

## RECEIPTS.

Mr. Editor,

Accident having placed me in possession of the following valuable Receipts, I think I will be doing the public injustice in not publishing them, as it may be the means of enriching them to any extent. I have no doubt we shall become in a short time as wealthy as any town in the Province. Having discharged my duty as an humble philanthropic citizen,

I remain your's truly,

SMILAX.

P. S., I am sorry the remainder of the document is destroyed, as the writer's name cannot be seen.

*Cook's Silver Solution for Plating Copper, Brass, and German Silver.*

1. Cut into small pieces a 25 cent piece, and put it into an earthen vessel with half an ounce of Nitric Acid. 2. Put vessel into warm water uncovered until it dissolves. 3. Add half a gill of water, and one teaspoonful of fine salt, let settle. 4. Drain off and repeat adding water to the sediment, until the acid taste is all out of the water. 5. Add finally about a pint of water to the sediment, and 4 scruples of Cyanide of Potassa, and all is ready. 6. Put in bottom of solution a piece of zinc, about 2 inches long, 1 wide, and one eighth in thickness. 7. After cleaning, immerse the article to be plated in the solution about half a minute, letting it rest on the zinc. 8. Wipe off with dry cloth, and repeat once. Polish with buckskin. Thickness of plate can be increased by repeating.

*Leslie's Directions for making the new superior Washing Soap.*

Take five lbs. bar soap, or six lbs. good soft soap, four pounds sal soda, two oz. borax, one oz. hartshorn; to be dissolved in twenty two quarts water and boiled about fifteen minutes. For hard soap, add to the above a pound of resin.

*Leslie's Superior Boot-Blacking.*

To four ounces gum asphaltum, add half a pint of turpentine, put over fire for fifteen minutes.

I have just received E. Bowmans, thirty different Receipts for making money, from one of which alone, he says, he has known young men recently to make from five \* \* \* \* \* (Here the manuscript is obliterated.)

## Legislative News.

## OUR CORRESPONDENT'S LETTER.

FREDERICTON, 18th March, 1854.

Dear Pierce,

The House in Committee two days this week, "Ways and Means." Long discussion; Free Trade and Protection principles propounded and argued out. Partelow moved to appoint Committee to prepare a Revenue Bill, and stated his object to take off the duty on Flour, Meal, Molasses and Coals. Botsford moved amendment that the state of affairs in Europe rendered it unwise to make any change in the Tariff:—House divided on the amendment—yeas 29; nays 19, so the old Tariff remains. The general opinion was much against the duty on Flour, Meal, Molasses, and I think Sugar and Tea, and that a sufficient revenue would be raised without such impost, but from the varied opinions in the House, it was feared that any attempt to amend would be worse than useless; the members for Northumberland were divided, Street and Kerr voting against opening the question, Williston and Johnson for it. Kerr and Street argued that there should be much change if it were possible to make it, yet feared the time it would take and the danger of making it worse.

The Road Committee met yesterday, and agreed to recommend £54,990 for Great and Bye Roads; £10,000 of which to be placed at the disposal of Government for great Road Bridges, among which are the North West and Oyster River Bridges in Northumberland, the Nipisiquit in Bathurst, and a Bridge at Campbellton, Restigouche. There will be £17,000 for Great Roads besides this, and £17,000 for Bye Roads, of which latter Northumberland gets £1,596; Gloucester £1077; Kent 1037, and Restigouche £855. The balance of the £54,000, say £10,000, is for Special Grants for Bye Roads, each County getting double the last year's grant for this purpose, which will give Northumberland's share about £900. The Grant for Roads will be much the largest ever made, but the rate of wages will not admit of its doing much more work; it is important to appropriate so large a sum, as it would doubtless be frittered away in useless grants for all sorts of purposes and to no purpose.

Committees are now getting to work in earnest, and the Committee on Trade will report early next week; they have determined not to recommend any Grant for the St. John Atlantic Steamers. This is wise, as it would only benefit one side of the Province, and it is much more important to make Roads and get a Railway connection of the Northern and Southern Sections of New Brunswick, than to connect us with Great Britain for freight and passenger purposes. It is clear the mails would not come by such a line as quickly as at present.

