

# THE NEW-BRUNSWICK ROYAL GAZETTE.

Volume XIII.]

TUESDAY, 9th MAY 1826.

[Number 11.]

## The Gazette.

BY His Excellency Major General Sir HOWARD DOUGLAS, Baronet, (L. S.) Lieutenant-Governor, and Commander-in-Chief of the Province of New-Brunswick, &c. &c. &c.

HOWARD DOUGLAS.

A PROCLAMATION.

IN pursuance of the powers vested in me by an Act of Parliament passed in the Sixth Year of the Reign of His present Majesty, intituled, "An Act to regulate the Trade of the British Possessions abroad," I have thought fit, by and with the advice and consent of His Majesty's Council, to appoint, and I do hereby, by and with the advice aforesaid, appoint the Parish of Saint Stephen in the County of Charlotte, a place of Entry for the entry of Goods brought or imported from any adjoining Foreign Country, pursuant to the provisions of the said Act—of which all persons concerned will take due notice and govern themselves accordingly.

Given under my Hand and Seal at Fredericton, the Fourth day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-six, and in the seventh year of His Majesty's Reign.

By His Excellency's Command, Wm. F. ODELL.

BY His Excellency Major General Sir HOWARD DOUGLAS, Baronet, (L. S.) Lieutenant-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Province of New-Brunswick, &c. &c. &c.

HOWARD DOUGLAS.

A PROCLAMATION.

IN Pursuance of the Powers vested in me by an Act of Parliament passed in the Sixth Year of the Reign of His present Majesty intituled "An Act to Regulate the Trade of the British Possessions abroad," I have thought fit, by and with the advice and consent of His Majesty's Council, to appoint and I do hereby, by and with the advice and consent aforesaid, appoint the Town of Fredericton and the Parish of Woodstock in the County of York, as Places of Entry for the entry of Goods brought or imported from any adjoining Foreign Country pursuant to the Provisions of the said Act—Of which all Persons concerned will take due notice and govern themselves accordingly.

Given under my Hand and Seal at Fredericton, the first day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-six and in the Seventh year of His Majesty's Reign.

By His Excellency's Command, Wm. F. ODELL.

BY His Excellency Major General Sir HOWARD DOUGLAS, Bart. (L. S.) Lieutenant-Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the Province of New-Brunswick, &c. &c. &c.

HOWARD DOUGLAS.

WHEREAS by an ordinance establishing fees to be taken in the Province of New-Brunswick, made and passed by His Excellency THOMAS CARLETON, Esquire, Governor of this Province, in Council, the second day of March one thousand seven hundred and eighty-five, there are allowed and established among other fees the following, that is to say:

For Attornies in the Supreme Court, Travelling charges per day 10s.

For Counsel in the Supreme Court, travelling charges the same as Attornies, and no more than one Counsel to be allowed in taxing Costs.

And whereas in the present circumstances of the Country, it is expedient and proper that the said fees for travelling charges to Attornies and Counsel in the Supreme Court should be abolished, I do therefore, by and with the advice and consent of His Majesty's Council, ordain and declare that the said fees for travelling charges herein before specified, be and the same are hereby abolished.

And I do further by and with the advice and consent aforesaid; ordain and declare that henceforth any Judge of the Supreme Court before whom a cause shall be tried or after being entered for trial, shall by rule of Court be referred to arbitration, may allow

to be taxed in the Bill of Costs in such cause, a Counsel fee at his discretion, in no case to exceed five Guineas.

Given under my Hand and Seal at Fredericton, the sixth day of March in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-six and in the seventh year of His Majesty's Reign.

By His Excellency's Command, Wm. F. ODELL.

NEW-BRUNSWICK, In Chancery, 9th Jan. 1826.

Nathaniel H. De Veber, Complainant, and

William B. Lowbury, Defendant.

FORASMUCH as the Court was this day informed by Mr. Peters of Counsel for the Complainant, that the Bill in this cause was filed on the twenty-fifth day of September last as by the Certificate of his Clerk in Court appears and process of Subpoena taken out against the above named Defendant, but that the said Defendant had departed from the Province in the month of August or beginning of September in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-four, and has not resided within this Province for the term of twelve months next preceding the commencement of this Suit, as by affidavit appears. And the said Certificate and affidavit being read, and the truth of the above allegation being made out to the satisfaction of this Court, it is ordered that the said Defendant do appear and answer to the said Complainant's Bill on or before the second Tuesday in May next.

