

[From the Head Quarters.]

Provincial Parliament.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY, April 5.

Hon. J. H. Gray presents report from committee on internal navigation. We notice that the applications of the Messrs. Glazier and others, and of Hatheway & Small, for the exclusive privileges on the Upper St. John, are not recommended.

Mr. Taylor obtains leave to enter on the supply book a grant of £200, in aid of moneys to be raised and expended by the City of Fredericton, in the erection of additional wharves along the western bank of the River Saint John.

Order of the day—Supply.

Grant to daughters of Louisa Watson, widow of Peter Watson, (old soldier) balance due at her death £12 10s.

Grant to make draw in the Bridge over the Richibucto River, £200, sustained after hard fighting.

St. Stephen's Academy, £100.

A good deal of discussion occurred on this grant, although very eulogistic language was employed, with reference to its Teachers, appointments and management by the Provincial Secretary, who said it was an honor to the Province, and he was rejoiced to have the opportunity to bear testimony to its merits. He trusted it would be liberally dealt with, and that the liberality of the rest of the House would be met by moderation on the part of the Charlotte members. The Honbls. John H. Gray and J. Montgomery also spoke warmly in its praise, and Mr. Johnson hoped to see such a school in every County of the Province, supported from funds now expended on the College and the County Grammar Schools. Still he should oppose the grant until some system was adopted to regulate the amount of public assistance to be furnished to these higher schools, and until some regular and sufficient returns were produced from them.

Mr. Cutler regarded the "Catalogues" sent forward by these Academics as advertisements rather than returns.

An interesting little episode was produced from this debate in this way.

It had been remarked that children from Calais crossed the river to this Academy, and on one side this was argued to be a most complimentary assurance of the value of the School while on the other it was contended that our Treasury should not be taxed to support a school for foreigners. In allusion to this the Attorney General stated that we ought to be willing to reciprocate any educational facilities we possessed with the United States, as many colonial youths had availed themselves of the advantages of their colleges, and mentioned that he himself had a son at the present time pursuing a course of study in a Theological Institution in New York, an institution of very high character, in which no fees for tuition were charged, and which was open to the young men of the Provinces as freely as to those of the Union. Divinity students from Canada, Nova Scotia, and this Province, were now prosecuting their studies at this institution with great satisfaction and advantage.

Hon. J. Montgomery thought it an extraordinary thing, and one which argued little confidence on the part of the Attorney General in the Bishop of his church here, or the College on the hill that he sent his son to study divinity in a foreign country.

The Attorney General very strongly reprobated the idea that his conduct implied the slightest want of confidence in the venerable and learned Bishop of the Diocese, or in the Provincial University. As to the former altho' he very kindly gave up a portion of his time to assist candidates for the ministry of the church it was utterly impossible, with the many claims upon his Lordship's time, that the students could receive such systematic and thorough instruction, as in an institution specially devoted to these studies, and possessing Professors in all their different departments. As to King's College, his son had received his Academic education and taken his degree there, indeed it was only as the graduate of a Univer-

sity that he was admissible to the Theological Institution of which he (the Attorney General) had spoken. He trusted after this explanation it would be understood that he was just pursuing that course which would recommend itself to every parent, placing within reach of his child the best advantages of the best education which were attainable in the profession he had selected.

Mr. Cutler very archly inquired if the Theological Institution at New York was careful in the matter of that *Loyalty* which the learned Attorney General had so anxiously included in the matters to be taught in our Provincial schools.

A Bill to divide the Parish of Woodstock into three Parishes was committed.

Mr. English in introducing this Bill took occasion to deny most pointedly and positively a report which he stated to have been falsely circulated, that there were differences of opinion on this and other matters between himself and his late colleague. The utmost confidence had prevailed between them, and he (Mr. English) had fully and freely consulted him down to the last moment of his life. There had never been the slightest difference between them except on the vote on the Government question.