I am not aware of any matters worth communicating, and dare say your readers care little for individual opinion on the doings of the past week.—Codification of the Laws not completed, and when done may not, I fear, be too perfect.

By the bye, there will be additional polling places in Northumberland next election, they have been added to the Election Law and passed. In Nelson, there will be one at the Village for Barnaby River people; North Ek, one at James Hutchison's; Newcastle, one at Goodfellow's for all freeholders below Gilmour and Rankin's Mill Stream, and above Grand Aunce Creek in Alnwick; this with the one established at McKay's, Black River, and at Noble's in Hardwicke, must be a great convenience to

the voters, and a saving of expense in every way; the old polling places remain as before.

Your's, &amp;c.,

FIDES.

From the St. John New Brunswick.

Fredericton, March 16.

As the debate which took place yesterday and the day before on the "Ways and Means of raising a Revenue," was very interesting, I will give you a brief synopsis of the debate on the 14th. I say brief because that best suits my time and the space you can afford me.

Mr Partelow went into a statistical account, showing the amount of last year's revenue, from what sources derived, the financial state of the Province, &c. He said it was necessary to enact a Revenue law, as the present law expired on the 31st December next; he proposed, however, to make such alterations only as the exigencies of the times required for one year, and to leave matters to be further dealt with by the new House. The Revenue last year exceeded £184,000, and he based the suggestions he was about to offer on the supposition that the same amount of Revenue will be collected the current year. He proposed, then, to repeal the Act imposing 1 per cent duty on all imports to meet the funded debt; that debt had been paid, as the Act was onerous in its character, involving the trouble of double entry, he proposed to relieve the people of the burden. He next proposed to abolish the duty on flour and meal; it was imposed in times of depression, and the extensive lumbering operations now carried on, and the dearth and scarcity of breadstuffs, required that those articles should come in duty free. He next proposed to abolish the duty on Molasses, an article of general consumption among the poor. He also proposed to abolish the duty on coals; the amount was but trifling, but still in the present time of dearth it should be taken off. The loss to the Revenue by repealing the Loan Act would be about £11,000, and by abolishing the duty on the other articles they would lose about £5,600. There would still be a revenue of nearly £170,000, which he considered quite sufficient. He therefore moved that a select committee be appointed to prepare a Revenue Bill, and if the House agreed with his suggestions, they would take them as their basis for action.

Mr Hatheway agreed with Mr Partelow's suggestions, and dwelt with some acerbity upon the high price of flour, and bad quality of the article, occasioned, as he averred, by the duty of 3s. a barrel on United States flour, which was equal to a prohibition.

Mr Boyd congratulated Mr Partelow on coming to his senses. He then intended that further alterations should be made, and that the duty on beef and pork should be reduced to seven and a half per cent.

Mr Williston agreed with the proposed reduction of duty, but he wished to go farther, and reduce the duty on implements of husbandry to 7½ or 10 per cent.

Mr Wilmot opposed the motion. He contended that this was not the time for abolishing duties, it being the last session of the House, and England just entering on a war, by which our trade might be seriously affected. He pointed to the present prosperity of the country as a proof that the present tariff was beneficial in its operations, and complained that the resolution was open in its character, and would not confine the Select Committee to the four articles enumerated by Mr Partelow; that if it did, it would not be binding on the House, for when the present Revenue Law was once opened, each would endeavour to alter it to suit his own opinions.

Mr Montgomery agreed with the last speaker—contradicting the assertion that Canada flour was more apt to sour than American—They imported nothing but Canada flour in the north, and found it sweet and good.

Mr MacPherson said the present duties were oppressive on the lumberer. He was for abolishing the duties on flour, meal, and salted meats.

Mr Harding went into all the ramifications of trade, and made one of the best (if not the best) speeches of the day, in support of Mr Partelow's propositions. He asserted that the Canadian flour purchased in the summer months would not keep—it was sure to sour—and merchants in St. John dare not lay in a stock to supply the lumberers during the winter until the fall, when the flour made from new wheat came down from Canada. This occasioned the present dearth, for instead of laying in a supply when prices were low in the American ports, they were obliged to wait, and meantime prices went up.

Mr Cutler opposed the resolution on the ground that if the law was opened this Session every extreme of opinion would be urged, and they might have a worse law than new, while the new House would have to open up the matter again.