By the Court D. LUDLOW ROBINSON, Regr.

NOTICE is hereby given, that we, the Subscribers having been duly appointed Trustees of all the Creditors of Amos White, late of the Parish of Saint Andrews, in the County of Charlotte, an absconding Debtor, and have been duly sworn to the faithful execution of the said trust, pursuant to the directions of the Act of Assembly in such case made and provided: and we do hereby require all persons indebted to the said Amos White on or before the twenty-fourth day of May next ensuing the date hereof to pay to us, or some, or one of us all such sum or sums of money, or other debt, duty or things, which they owe to the said Amos White, and to deliver all the effects of the said Amos White, which they, or either, or any of them may have in his, her, or their hands, power or custody, to us, or some, or one of us aforesaid: and we do desire all the Creditors of the said Amos White on or before the same day to deliver to us, or to some or one of us, as aforesaid, their respective accounts and demands against the said Amos White, in order that right and justice may be done pursuant to the form of the Act of Assembly in such case made and provided.

Given under our hands, at Saint Andrews the 14th day of February, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-six.

HARRIS HATCH, PETER STUBBS, ALEX STRACHEN, Senr.

NOTICE.

By order of the Honourable John Murray Bliss, one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of Judicature for the Province of New-Brunswick.

NOTICE is hereby given to all whom it may concern, that upon application and due proof made to the said Justice (pursuant to an Act of the Legislature of the said Province, made and provided, for relief against absconding debtors) by William Roberts, of Fredericton in the County of York, Merchant, a Creditor of Stair B. Agnew, late of St. Mary's in the County aforesaid an absconding debtor.—He the said Justice hath directed all the Estate real and personal of the said Stair B. Agnew to be seized. And that unless he the said Stair B. Agnew, shall discharge his said debt, within three months after publication of this notice, all his Estate real and personal, will be sold for the payment and satisfaction of his Creditors.

J. M. BLISS.

Dated the sixth day of February, 1826. G. P. BLISS, Atty. for Wm. ROBERTS.

NOTICE is hereby given, that we, the Subscribers have been duly appointed Trustees for all the Creditors of Joseph Kenah late of Fredericton, in the County of York, Esquire (a debtor departed from this Province,) and have been duly sworn to the faithful execution of the said trust, pursuant to the directions of the Acts of Assembly, in that case made and provided: And we do hereby require all persons indebted to the said Joseph Kenah; on or before the twentieth day of June next, ensuing the date hereof, to pay to us, or some or one of us, all such sum or sums of money, or other debt duty or thing, which they owe to the said Joseph Kenah; and to deliver the other effects to the said Joseph Kenah; which they or any or either of them may have in his, her or their hands, power or custody, to us or some or one of us, as aforesaid; and we do also desire all the Creditors of the said Joseph Kenah, on or before

the said twentieth day of June next, to deliver to us or some, or one of us aforesaid, their respective Accounts and documents against the said Joseph Kenah, in order that Right and Justice may be done, agreeably to the form of the said Act of Assembly, in such case made and provided.

Given under our hands at Fredericton, in the said County of York, the Fourth day of April, one thousand eight hundred and twenty six.

George Fred. Street, George Minchin, Trustees H. G. Clopper.

By the Honourable JOHN SAUNDERS Chief Justice of His Majesty's Supreme Court of Judicature for the Province of New-Brunswick

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that upon the application of Abraham Brown, of the Parish of Fredericton, in the County of York, and Province aforesaid, Tavern Keeper, to me duly made pursuant to the directions of the Act of the General Assembly in such case made and provided, I have directed all the estate as well real as personal of James Cameron, late of the Parish, County and Province, aforesaid, Merchant, (which said James Cameron hath either departed from and without the limits of the said Province or is concealed within the same, with intent and design to defraud the said Abraham Brown, and other Creditors of the said James Cameron if any there be, of their just dues, or else to avoid being arrested by the ordinary process of Law, as is alleged against him) to be seized and attached; and that unless the said James Cameron do return and discharge his said debts within three months from the publication hereof, all the estate as well real as personal of the said James Cameron, within this Province, will be sold for the payment and satisfaction of the Creditors of the said James Cameron.

Dated at Fredericton, this eighth day of April, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty-six.

