and that his object in so introducing them was to affix a stigma upon the representatives of Ireland which they do not deserve." This announcement of opinion was received with uproarious cheering from all the Irish Members sitting on the Ministerial side of the House. "Nevertheless" added Lord John Russel, "as the matter now stands I consider it would be better for the committee to treat the hon. Member's words with contempt, and to take no further notice of them." A vociferous cheer marked the general assent of the House to this contemptuous proposition. Mr. Lucas here stepped forward and endeavoured by a process of ingenious special pleading to show that nobody had a right to be offended at any thing Mr. Duffy had said; but his interposition only increased the storm it was intended to allay. It would be scarcely possible to pursue the scene through all the tumult which followed. Mr. Philmore and Mr. Otway thought that the Member for New Ross ought to be called upon to offer an immediate explanation. Mr. D'Israeli warned the House to be cautious in the proceedings they adopted, lest it should become an inconvenient precedent hereafter. He pointed out too that there was a wide distinction to be drawn between the allegation of corrupt motives in individuals, and of corrupt conduct in a Government. The former would undoubtedly be disorderly—the latter not so. It was uncertain in which of these two senses the words used by Mr. Duffy had been employed. The House, therefore, should take heed how it proceeded in the matter. Lord Palmerston generously urged Mr. Duffy to relieve himself and the House from an embarrassment painful to all, by withdrawing the offensive words and expressing his regret for having used them. "That," said his Lordship "is the course whch I should take myself, if in the course of debate, I had let drop any words imputing dishonourable conduct to honourable men; and I venture to suggest to the hon. Member that he will consult better what is due to himself, as well as what is due to the representatives of his country, if he fairly and handsomely states that he did not mean deliberately and seriously to impute dishonourable conduct to any Irish Member of this House." The manly propriety of the course thus suggested was obvious to everybody; but Mr. Duffy obstinately declined to adopt it. "I am a young Member of the House," said he, "and I may have got myself into a position of some difficulty from being ignorant of its forms. There is, however, one position which I shall not get into—I will never unsay any thing I have said." The boldness of these words instantly served to renew the storm which for a few moments had partially abated, and which now grew to be a perfect hurricane. Its fury was even aggravated by the sentences which followed. "If," said Mr. Duffy, "it is the opinion of the House that I should give it information of the facts which led my mind to the conclusion I have expressed, I am ready to give that information. If, on the contrary, it is the wish of the House that I should declare what I said untrue, then, whatever may be the consequences, I decline to do so, and I await the consequences, without fear." At length, after a vast deal of further confusion and tumult, the question that "the words be taken down" was put by the Chairman and carried by acclamation. The Committee of Ways and Means in which the House had been sitting immediately broke up; the Speaker resnmed the chair; and the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee instantly reported the words which the Member for New Rosss had used. The Speaker having read the words, inquired of Mr. Duffy whether he wished to retract or explain them. Mr. Duffy replied that if the House would give him a select committee he would explain them. The Speaker observed that, the words having been taken notice of, the terms must be either retracted or explained to the House. If the hon. gentleman was not disposed to do either, it would be his duty, according to the usual forms of the House, to withdraw, and in his absence the House would determine what course it would adopt. Mr. Duffy acordingly rose from his seat and left the House. A long and stormy descussion then ensued as to the course which the House should pursue, which finally terminated in an adjournment of the question to the following day, when Mr. Duffy was ordered to attend in his place

ITALY AS IT IS.

The London *Times* has the following letter, dated Rome, April 14:—The Count de Chambord has addressed what his friends call a very energetic letter to Pius IX., remonstrating against his Holiness's sanctioning, by officiating at the coronation of Louis Napoleon, a government originating in revolution, and diametrically opposed to the law of divine right. This is not the first attempt to wound the *amour propre* of Louis Napoleon from the same quarter; the Countess de Chambord is said to have been the principal instigator of the opposition to his marriage with the Princess of Vasa; and now, of course, the Cabinet of Vienna has approved this irritating document. Here, in Rome, a proclamation has been issued within the last few days from a secret society, calling on their countrymen to join under the banner of 'Independence.' With the rallying cry of "Out with the barbarians;" it enjoins them to be warned by sad experience of the past, and give up all discussion on minor objects until this most desirable consummation be attained. Though it has avowedly failed in at once giving any thing like general satisfaction to the various parties it was intended to cement, yet the strenuous efforts made by the government, through their spies, to discover the authors, show how dangerous such a move is considered; and as the appeal is more to the good sense than the passions of the people, there is every chance of its becoming popular by digestion. The same spirit has long prevailed among the most enlightened patriots of Central Italy, and is now fast spreading in all parts, and through all ranks; so that, should an outbreak occur between Austria and another power, it would probably be regarded as a pious duty in Italians to join the ranks of her enemies; and we may expect to see in Italy a guerilla war as sanguinary as the French suffered from, in the Spanish Peninsula. Still Austria continues to oppress and bully, as though no day of reckoning for her could ever possibly arrive; and every post brings reports of strangulatiens, and confiscations, and forced contributions, insomuch that no one can feel surprise, except those wilfully blind tyrants themselves, if the people despair of all amelioration short of their expulsion. The chief supporter of Austria here is the Cardinal Antonelli, who is also greatly opposed to the journey to France, the objection to which is said to be a fear of the Pope becoming too liberal."