The Speaker also opposed the resolution, on the ground that the subject would be brought up next session, but if the law was thrown open, he should go for the repeal or reduction of duty on many articles, particularly on farming implements, but he would not go for abolishing the duty on salt meats.

Mr McPhelim spoke in terms of contempt of protection principles. He contended that the lumberer had no fair play—that he was taxed heavily for all he consumed, and then had to pay an export duty for his lumber. In addition to the articles enumerated by the Secretary, he was for abolishing or reducing the duty on boots and shoes, hats, salt meats, &c.

Mr Botsford took the same view of the case as the Surveyor General. A crisis was approaching, on account of the European war, and the most politic course to pursue was to re-enact the present Bill for one year, and by another year matters now in embryo will have assumed a different shape. He then moved an amendment to re-enact the present law for one year.

Mr Hayward said the present law was the result of a compromise, after nine or ten days struggle, and he was for leaving it to the new House.

Mr Ryan spoke in strong terms in favor of the present tariff.

Mr Gray supported the original resolution. He contended that the high price of flour, &c., and the large quantity imported, convinced him that we should abolish the duty, in order to encourage our lumbering and manufacturing.

The Attorney General made a long speech against opening the Revenue Bill this year.

Messrs Scoullar and Porter followed in favour of the original resolution, and Capt. Robinson avowed himself an ultra free trader.

Mr English said the people of this country had lost at least £20,000 in consequence of the duty on flour, during the past season.

The Committee then rose and reported progress. The House again went into Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr Johnson opened the debate, in a long and able speech in favor of the resolution. He confessed,

however, that when the law was open he would not be confined to the four articles enumerated by Mr Partelow. His was decidedly a free trade speech, with the exception that he opposed abolishing the duty on American flour; this he would do his best to keep on—although it would make no difference to the people of the north, who imported their flour direct from Canada—but merely to retaliate on the southern portion of the Province for maintaining protective duties on such manufactured articles as the north is obliged to import.

Mr Jordan then spoke briefly in favour of the amendment; then followed the Speaker with a second speech; Mr Smith followed on the other side; Mr Barbic spoke briefly on the amendment; Mr Needham to some length—a speech moderate in its tone,—supporting the original resolution on the ground that the exigencies of the times demand that the duty should be taken off breadstuffs; Messrs. McLeod, Kerr, Gordon and Rice followed in favour of the amendment, Mr Kerr's speech being very much to the point; Mr Connell next spoke to some length in favour of the original resolution, contending that the flourishing state of the Province was to be ascribed chiefly to the lumber trade, while the present scale of duties was oppressive to the lumberer, or. The Surveyor General next spoke in angry terms; he declared that the original resolution was not fair—as no articles were specified to which an amendment could be moved; he defied Mr Partelow to control the House, and prevent the whole tariff from being opened up, if the present revenue bill was not re-enacted as it now stands, he avowed his determination, if the resolution passed, to use his utmost endeavours to abolish the duties on sugar and tea; he accused Charlotte members of ingratitude in trying to repeal the present tariff, under the operation of which they had paid so little and received so much, and he threatened to bring in a bill to impose a direct tax on Carleton and Charlotte to pay the interest on the St. Andrews Railway Debentures.

Next came another speech from Mr Hatheway, then replies from the Speaker and Mr Montgomery, and then Mr Hatheway's rejoinder. Then speeches almost interminable, from Messrs Macpherson, Connell, Boyd, Partelow (replying to Wilmot), Montgomery, Street, Wilmot again, Johnson, Robinson (complaining of Wilmot's threats) Ryan, English, Harding, Gray, Porter, McPhelim, Cutler, Thomson, and then Mr Botsford's closing speech. The question was then taken on the amendment, when the Committee divided as follows:—

Ayes—Messrs Speaker, Street, Wilmot, Montgomery, Hayward, Botsford, Cutler, Ryan, Jordan, Barbic, McLeod, Kerr, Gordon, Rice, Godard, Read, Stiles, Gilbert, Earle, and Purdy—20.

Nays—Messrs Partelow, Gray, Hatheway, Williston, Boyd, Harding, McPhelim, Scoullar, Macpherson, Porter, Robinson, English, Lewis, Johnson, Smith, Needham, Connell, Thomson, and Landry—19.

