

# The Gleaner

AND  
NORTHUMBERLAND SCHEDIASMA.

VOLUME II.]

"Nec aranearum sane texus ideo melior, quia ex se fila gignunt nec noster vilior qui ex alienis libamus ut apes."

No. 27.]

MIRAMICHI, TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 15, 1831.

## THE GLEANER.

### AMERICA.

#### New-Bruswick.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, FREDERICTON;

Wednesday, Feb. 23.

SCHOOL BILL RE-COMMITTED.

On the 4th section.—Mr. Smith observed, that he could see no reason why female teachers should not receive equal payment with males. He thought there should be no difference between them. If a woman is competent to teach, and performs her duty in the school, her services are worth those of a man.

Mr. Cunard concurred. He would agree to limiting the number of female schools, but would pay females equally with males.

Mr. Speaker was inclined to make a moderate allowance for female schools, but he thought if the bill provided too greatly for them, it would defeat the desired object, as the bill might then meet with opposition altogether. He thought it would be better to abandon the bill altogether, and let the present law remain, than to give more than £10 per year bounty to female schools, or to allow more than two in each parish.

Mr. Cunard thought Mr. Speaker's fears unnecessary. If the bill were sent up and should come back rejected, it would then be time enough to alter it, and send up such as might be passed above. It was very important to establish female teachers, and he would be for giving them every possible advantage.

Mr. End had not the experience in these matters of Mr. Speaker, nor the factious eloquence of our Hon. Member for Westmorland, (Mr. Scott). The latter gentleman had, yesterday, made every body laugh, by his vivacious wit; but he (Mr. End) nevertheless, believed that he had not convinced any body by his arguments. He was surprised and grieved to hear hon. members object to giving female teachers the same allowance as males. He thought he could shew very plainly, not only that female schools are entitled to equal, but even to more consideration, than male schools. He had found, on turning over the pages of history of all ages, that the first impressions imprinted by mothers on the minds of children, are the most durable, and conducive to the formation of character in after life. When the tender wax of youth receives a good impression from the mother, the beneficial result will afterwards be evident. As the twig is bent so will the tree be inclined. The best results follow from proper material instruction. The country now labours, nay, groans, under the want of female teachers. The sad misconduct which has occurred in male schools, renders a reform imperatively necessary. Many female children had been seduced by male teachers. There had been abominable conduct of the kind at Miramichi, and horrid conduct in Dorchester. If there existed no other reason for female teachers, this was quite enough.—As to the value of the time of females, he (Mr. E.) had heard no argument to prove it to be less than that of males. Males can do many things out of school hours. They may post books, collect accounts, &c. But females have no such opportunities. They must give their sole and exclusive attention to their schools, and ought to be paid accordingly. All the arguments to the contrary, which had been adduced, were without foundation. Female schools are pre-eminently useful. They have been found to work well where they have been hitherto established. Such schools were not in contradiction, but in furtherance of the law. No difficulty had ever been found in getting a license for Mrs. Smith, of Newcastle, who had for some years had a school there. He (Mr. E.) thought every man—every father—every brother; must be convinced of the necessity of female schools, that he was surprised to hear any arguments on the other side. He hoped the committee would take into consideration the arguments in favor of females.

Mr. Scott thought the Hon. Member for Gloucester incorrect in his arguments respecting females, and also as to what he had said respecting him (Mr. S.).—He (Mr. E.) had said that he (Mr. S.) had yesterday made an eloquent speech. Now he certainly had not, for he was not capable of doing so. He had also charged him with displaying a great deal of wit. Now he (Mr. S.) laid no claim to wit; did not believe he had any; had never pretended to have any. As to not convincing any body; he (Mr. S.) believed he really did convince a number of Hon. Members. But he could not say whether the conviction still lasted or not, because he had heard it said,

"Convince a man against his will,  
And he's of the same opinion still."

He thought the Hon. Member for Northumberland (Mr. Cunard) appeared to be fully convinced of his duty to the fair sex, in every respect but one, and that was wrapping them up in the holy bands of matrimony. He believed the Hon. Member for Gloucester, (Mr. End) had but recently tied the bonds of matrimony, and he supposed he was so enraptured with its comforts, and with the value of the fair sex, that he wishes to give £20 a year to every bit of a girl that takes to teaching a school. He (Mr. S.) thought however that the house should deal justly. They should deal out the public money so as to make it as equally beneficial to the people as possible. They should take into consideration the value of womankind's wages, which are always much lower than men's.