Petty Tyranny of Louis Napoleon.—There is no more prominent characteristic of the Government of December 2, than a systematic contempt for law—a persistent determination to ignore anything like fixed principles of common right. After the revolution of 1848, the right of sporting over a portion of the forest of Compiegne was let on lease by the state to M. de Ruze. In 1852 the President of the Republic chose prematurely to enter into the employment of various royal prerogatives, and directed his senate to put him in possession of all the royal palaces and forests. M. de Ruze's lease was in the way. He was at first applied to privately to surrender, but as he declined to do so, a Senatus Consultum of April 1, passed over his rights without notice, and declared that the Prince President should exclusively enjoy the right of sporting in the forest of Compiegne. M. de Ruze was then served with notice to quit, and, protesting against the legality of the senate's declaration, he was forcibly ejected from the forest. He appealed to the Court of Amiens, which decided that the Senatus Consultum was binding, although there is not a word in the constitution enabling the senate to make laws, and it is too clear for argument that nothing less than an act of the legislature can lawfully deprive any man of his property, even although compensation may be offered him. This act of mere violence is now awaiting the decision of the Supreme Court of Cassation. But in the meantime, the Government has discovered a means of proving to M. de Ruze the danger of standing upon individual rights when opposed to imperial desires A clause in his lease required him not to allow rabbits to multiply to such an extent as to be injurious to the forest. From 1848 down to the moment of his refusal to surrender his lease, no complaint was ever made about the rabbits, but from that moment the local authorities systematically thwarted his efforts to destroy the rabbits for the purpose of taking exception against him. They cut and sold the hog-weed, cow-weed, and different herbs upon which rabbits feed, so as to drive them of necessity to gnaw the young trees. Then, although authorized by M. de Ruze to destroy the obnoxious animals, the state keepers systematically abstained from doing so, and an application by M. de Ruze for permission to use guns for their destruction, out of the shooting season, was refused, although the prefect of the department has given leave to all other proprietors to shoot at any time of the year for such purposes. An action has now been brought against M de Ruze, for injury done to the forest by the rabbits, and a court of justice has adjudged him to pay 10,000 fr. damages.

A PEEP AT UNITED STATES POLITICS

The late Presidential election, like many of its predecessors, was a striking exemplification of the energy of the "popular will." It was not, as foreigners to the intellectual action of our political system are apt to imagine, a mere contest between two distinguished citizens for the highest office of honor in the popular gift. It was something more than this. It was a war of Measures, not of Men. Mr. Fillmore made a worthy and a capable President. He was honest, faithful, and circumspect. As a Man, only, he might have been nominated and elected. But, his measures did not, apparently, meet the requirements of the "popular will." General Scott had the advantage, in point of celebrity, over President Pierce, just as Henry Clay, in a previous canvass, had the advantage over President Polk. Yet measures, not men, carried the day. The result was the same in both instances.

In truth, our Presedential elections may be considered but as so many strugles for political principles, of which the candidates on both sides stand as the public exponents. These principles continually shift their application to facts, under the pressure of political contingencies. The administration that does not shift its policy accordingly, *pari passu*, becomes unpopular. The man who does not keey pace with these fluctuations loses caste or runs into "old-fogyism." The popular feeling, ever alive to new impressions, rejects authorities thus made obsolete, and in its decisions often overflows all the old landmarks, sweeping before it everything familiar that may present itself as a temporary obstacle. The recent election was an instance of one of these political freshets. The election that placed General Harrison in the Executive Chair of the nation in 1840 was another. That which gave Mr. Polk a triumph over Henry Clay in 1844, and that which swept General Taylor into the White House in 1848 were equally significant. The candidates thus everthrown were not arraigned for any deficit in patriotism or ability. They had merely fallen behind the popular temper in its appreciation of current events. The popular will, would not pause in its onward career to instruct them, but cast them impetuously aside as so many idle waifs upon the shores of the political ocean.

The contest in 1852, though nominally between General Scott and General Pierce, was, in fact, nothing but a test, at the ballot-box, of the popular will in regard to the principles involved in the celebrated "Fugitive Slave Law" and the "Compromise Measures," upon which that law reposed, together with other less prominent principles of government. The agitation of the slavery question had proceeded so far—public opinion had been so distinctly and so vehemently arraigned, both for and against the policy of surrendering to their owners all arrested fugitive slaves—that, upon this point principally, the whole republic involuntarily took issue. With or without reason, the popular sentiment made General Scott the champion of Abolitionism, and General Pierce the apostle of Sothern Rights. With or without reason, it was the belief that, if General Scott triumphed, the Fugitive Slaxe Law would be repealed. The election of General Pierce, it was assumed, would leave our legislation on the subject ef Slavery intact; would conciliate every Sothern feeling; renew all confidence in the integrity and universality of our institutions; and knit into a still more indissoluble unity the political affections of the American people. The result might have been anticipated. The nation rose to put its seal of condemnation on the supposed at tempt to introduce into our political system the elements of disunion. A most important change was made in every part of our administration—not at the point of the baynot—but more reliably, though peacefully, from the potent fiat of the ballot-box.