After reading all the petitions in favor of and against the measure, Mr. English proceeded:—

The Richmond people don't care a fig whether Woodstock is cut up into three or fifty Parishes, they want a Parish for themselves, and to get this they would sign a Petition for anything. It will be evident from these papers that there are conflicting interests and inclinations at work in this matter, and I have concluded that it is my duty to represent Carleton rather than Woodstock, and in accordance with the larger number of the petitions to support an amendment to divide it into two Parishes. The division into three Parishes would give what is now Woodstock six Councillors, and an unfair preponderance in the Council of the County—My late colleague was of the same opinion, altho' the hon. member of the upper branch for Carleton, for some reason or other, favors the three-fold division.

Mr. Taylor.—It is certainly a very unusual and somewhat suspicious circumstance, that the member for the County should attempt to substitute a new and different Bill for the one read in the Sessions, sanctioned by the unanimous resolution of a Public Meeting of the rate payers of the County, called to consider it and supported by numerous and most respectable petitions. I think that we ought not to interfere with the Bill, as adjusted by the parties interested.

Mr. Pickard.—The matter is entirely local, and I shall vote for the measure recommended by the County member, and leave the responsibility with him.

Mr. Johnson.—Although this is a local question I think I can see straws enough to teach me which way the wind blows. The reading of a Bill before the Grand Jury implies no sanction by the Jury, it is a mere notice, and in this case has brought two parties before us, a two parish and a three parish party. The latter seems to me to include the "nobs," the aristocracy of the old system, and who are anxious by this division and obtaining six Councillors for their district, to retain the influence they formerly possessed in the Sessions. It is true this is merely a matter of conjecture and may be erroneous, still it is so probable I shall support the two parish scheme, because I hold that the power should not only be given to the people, but should be equally distributed through the districts.

Mr. Needham.—The population and extent of Woodstock justify the larger number of councillors. Mr. Johnson's conjectures are all wrong and he should be convinced of this by the resolution of the public meeting and the weight of the petitions.

(Here the discussion assumed a new character. The geography and topography of Bull's Creek and the parts adjacent, and the population, schools, trade, &c., of the respective districts were narrated by Messrs. Needham, Pickard, Macpherson, and English.)

Mr. English.—I feel bound to protect the o-

ther parishes from the influences of Woodstock, and the butter-hole manoeuvres and lobbying which are at work here. The North Star had better stick to his own house and oppose our division if he dare. Let him do this and go back to the County, and the consequences will soon be seen. I am much obliged to the member for St. John for his generous and disinterested endeavors in behalf of Carleton, but I must say I think he's been ploughing with somebody else's heifer.

Mr. Needham.—If the member for Carleton means to intimate that I have been subjected to undue influences, why does he not speak in man fashion straight out. If he has anything to say let him say it and not insinuate his slanders. If I hear any further allusion to the heifer, it will be apt to whisk its tail where it won't be pleasant to the hon member.

Mr. Hatheway.—Our best authority in such a case as this is the member for the County, and we would be treating him unfairly if we refused to receive it. He has acted frankly and fairly in a case of great embarrassment, the circumstances in which he stands are circumstances of great delicacy and responsibility, and if ever a member was entitled to courteous consideration it is the member for Carleton.

Mr. Taylor.—I know quite as much about the County of Carleton as the member for it. I had the honor to represent it for many years. No one has spoken to me nor have any influences been attempted.

Mr. Smith.—I think the member for the County has acted very fairly, and put the question to us honestly. It would be a clear injustice to the rest of the County of Carleton to give six Councillors to Woodstock. We are told the lately deceased member concurred in the opinions of the present one, and this should have great weight with us.

Mr. Macpherson.—I fully concur in the views of Messrs. Hatheway and Smith. We ought to support the representative for the County, especially when we find his opinions supported by the marrow and sinew of his County.

Mr. Cutler concurred.

Dr. Thompson.—While I am willing to extend every courtesy to the member for the County, I cannot forget the courtesies due to the Grand Jury of Carleton, and the rate payers of Woodstock. I think we had better report progress until the Representation of Carleton be filled up.

Mr. Ryan.—As I happened to be in conversation with an hon. member of the Upper House, from the County of Carleton, perhaps the allusion of the hon. member (Mr. English) was to me. If so, I want him to understand that I do not suffer myself to be button-holed by any body and that no such attempt has been made in this case. I am authorised to contradict the whole insinuation.

