

The motion to reconsider the section was lost—Yeas: Wetmore, Colter, Huntington, Lewis, Black—5.

Nays—Glaser, Ryan, Hetherington, Turner, LeBlanc, Mitchell, Nadeau, Ritchie, Stokewell, Blair, White, Humphrey, Palmer, Fleckinger, Hibbard—15.

Mr. Colter thought the operation of the twelfth section too large, because it required all the parish officers to attend to the extinguishment of any fire first in their parish.

The Attorney General did not think any difficulty would arise under the section, but he thought if the words were altered as suggested the section might be weakened.

Mr. Colter said he did not want an officer liable for not extinguishing fire 20 miles away.

Mr. Huntington agreed with Colter and suggested an amendment so as to make all parish officers near a fire, whether in their parish or not, to see to the extinguishment of it.

The Attorney General said he was about to suggest such a change.

The section was amended accordingly. Mr. Huntington again asked that the section relating to railways should be amended. The section is as follows:

"(11)—Whenever a railway passes through woods the railway company or owner or lessee of such line of road shall clear from off the sides of the roadway up to the edge of the forest all combustible material by burning the same at a safe time, or otherwise removing the same."

He wished it altered so as to read, "so far as reasonably practicable." He thought the section as it read was to impose an unreasonable responsibility on the companies. They could not be expected to remove grasses and the like.

The Surveyor General said the object of the section was not to compel them to remove grasses, and he proposed to amend the section by inserting the words "brush and logs and like combustible material."

The amendment was made and progress was reported.

Mr. McManus committed the bill to authorize the firewards of Bathurst to issue debentures, Mr. Hibbard in the chair. Mr. McManus explained that the bill was to borrow \$5,000 for the purchase of a steam fire engine and provide for a supply of water. The committee took recess till 7.30.

After recess the bill was agreed to. Mr. Adams introduced a bill to incorporate the Miramichi Marine Railway Company. Adjourned.

On Tuesday forenoon, 18th,—Mr. McManus committed the bill to cancel certain grants erroneously issued, and to authorize grants in lieu thereof to persons entitled thereto which was agreed to.

In the Legislative Council on Monday,—Hon. Mr. Young asked for the information he had asked for regarding the loans contracted on account of the Fredericton bridge would be furnished.

He charged the Government with withholding the information as it was either ashamed of the information as they had passed no order, or were ashamed to confess it.

Hon. Mr. Harris explained that the reason they had not been furnished was because the original despatches of the 27th of March and the 17th of July had been laid on the table of the lower house. The correspondence had since disappeared, and could not be brought down here for the want of the despatches. He could safely say Hon. Mr. Young knew at one time of their whereabouts, for on Friday last he shook at him (Hon. Mr. Harrison) the correspondence in question, and the papers were not now on the files of the lower branch.

Hon. Mr. Young admitted he had the papers at one time, but said he had returned them.

A discussion took place in which several members joined, as to the right of members to go to the lower house and take papers of the government and also as to the right of the government to lay original papers, instead of copies on the table. It appeared in the course of the discussion that the papers are still missing, but are supposed to be safe in Mr. McLeod's desk.

This bill to incorporate the Douglas-Thomas Branch Railway Company was agreed to with amendments.

Special despatch to the Advance. MARCH 18TH.

In the Assembly,—Mr. McManus presented a petition of S. M. L.anson and 18 others praying for the passage of an act to increase the number of Councillors in certain parishes in Gloucester.

Adams asked leave to explain that he had had the papers relating to the Fredericton bridge and that he had returned them to Mr. Young to have them, but he had returned them to the clerk within fifteen minutes.

The Attorney General said that while there was no doubt that Mr. Adams' statement was correct the papers had been referred to by a member of another house who had produced them from his desk. He must therefore have had them on another occasion than that to which Mr. Adams referred. The matter was under consideration and would probably be referred to committee on privileges.

Hannington rose to speak on the question of privilege, but was called to order by the Attorney General.

The Speaker ruled that Hannington was out of order.

Hannington—"I propose to speak upon the question."

Several honorable members, "Order!" Hannington—"It is very well for a lot of subsequent men to call order."

Mr. Speaker—"The hon. gentleman is out of order."

Miramichi and the North Shore, etc.

MASONIC HALL TO-NIGHT.

LECTURE—Rev. Mr. Waits lectured at Napier on Tuesday evening to a full house.

ENTERTAINMENT—A Musical and Literary entertainment, under the auspices of the Chatham Temperance Alliance, will be given in the Hall of the Sons of Temperance, on Tuesday evening next, the 24th inst. at 8 o'clock. Admission 5 cents.

TEMPERANCE—The Tuesday evening meeting at Temperance Hall, Chatham, was largely attended. Addresses were delivered by Rev. Prof. McCurry, Rev. Neil MacLachlan and Mr. J. Edgar and Mr. T. G. Marquis gave a recitation.