The Congregational Church in Lockport was struck by lightning yesterday, during service. It entered the singers gallery, instantly killing Luther Crocker, one of the choir, and severely wounded six others, three of whom were ladies. The minister on witnessing the awful occurrence fainted in the pulpit and consternation seized all present.

The Connecticut Legislature has appointed a Special Committee to investigate the circumstances of the Norwalk disaster. A bill has also been introduced into that body, the object of which is to impose a fine $10,000 on the company for every person killed on the Railroad, and heavy penalties for all injuries caused by negligence or malice.

Deplorable Accident.—Lieut. Fortescue, of H. M. S. Cumberland, was suddenly deprived of an eye by a blow from a racket ball, at the Garrison Ball Court, on Wednesday. The injury he received was so severe that it cansed the eye to burst from its socket, while a party of friends were anxiously endeavouring,—by every means in their power, that the deepest sympathy could suggest,—to relieve him of the torture which the dreadful mischance occasioned.—*Halifax Recorder*.

Rumoured Changes.—The Colonist of Thursday last, upon what authority we are not apprised, states that it is in contemplation on the part of the Government to appoint the Speaker, Mr. Young, to the office of Solicitor General, about to be vacated, we suppose, by Mr. McDougall. If this prove to be a fact, though the Speaker for the last two years has been like a cricket in a crevice, nobody, not even himself, knowing what he intends to do, we shall look forward with some interest, and for *more than one reason*, to know how such a movement is relished by the Liberal section of the Legislative Council.—*Ib*.

PROTECTION OF THE FISHERIES.

(From the Halifax Daily Sun.)

The Hon. William Young, the Speaker of the House of Assembly, attended by the officers of the House, and accompanied by most of the members now in town, waited, by appointment, on Friday, at noon, on his Excellency Vice Admiral Sir Geo. Seymour, who received them, attended by his Secretary and several of his officers, when the Speaker addressed him nearly as follows:

May it please your Excellency,—

The House of Assembly having unanimously requested the Lieut. Governor to express the gratitude they feel for the recent effective and spirited protection of our fisheries, his Excellency has imposed on me the agreeable duty of presenting the resolution, and the members of Assembly now in town have accompanied me, in order to give it the united weight of their personal approval and sanction. We account it a matter of sincere congratulation, as it is of vital importance, that the Home Government have determinated to guard our coast fisheries—the chief source of our commercial prosperity—from the irregular and indefensible invasion so long and so justly complained of; and that the naval force employed in this service has been entrusted to officers so zealous and able as your Excellency and the squadron under your command. Permit me then, sir, not as a mere compliment, but as the genuine exponent of the feelings entertained by the Assembly and people of Nova Scotia, to tender to you this resolution, which you will receive, I must, as an indication at once of our warm approval of the measures adopted with such signal success during the last year, and of our earnest hope, that the future will be distinguished by the same activity, and by exertions equally acceptable to her Majesty's faithful and loyal subjects, the inhabitants of this province.

In the House of Assembly, 26th March, 1853.

Resolved unanimously, That the Lieut. Governor be respectfully requested to communicate to Vice Admiral Sir George Seymour the report of the committee on the fisheries adopted by this House, and to convey the appreciation and thanks of this House and the people of Nova Scotia, for the prompt and efficient measures adopted and carried out by him, and the officers of the squadron under his command, in the protection of that great national branch of industry, the coast fisheries.

[Extract from Report.]

"The committee recommend that the usual sum be placed at the disposal of the Lieut. Governor, to be expended on the protection of the fisheries, according to the suggestions contained in the very able report of Commander Colin Yorke Campbell, submitted to this honorable House; and that the thanks of this House should be offered to his Excellency Sir George Seymour, Admiral on the British North American and West Indian station, for the prompt and efficient manner in which he and the officers under his command carried out the wise policy of her Majesty's government in protecting from aggression the reserved and inherent rights of her Majesty's faithful subjects in this part of her dominions; and to convey to that distinguished personage and the officers under his command, that this House and the people of this province highly appreciate the exertions of those employed in that important national service."

After which his Excellency was pleased to make the following reply, and the gentlemen withdrew:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Assembly,—

I have to offer my thanks for the communication which you have this day made to me of the report of the committee of the fisheries, and of the resolution adopted by the House of Assembly during the last session.

In the mother country there is no honor which is more prized than the approbation of the House of