Mr Pickard was the only member absent, and Mr Taylor was in the Chair.

## From the Reports of the House of Assembly.

## MILEAGE PAID THE MEMBERS.

Mr Kerr moved a resolution for a Select Committee to be appointed to examine and report upon the mileage paid the members of the House for coming to and going from the Legislature.

Hon. Attorney General hoped his hon. colleague would not press the motion, as it would probably lead to discussion, and the time of the House be taken unprofitably. He thought the object could be effected in another manner.

Mr Kerr said he knew of no other mode in which to effect his object, which was to correct error, as he had spoken to the hon. Speaker about it, and he did not think he could interfere. If his moving the resolution provoked discussion it was not his fault, as he was ready to take the vote upon it at once.

His Honor the Speaker said he had been spoken to on the subject, but when he was chosen to fill the high office the House had been pleased to confer upon him he had followed the precedent laid down for him by his predecessor, nor did he think he ought to deviate from it unless instructed to that effect by the House.

Mr Barbic cared nothing about the motion before the House, whether it was carried or not, but he thought it rather small potatoes. To be paid for the shortest route might suit some hon. members very well, who, the moment the Session was over, could step on board a steamboat and be carried almost to their doors, enjoying all the comfort they wished as they proceeded; but they did not consider that others were differently situated, and would, if they took the direct route at that season of the year have to wade through mud and snow. He had always taken what route he pleased, although it might be a round about one, and would do so again, and he had pocketed his mileage for that route without compunction. He did not think the country wanted this cheese-paring—he was sure his constituents did not want it.

Dr Thomson said this came of the cries got up for retrenchment and reform just before the election.—It would be much better if they allowed things to remain as they were, and not be stirring matters up when there was no complaint among the people.

Mr Connell did not see why any one should object to the motion for a Select Committee. It did not reflect upon any one—there was nothing invidious about it—and if the hon. and learned member for Restigouche thought he was entitled to the mileage he was accustomed to receive because the travelling was bad by the direct route, that was a subject for the committee to consider. That some had been overpaid was evident, as one hon. member from the north had refused to accept of all the amount tendered him; and other hon. members might be receiving more than they were entitled to, having never paid any attention to the subject. Let a committee be appointed, and report to the House what amount of mileage each hon. member was entitled to receive.

Mr Cutler said the subject was of too trifling a nature to occupy the time of the House, and he was sorry the motion was made. Other matters of far more importance required their attention, and this could be settled in a satisfactory manner without referring it to a select committee.

Mr Johnson said hon. member might consider the subject trifling, but the fact was they should have what they were entitled to receive, and no more. He did not mean to argue whether fifteen shillings a day was enough or not, but if it was not enough, let some hon. member who thought so move a resolution, fairly and openly, to increase it to twenty shillings a day, and when called upon to vote he would not shrink from expressing his opinion, and voting as he thought proper; but while fifteen a day was established as their pay, and they were entitled to fifteen shillings for every 20 miles they travelled, let them not endeavour to put more money in their pockets by unfair means; for if some hon. member did so, and swelled the aggregate, other hon. members would, perhaps, be blamed for it, as the details were not published. The first year he

had the honour of a seat in the House he was paid more than he was fairly entitled to, but learned that the Speaker had followed the precedent set by his predecessor; when he came to the House the following year he had a resolution prepared to have the whole thing investigated, but he did not move it, lest it should have been attributed to a factious opposition, with which he was sometimes charged about that time; but he determined to set himself right, and refused that year to receive more than he was entitled to, reckoning the distance by the direct route and ever since he had pursued the same course. As to the amount of pay hon. members were entitled to while attending to their Legislative duties, he did not look at in that light,—he considered that fifteen shillings a day was merely to pay their expenses. In 1850 he had refused to vote for reducing the allowance to ten shillings a day, as that was not enough to pay a member's expenses, but he told hon. member that he would vote for fifteen shillings a day, or nothing. He did not see why a select committee was objected to it was a very easy matter for them to examine the distances, and in their report they would not be obliged to state what hon. members had received too much in times past, but what each hon. member was entitled to, which could be acted on in future. The hon. Speaker was placed in a delicate situation in regard to this matter; if an hon. member certified that the distance he had to travel was a certain number of miles, the Speaker might hesitate before he would say "No, sir; you do not travel so far!" but if he (Mr Johnson) was Speaker he would say "That is not right and I won't sign it."