JOHN SAUNDERS, C. J. G. F. STREET, Atty. for A. Brown.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, March 2.

CORN LAWS.

Mr. Brougham presented a petition from the operatives of the Staffordshire Potteries, praying for an alteration in the Corn Laws. The Honourable and Learned Gentleman described the petitioners as an industrious and suffering part of the population, and at the same time observed, that though there were many points in the petition, in which he agreed with the petitioners, there were others from which he must beg leave to withhold his concurrence.

The petition was then read by the clerk. One of the allegations in it was, that the country was now in the rapacious gripe of the landlords; and ought to be rescued from it: and another, that the landlords had a profit of sixpence upon every loaf of bread that was sold for a shilling.

Mr. Robertson complained of the violent language used by the petitioners; and then proceeded to contend that there could not be a greater grievance inflicted on the country than cheap bread. Who were to purchase Potteries, if corn became cheap? It was not cheap corn, but good rents, good profits, and well paid labour that were required to restore the country to prosperity.

Mr. Hume defended the statements of the petitioners, and controverted the doctrines laid down by the Hon. Member for Grampond. Cheap corn would cause the manufactures of the country to flourish, since every person who imported corn would be compelled to take our manufactures in return for it.

Mr. Calcraft referred to his uniform support of the lowest import price, when the question of the Corn Laws was before the House in 1813, as a proof that he was not an advocate for a high price of corn.—At the same time he thought that those who fostered the prejudices of the country upon this subject, did not take the best mode of advocating their own interests. It was quite impossible to have a low price of corn with a taxation of 60,000,000l. a year. It was particularly unfair to say that the country was in the gripe of rapacious landlords, and that the landlords were the only obstacles to its having cheap bread. (Hear.) Give the landlords of England the same chance as the landlords of other countries, and they would sell their corn at quite as cheap a rate. He begged Hon. Members not to hold up the landlords of the country to unmerited obloquy.—They had long been renowned for the generosity of their character, and he knew of nothing which they had recently done to impair that character.

Mr. G. Phillips was surprised that the Honourable Member for Wareham should say, that it would be a serious disadvantage to the country to have cheap corn.

Mr. Calcraft.—"I said no such thing—I meant no such thing."

Mr. G. Phillips said, that if the Hon. Member had not said so in express terms, his argument went to prove that point. Now in his opinion, nothing was so injurious to commerce as the existing system of Corn Laws; and without commerce the country could not long maintain its rank in the scale of nations.

Mr. Calcraft complained of the misconception under which the Hon. Member who had just spoken laboured. He did not advocate cheap corn; but he had said that it was impossible to have cheap corn with an annual taxation of 60,000,000l.

From the *Albion* of the 15th of April.

THE COLONIAL TRADE.

And the Report of the Senate of the U. States thereon.

On the 31st of March, Mr. Lloyd of Massachusetts, from the Committee of Commerce, to whom was referred the Memorial of the merchants, ship-owners, and manufacturers of the city of Baltimore, made the following Report:

The memorialists state: "That Great Britain having lately opened the trade of her North American and West India Colonies, inasmuch that not only are almost all articles admitted, but the trade of those colonies is accessible to all parts of the world, on far more favorable terms than those now enjoyed by merchants of the United States:—They, therefore, submit the propriety of abolishing the discriminating duties of 96 cents per ton, on British colonial vessels, and of 10 per cent. additional on the duties on their cargoes, and of admitting British vessels, from whatever ports, on the same terms as the vessels of the most favoured nations."

[The Report then enumerates the conventional prohibitory and retaliatory acts, duties and countervailing duties imposed by Great Britain and the United States during the last ten years, which are too well known to the unfortunate merchants who have been perplexed and afflicted by them, to render their recapitulation necessary. It then proceeds:—]