A HEAVY SNOW STORM prevailed yesterday along the Northern Division between Moncton and Campbellton. The accommodation train was three hours late reaching Moncton last evening, in consequence of the storm.—17th.

The above storm has not reached Chatham yet.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY was partially observed as a holiday in Chatham. The weather was delightful and Shamrocks were worn quite generally.

HATS.—Messrs. Loggie & Burr have taken charge in the hat line. They have just received a stock that will fit out half the men and boys in the country and suit all tastes. Some of the styles are very taking and the prices are away down to suit the times.

DON'T FORGET the concert in Masonic Hall, Chatham to-night. It will be a first-class one.

BEAR BOUNTIES.—Northumberland led the Province in the number of bears destroyed, last year, returning 261 novos. York came next with 223; while the record for St. John was the lowest, only 6 having been captured. 1102 bears were killed last year.

THE REV. DR. SPRAGE of Bathurst, who is one of the most eloquent pulpit orators in Canada, will preach the Annual Educational Sermon in the Methodist Church Chatham, on Sabbath Evening the 22nd inst. A collection will be made on the occasion in behalf of the Educational Fund of the Methodist Church.

WASHINGTON'S MONUMENT.—L. S. Johnson & Co., 22 Custom House Street, Boston, will send free, to all who will send their address on a postal card, an engraving of this famous Monument, the tallest structure in the world; also valuable historical facts connected therewith. If you don't see to it, you will be sorry when it is too late.

METHODIST CONCERT TO-NIGHT.

ST. MARY'S GUILD.—A regular business meeting of St. Mary's Guild was held in the School Room on Monday evening last. The meeting was opened as usual with prayer and singing, Miss Hocken being the organist. The evening was spent pleasantly and profitably in the consideration of the various branches of the work of the Guild in which an increasing interest was manifested. After Prayer and Benediction by the President the meeting closed.

INSPECTION.—Mr. Coker, Dominion Inspector of hulls, visited Miramichi this week and inspected the two steamers under construction for the Steam Navigation Company and also the Schooner being built at Bay du Vin for T. B. Williston, Esq. It appears to have been entirely satisfied with the work and materials in each case, remarking that he could see nothing to find fault with.

TWO RASCALS hired a livery stable rig from Mr. D. T. Johnston last week, saying they were going up on the railway to look after some money that was due to them. They, however, went as fast as possible towards Fredericton and, at Boiestown, were arrested by a Mr. Carroll of being runaways. He made them believe the Sheriff was after them for horse-stealing and they were glad to clear out and leave Mr. Johnston's team in Mr. Carroll's hands. Mr. Johnston has now returned from Boiestown, where Mr. Carroll restored his property to him.

CONCERT TO-NIGHT at Masonic Hall.

THE "WORLD" now pretends that it took little interest in the late parish election. Its issue of the Saturday preceding pulling it very near to indicate that it looked upon the contest as one of great importance. It now makes a half-hearted denial of our reference to its editor being the Chatham correspondent of the Sun etc. An editor who will publish private letters at the instigation of parties who obtain them by dishonorable means will do and assert almost anything, and that is the kind of person the editor of the World is. That is a gauge of his ideas of what is honorable and right in his profession.

RACING AT THE RINK.

The ice was in fine condition and there was a fair attendance at the Chatham Skating Rink on Monday evening last when the County champion and other races came off. The music by the Band was really excellent and there was, therefore, everything that the management could furnish to make the occasion attractive.

The first race called was one of 8 laps, each skater having to pass through head-balls and over or under a hurdle about one foot or more above the ice, the hurdle being an ordinary log bench. The contestants were masters Harry Moss, Archie Snowball, Theo Jardine and Willie Murray. The race from the first was between Snowball and Moss, the former winning after being pushed from start to finish.

The second was a race of 40 laps around the rink the entries being W. Sweeney, Beaumont Moss, Chas. Gunn, Jr., W. McIntosh and Fred Howard. The latter, finding the pace too hot for him dropped out after skating 4 laps. McIntosh retired on 13 laps, and Gunn on 19, leaving Sweeney and Moss with the leader, Sweeney, who won as he pleased by three laps.

The County championship race was one of 16 laps and the contestants were Bertie Wyse (who in the first race for the trophy took against Fred Copeland of Newcastle) and Chas. Gunn, Sr., one of our most promising skaters. Wyse is, undoubtedly, a fast skater, with good staying qualities, and he had the advantage of being better fitted for the contest in the matter of skates and their fastenings than his opponent, who dogged him persistently for a few of the initial laps. Gunn's ankle-straps, however, worked loose and nearly tripped him several times, causing him to lose courage and pace, which gave Wyse opportunity to gain three laps. Then Gunn stopped and lost two more laps in ridding himself of the straps altogether, after which he continued to lose, Wyse gaining lap after lap as he pleased, until it was evident that Gunn was only keeping up to win the second prize. Wyse's form and pace were the subject of very favorable comment by excellent judges and, considering his youth, he is a very fast skater. He won the race and medal by 17 laps.