Mr English said there was no need of long speeches about it; if there was anything wrong let them have it settled at once.

Mr Williston said he had never received more money than he was entitled to, and therefore an enquiry would not affect him. He considered the whole system wrong. For instance, instead of paying the clerk a yearly salary of £400, not only as a remuneration for his services during the session but for the work he had to perform during the recess, in attending to the revised journals and appendices, and making up the indexes, they paid him a certain amount in supply as a remuneration for his services as clerk, and then paid him a similar amount on the contingent bill; thus making it appear to the people that they paid him twice for the same services. The assistant clerk was paid in the same manner. If all this was done in the House openly, so that the people could see what they were paid for, there would be no finding fault. There were no doubt some items of expenditure connected with the Legislature that might as well be struck off, and he had tried to do so, but had been overruled by the majority of the house. There was £40 a year paid to a Master in Chancery to bring down messages from the Legislative Council. This office should be abolished, and the Clerk of the Council should perform the duty. He regretted his hon. colleague had moved the resolution, as the object could have been effected in another manner. In the case of any hon. member getting too much, if the hon. Speaker were to ask him the exact number of miles he had to travel surely no hon. member would make a false statement, and pocket more than he was entitled to.

Mr McPhelim said if any hon. member was overpaid, it was not the hon. Speaker's fault, who had acted according to the practice of his predecessors; and if he (Mr McPhelim) was overpaid in the mileage he received it was not his fault, he had received the usual amount and made no enquiry, and was quite willing the matter should be examined, and corrected if wrong. But hon. members who originated those measures of retrenchment were not always as patriotic as they seemed. He recollected the attempts made at reduction the first session he was in the house; they attempted to reduce members' pay to ten shillings a day—which he would not vote for; they next determined not to allow any pay to the members of the Legislative Council, and when that body refused to pass the appropriations for the payment of the members of this House unless their own pay was provided for, the House let the matter drop until near the close of the Session, which was tantamount to saying they would go without their own pay rather than pay the Council—

in fact many hon. members did say so. But what did he see at the close of the Session, when the matter was brought up again, and it was moved that the members of both Houses should be paid? He saw hon. members all around him deserting their seats, to allow the grant to pass, and those who were most clamorous against paying the Councilors and most patriotic in protesting that they wanted no pay, were the first to run to the bank and get their money. (Laughter, and cries of "That's true.") He was not afraid to say what he thought upon the subject, and he would now say that he thought fifteen shillings a day too little, and if he came there again next year he would vote for their pay to be twenty shillings a day.

Mr Boyd said he also would vote for twenty shillings a day if he came there again. He was so situated that, although there was a direct road to his place of residence, it was generally in such a state at the time he was coming to and going from the Legislature that it was much easier for him to travel round by St. John.

Mr Botsford said he had never given a thought to the amount of mileage he received; it might be too much or it might be too little; he only knew that he received the amount that was established before he entered the House.

Dr. Gordon said he had been paid the same mileage as was paid to former representatives. He did not know whether it was right or wrong—in fact he had never troubled his head about it, and did not care about it, and if on investigation it should be found that he had overdrawn, it was not his fault; he had taken what was offered him without any question as to the amount. He was quite willing that an investigation should take place, and would support the resolution.

Mr Hatheway said the appointment of a committee could not make the slightest difference to him, personally. He resided but eleven miles from Fredericton, and received mileage for one day coming and one going,—it could not be less. He did not blame the hon. and learned member for Northumberland for moving and pressing this resolution—they had probably done it to set themselves right with their constituents, for a story had been circulated in Northumberland that two hon. members, representatives of that county, had been accustomed to receive mileage for two days each way more than they were entitled to.—Another hon. member for that county, who had a high official situation, and received a salary of £600 a year, did to his (Mr. Hatheway's) certain knowledge pocket his mileage to and from Miramichi, although he lived in Fredericton. [Laughter.] He would repeat that he cared nothing about the matter, but as some hon. members wished to have an investigation he should not object to it.

Mr Pickard said if the fifteen shillings a day was allowed as pay, it was not enough; it did not pay his expenses. If he was at home instead of being in the