[From Mr. Taylor's Reports.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

MONDAY, April 4.

A Bill to continue the Charter of the Aroostook Boom Company—committed.

Hon. Mr. Botsford.—The present Charter does not expire until 1855. The parties wishing the present Bill to pass, say they are anxious to put the Boom in an efficient state. Both those who are in favor of the bills passing, and those against it, were heard before the Committee, and from all the evidence, and taking everything into consideration, the Committee came to the unanimous conclusion to let the matter stand over until another year, in order to give all parties a hearing. There was evidence before the committee, that interested parties living in the State of Maine had not had sufficient notice of their being any application for the extension of the charter; if they had, they would have been prepared to show why the charter should not be continued as it at present existed. He had from the beginning been of opinion, that having a Boom across the Aroostook river, impeding its navigation, was an infringement on the Ashburton Treaty. He would move that the bill be postponed until next session of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Harrison before expressing an opinion would like that all the papers for and against the Bill might be read by the Chairman.

Hon. Mr. Robertson.—As regards the renewal of the Charter, a good deal might be said on both sides. The parties ask for the renewal of the Charter in order that they may put the Boom in an efficient state, which probably they would not do unless the extension was given. This seemed to be a reasonable request, that they might expend their money to the best advantage, for his part he thought the granting of Charters to Boom Companies, that interfered with the Navigation of rivers was a wrong principle, and should never have been done. Many persons think that they can get their lumber to market better and cheaper without the aid of Booms at all. He feared that if the bill did not pass the Boom would not be put in the state required, as a Charter had been already given, and all that was now asked for was to extend it—he would vote for the bill.

Hon. Mr. Brown observed that the question had come up before the Committee, and had been fully examined. Evidence had been produced both from the State of Maine and the Province, and from all the information received the Committee came to the conclusion which they considered the only just one, to allow the matter to stand over until another year in order to give all parties an opportunity of having a hearing. The parties interested are Americans. The lumber that comes down the river is cut on American Territory, although the Boom is in British Waters, extending across the river near where the Bridge was erected. He believed from all that he had heard that the Boom had not met the expectations of the parties who first desired it. The character of the business on the river had changed since then—when the charter was first granted, the lumber that came down was chiefly large square timber, now it was logs and sawed lumber in a great measure, therefore the same necessity did not exist for a boom now as then, as logs could be got down the Saint John river better single than if rafted. All the opposite party ask for is time to lay information before the Legislature, and as the present charter does not expire for two years, he hoped the matter would be allowed to stand over until the next session of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Saunders thought that it was a question for their Honors to consider whether a charter should have been granted at all or not. He thought that doing so was intervention of the Ashburton Treaty, as it stopped the Navigation of a river that emptied into the Saint John river. He considered such companies was a monopoly. He felt disposed to support the report of the Committee to allow the matter to remain over until another year, in order to give all parties a chance and a hearing.

Hon. Mr. Chandler was a member of the Committee and had heard the evidence on both sides, and they had come to a unanimous conclusion to allow the matter to stand over until next year, as the present charter does not expire for two years, the parties wishing the bill would not be put to any very great inconvenience as he was aware of, as both parties when before the Committee, he meant Col Godard and Mr. Gray who both seemed to be of opinion that the Boom was a necessary erection. All the opposite party required was time to see what alterations were really necessary, and he believed that next year they would be prepared with all the necessary information.

Hon. Mr. O'Dell would support the report of the Committee, as the request was a very reasonable one. He thought that granting charters for the purpose of incorporating Boom Companies should be done with great caution when they interfered with the Navigation of a river. All the opposite party asks for is time in order that they may be able to show what is really necessary, therefore he would go for the motion of passing the present bill.

Hon. Col. Hatch observed that the bill passed in the Lower House by a very large majority, 36 to 4. This was rather conclusive evidence to his mind that they ought to pass it unless their honors were of opinion that this House was the best judge in the matter, although the Timber that comes down the river is cut on American Territory, justice should be done to all parties, the buyer as well as the seller. He could not agree with one of their honors that