The fourth was a three-legged race—the coupled contestants being Fred Howard and C. Gunn, Jr., C. Gunn, Sr. and W. McIntosh, Stanley Murray and Bertie Wyse, R. Hutchison, Jr. and Bertie Wyse, Stafford Benson and Howard Feigler, Beaumont Moss and Jack Jardine. Murray and Wyse sailed away easily and led the field all through with Messrs. Howard and Gunn 2nd, Benson and Feigler 3rd and the others rolling about anywhere.

The fifth was the apple race, which was hotly contested by quite a large field, Jack Jardine winning 1st prize and Beaumont Moss second.

The Late William Sinclair.

The funeral of the late Mr. William Sinclair, who died on Monday afternoon at 7 o'clock, took place on Saturday morning last, the funeral service at the house of decessit was conducted by Rev. E. Wallace Watts, (pastor of St. Andrew's Church, of which Mr. Sinclair was a member), assisted by Rev. James Murray of Douglastown. Northumberland Masonic Lodge and Mount Lebanon R. A. Chapter, to which he also belonged, led the procession in regalia, their ranks being augmented by visiting members of the order. The pall bearers were Messrs. G. A. Blair, John Shireff, Wm. Anderson, Robert Gordon, John Brown and Wm. Johnston. The funeral procession was very large and included citizens of all classes, for Mr. Sinclair was well known and deservedly esteemed in the community. At the grave the brief service of the Presbyterian Church was read and prayer offered by Rev. Mr. Watts, and followed by the Masonic Burial Service which was read by Dr. J. S. Benson, Past Master, the prayer being offered by Rev. Mr. Watts.

The following tribute to Mr. Sinclair's memory is sent to us by one who has long known him and the sentiment it expresses are, we believe, those of hundreds who will long remember deceased as a good citizen, neighbor and practical Christian.

IN MEMORIAM.

On Monday last there was borne to their last resting-place the mortal remains of the late William Sinclair. The large concourse of people who paid the last and tribute of respect to his memory demonstrated the esteem in which he was held in the town where he had so long dwelt. The marked features of his character were his honesty of purpose, kindness of heart and an all-pervading sense of the goodness and mercy of Divine Providence. To these were added intelligence of a superior order and a most judicious and practical speech in which were often conveyed wholesome truths. He was universally known and esteemed, and had many warm and attached friends. The gentle, genial, kind-hearted old man will not soon be forgotten by those who knew him intimately. His friends were many—enemies he had none. His death is universally regretted and this brief tribute of respect is lovingly and tenderly placed upon his bier by one who knew and loved him well.

CHATHAM, MARCH 17, 1885.

SCHOOL TROUBLES.

The Moncton Transcript has the following despatch of Monday last in reference to Newcastle School difficulties—

A large and influential meeting of the rate payers of school district No. 7, was held this morning in the Temperance Hall, for the purpose of discussing the action of the trustees in dismissing the teachers in such district. E. Lee Street was elected chairman and Mr. William Fenn, Secretary. It was unanimously resolved that the trustees be asked to attend the meeting and give the rate payers so assembled their reasons for dismissing the teachers. The trustees refused to attend the meeting. It was therefore resolved to memorialize the chief superintendent about the matter and ask him to have an investigation of it. It was also resolved to draw up a petition, and to treat the Dominion Government, and to ask the Local Government, in which it was shown that even if the Federal Government were right in their view of the law, they should not press it. The despatch also stated that the Local Government should be treated with this nature with full courtesy. It also declared to adopt either of the alternatives offered by the Federal Government because the Government could not agree to refer the matter to the Courts, except on the understanding that the work should go on and because they were prepared, if need be, to test the constitutional question involved.

FEDERAL ENCROACHMENT NOTICED.

The despatch also pointed out that the Federal Government was wrong in supposing that a message upon the subject had been sent to the Local Legislature. He read as follows—

"One other matter only contained in the despatch of the Under-Secretary remains to be mentioned. It is not quite clear, in His Honor the Lieutenant Governor's message, whether a copy of the despatch of the 27th of March to each branch of the Legislature, and that it does not appear such message was ever conveyed to the Legislature. It is not clear to the committee why this fact, admitting it to be true, should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action. One effect of the statement, whether true or false, is to suggest to anyone who reads the Under-Secretary's message that the latter on the part of the officials through whom the message was forwarded by His Honor would have reached its destination in the Legislature, and that the officials were sufficiently aware of the fact that the message was being withheld from the Legislature. It is not clear why this fact should be omitted from the special notice given by the Under-Secretary, either as part of the narrative of the bridge transaction or as part of the reasons for the Government's action.