He thought a bounty of £10 quite enough, or even too much to give to a female teacher. He should by all means oppose any higher sum. Women's expenses are much less than men's, and their time the more, much less valuable. If £20 a year should be given to every woman that would teach a school, the people would soon be unable to get any male teachers that were good for any thing.

Mr. S. Humbert thought there might be a possibility of extending beneficial views so far, and they should therefore be cautious.—[Mr. H. deprecated too much indulgence of jocularity in debate.]—As to the assertion that gross misconduct had occurred in schools taught by male teachers, in some counties, he thought that no rule why it should be the same throughout the whole country. It was a matter of profound regret, that such occurrences had taken place, and hon. gentlemen had done their duty in mentioning them. As to the matter in question, he (Mr. H.) was disposed to be as liberal as any man. But he thought they might go too far.—They might draw the bow too tight, and it might break. They should be careful to keep within bounds. He (Mr. H.) did not think female teachers entitled to an equality of pay with males. [Mr. Smith explained.]

Mr. Chandler trusted all the hon. members had but one object; the diffusion of general education. But in passing an act like the present, reference must be had to the state of the public funds. If hon. members merely consulted their feelings as men, as fathers, as brothers, they might be liberal in the matter. But in that house it was necessary they should be influenced by a due consideration of the revenue, and the expense attending the proposed measure. Looking at it in this way, however, Hon. Members, and especially the hon. member for Gloucester might be disposed to follow the benevolent impulses of a generous heart, they would find it inexpedient to go beyond the usual sum granted to schools; or, if they did so, they must restrict the number of schools. As to female teachers: if it should be found that two female schools can be established with the same expense as one male, the public will derive a benefit from the regulation. He (Mr. C.) thought the females themselves, who might be effected with this bill, would gladly engage their services for the services of £10 bounty, in addition to the private subscription. Such women are generally in poor circumstances, and the ensuring such an income would, no doubt be a sufficient inducement to them. The public would thus derive the benefit of two teachers instead of one.—But the royal instructions were never intended to apply to women. They only intended to provide for the appointment of male teachers, competent to their duties, and of strict morality. Trustees might have granted license to females, but such licenses were contrary to law. If it had not been so, the provisions of this bill authorising the employment of females, would have been unnecessary.—As to the criminal occurrence in Miramichi, that was the only instance which had occurred in this large County. The solitary nature of the circumstance alluded to, was a proof that the mischief is by no means common, or to be feared as likely to be so. As to the bill itself, he would beg Hon. Members to remember, that it was not in their power to give all they might wish. He hoped they would endeavor to square the act with the state of the revenue, and be governed by that principle. As to the warm hearted arguments of the hon. member for Gloucester, they were an honor to him, and to his nation, which is so distinguished by such liberal feelings; but in his (Mr. C.) opinion, they could not be allowed to have any effect on this bill. The hon. gentlemen had probably, been more influenced by his feelings than by long reflection on the subject. He (Mr. C.) was not disposed to allow 20l. to female teachers, nor much alteration in the bill.

Mr. Cunard observed, that improper conduct in male schools had happened in more counties than those which had been named; and if therefore, if any part of the people found women's schools desirable, the bounty ought to be equally allotted to them. Many men come into the country and obtain situations as school-masters, without any previous knowledge of them by the trustees or people; and they might, therefore, be very improper characters to entrust in such situations. But where the people wish to appoint women as teachers, the women and their circumstances are well known, and they ought therefore, being considered competent, to have an equal allowance with men.—The allusion to female servants' wages was irrelevant and improper. No comparison ought to be instituted between a dairy maid and a teacher; and that therefore formed no reason for regulating the pay.

[Mr. Brown, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Glasco, and Mr. Clinch, severally expressed their sentiments, and thought the rate of male and female teachers' remuneration should be different.—The latter gentleman observed, that some hon. members were very warm hearted in favour of female schools; they were, therefore, at least, entitled to the thanks of the ladies.]

[The section of the Bill was agreed to, giving an allowance of 10l. to male semi-annual schools; 20l. to male annual schools; 5l. to female semi-annual schools; and 10l. to female annual schools.] Some few further observations were made on subsequent portions of the bill; in the course of which, Mr. End took occasion to remark that he would oppose the bill in every stage while it limited the number of female schools, and lessened the allowance to female teachers. A great many compliments had been paid to his (Mr. E.) heart, at the expense of his head. He reminded

Hon. Members, that it was an Irish heart; and its feelings must come out, in some way or other; and that, perhaps, if they did not escape in that way, they might come out in the shape of a leprosy.