On the part of the American Government, it is alleged, that a just reciprocity does not exist, inasmuch as the duties on American vessels and their cargoes, arriving at British colonial ports, are required to be discharged by an immediate prompt payment, and frequently at a great sacrifice to acquire the means of doing it, while a credit is given for the duties payable on British vessels and their cargoes, arriving in the United States from the colonies, of six and nine months: that bonds, with sureties, are required for the landing of the return cargo in a specified port in the United States, which are occasionally obtained with great difficulty, by the owners or masters of the smaller American vessels engaged in the trade: that an export duty of 2 per cent. is imposed on the return cargo, which cannot be countervailed in the United States: that vessels, arriving at a bad market; have, at times, not been allowed to seek a better, unless by a double payment of duties, while British vessels from the West Indies seeking a favourable sale for their cargoes, may run along the whole coast of the United States, from New-Orleans to Esaport: that onerous and heavy duties, and colonial fees, are exacted, amounting, as is stated in some instances, on small lumber-loaded vessels, to the value of the cargo: the latter of which is corroborated, in a degree, by Mr. Huskisson, in his speech in Parliament, in March, of the last year, in which he mentions the liability to abuse, and vexation of the practices in this particular: and states that, in many instances, the fees alone, which are exacted upon a ship and cargo, amount to much more than all the public duties: and that an important discriminating duty is imposed, in the West India markets, on the flour, the bread stuffs, and the lumber of the United States, over that which is paid on the same articles, when received from Canada, Nova Scotia, and New-Brunswick, and which, amounting in many instances to a full freight, gives a decisive advantage to importations from the latter.

And although it is to be admitted, that some of those regulations are of a character so municipal, as not to be legitimate object of complaint, in reference to an international

intercourse; yet they, nevertheless, do, in fact, contravene that just reciprocity, on which it was to be presumed it would be the desire of both parties to place the trade between them.

While the British Government, on its part, contends, as is understood, that it is justified in requiring an abrogation of the discriminating duties, in consequence of its having partially opened its colonial ports, for the importation of a limited number of articles from the United States; and that it has a right to make any municipal or local regulations it pleases; and among others, that of admitting, free of duty, the produce of its colonies, however remotely situated, while it imposes an impost on articles of the same description, from other countries: but allowing some plausibility to this reasoning, it is to be recollected, that the question at issue between the two countries, is not so much one of abstract right, as of equality and reciprocity in entering into a commercial arrangement intended to promote the mutual advantage of both parties.

The foregoing presents a brief synopsis of the measures which have been adopted since the year 1815, by the United States and Great Britain, relative to the trade with the British colonies, and of the present state of it.

The recommendation of the memorialists now is, that the discriminating duties still imposed on British vessels and merchandise from those colonies, should be immediately abolished; and that British vessels, coming from whencesoever they may, and with whatsoever loaded, should be admitted into the ports of the United States, on the same terms as the vessels and cargoes of the most favoured nations.

The effect of which the committee believed would be, summarily, to yield to Great Britain all she could ask, without any equivalent accommodation being granted on her part: for to admit British vessels indiscriminately, into the ports of the United States, with their cargoes, from whencesoever arriving, or of whatsoever composed, on the same terms as our own vessels or those of the most favoured nations, which would be the same thing, while she allows the admission of American vessels into her ports only partially, for certain prescribed articles, and those limited to the growth, produce, or manufacture, of the United States, and to a manifest disadvantage when compared with the like and the principal articles which she wants when from elsewhere imported into the colonial ports, would operate as a surrender of the principle of equality, and a withdrawal from the control of the government of the United States, of the means it possesses of leading to a better and more desirable, because more equal, state of intercourse between the two countries.

From this view of the subject, and a cursory reference to the numerous acts which have been passed in relation to it, during the last ten years, both by the United States and by Great Britain, evidence will at once be furnished of the complexity of the interests connected with it, of the difficulty satisfactorily to arrange them, and especially of the inefficacy of isolated legislation for the attainment of this international object; and also affording, as the committee cannot but believe, a strong ground of preference, for an arrangement being effected, if practicable, by a convention between the two Governments, on a just and liberal basis, which when agreed to, would be permanent and unalterable for the term of its duration; rather than to rely on detached, independent, substantive acts of legislation, which, however well intended, are sometimes ambiguous, and liable to misconstruction by those who are called to administer them; and at all times, subject to revocation by the parties enacting them.

Of the inconvenience and inexpediency of substituting which, the memorialists themselves furnish a strong proof in point, by the statement they make in their memorial, of the British ports of Halifax, in Nova Scotia and St. John in New-Brunswick, which were opened for the admission of vessels of the United States by an act of Parliament, of June 24, 1822, having in January last, suddenly, and without notice, been closed against vessels of the United States in mid-winter, and on an extremely hazardous and inclement coast; under a construction of an act of Parliament of July 1825,