The Bill was agreed to with amendments.

[Mr. Scott proposed an amendment to the Bill, to provide female trustees of schools, as well as female teachers; fearing that young male trustees might be too partial to young female teachers, and also that it might not be proper to allow the qualifications of female teachers to be examined by male trustees.—Amendment negatived.]

#### ELECTION LAWS.

Committee of whole House on Bill to regulate the qualifications of the Representatives in Assembly.—Mr. J. Pumbert in the chair.

Mr. S. Humbert stated that this bill was intended to repeal the old election laws, and to provide a new law. This was a very important matter. Many doubts had arisen as to the execution of the old laws which ought to be obviated. Some of those laws ought to be repealed. He hoped the Committee would turn their attention to the subject, and, in the course of the discussion of the bill, suggest such amendments as they might deem suitable to the wants of their respective Counties. Great difficulties had arisen at elections under the present laws, as to the qualifications of electors. Most of them were of the lowest class of the people; and many of them very illiterate. It frequently happened, that at the poll they were called upon to swear as to their qualifications, &c. without even knowing the meaning of the words of the oath. One object of this bill was to simplify the oaths. The first amendment proposed by this Bill was contained in one word. It consisted in defining by the word "MALE," those members of society who are entitled to vote.—Questions had arisen, as to the qualifications of female voters. Such questions were hitherto undecided, as it appears by the law at present, that females may vote. But such a course was certainly objectionable. The word "MALE" would obviate every difficulty in this respect. Another difficulty existing, was as to the title on which a freeholder may vote. This required to be rendered more explicit.—Another reason for a new law was, the necessity of consolidating all such parts of the old laws, as it might be expedient to retain.

On the reading of the First Section of the Bill, which went to repeal all the existing laws on Elections—

Mr. Weldon thought the present act relating to the trial of controverted elections, called a copy or child of the Granville act, a very good one. It had been found a very good law in the mother country, and in the neighbouring colonies, from practical experience; and he (Mr. W.) could not see any necessity for repealing it. He should go against the repeal of that act.

Mr. Partelow thought it inexpedient at present to repeal that particular act. If necessary to repeal it, it might be done afterwards, by a separate bill. As to the other provisions of this bill, he acceded with the sentiments of his Hon. Colleague, the mover of it.

Mr. S. Humbert acknowledged his feelings were to repeal that act altogether. Notwithstanding its great parent and high origin, he did not think it all needed in this province. The country wanted an election law more simple in its operation, and less expensive. That act had been passed unnecessarily, merely because it had existed elsewhere. The country had gone on tolerably and orderly without it, and did not require it. It had produced every pernicious effect. He was bold to say, that the law had kept petitioners from coming before the House for securities in cases of undue elections. It obliges a petitioning candidate to swear that he is worth 400l. before he can come before the house.—What reason was there for this? If petitioners could come to the house as they could have done before the passing of this act, they could get securities promptly, and the people would be satisfied. There were many good and efficient men in the county, capable of serving their fellow men in this House, and likely to be chosen who could not put their hands on their heads, and say they were worth £400. Yet they must do so, or they could not come to that House. That requisition was necessary to be repealed. The law in question was founded on tyranny and oppression. A man might have a great extent of property, but it might be mortgaged, and therefore he would be prevented from serving his countrymen in that House. Yet if such a man were returned, who among his constituents would complain of his want of property? Who would raise a murmur against it? Why then should the law prevent it? Such a law ought never to have existed. The sooner it dies, the better for the country.—There are now two laws on the same subject in existence. The original law which was intended to be superseded by this Granville act, was nevertheless, not repealed by it. Which, therefore, is to be acted on? The old law allows a person to sit as a member, although his property may be mortgaged; but the later law says he shall not, yet does not repeal the former law. Here is a clashing of interests.—Look also at the language of this new law: "Whereas it is deemed expedient to do what?—Do we ever come here to fetter and abridge the rights and privileges of the people? No. We come here to guard, and not to sacrifice those rights. But this act says, it is deemed expedient TO LIMIT AND RESTRAIN!"—Such an enactment is unconstitutional. It is inconsistent with every principle of honor and justice. The members of this House cannot restrain the rights of their constituents. If such a thing has been done by this act, the sooner it is repealed the better. It