

Editor's Department.

MIRAMICHI:

CHATHAM, THURSDAY, JUNE 26, 1856.

THE ELECTION.

We publish a half sheet to-day to put our readers in possession of the sentiments of the respective candidates elicited at the hustings on Monday last, previous to the polling day, that they need not ignorantly vote for any candidate entertaining sentiments contrary to their own.

THE NOMINATION.

Monday last was our nomination day, and a very large body of Freeholders and other inhabitants, congregated at the Court House, Newcastle, for the purpose of hearing the speeches of the respective Candidates.

The competitors were originally ten, they are now reduced to six, sufficient to make a warm and intricate election.

If the Freeholders act with consistency, and are guided by principle, the path of duty lies plain before them. Those who wish to sustain the course the Lieutenant Governor has pursued, which we consider arbitrary, high handed, and the precedent, if sustained, dangerous to the liberty of the people—while others consider it manly, independent and justified by the circumstances—know the men who will support and those who will oppose him.

Messrs. Street and Kerr, distinctly stated that they approved of his conduct in dissolving the Assembly, and if returned would sustain him, while Messrs. Johnson, Sutton, Mitchell, and Tozer disapproved of his conduct, and would oppose him. All the Candidates declared themselves unfavorable to the Prohibitory Law, and would use their exertions to have it repealed.

Mr STREET was proposed by Alexander Davidson, Esq., and seconded by T. W. Underhill, Esq.

Mr SUTTON, by B. Stapledon, and seconded by J. Lawler.

Mr JOHNSON by W. J. Fraser, Esq., seconded by John Beggall, Esq.

Mr KERR by John McDougall, Esq., and seconded by Miles Carrol.

Mr MITCHELL by Rowland Crocker, seconded by George Whitney.

Mr TOZER by Edward Whitney, and seconded by Rowland Crocker.

We give below an abstract of the Speeches of the respective Candidates.

After the above named gentlemen were proposed, Mr CARMAN addressed the Freeholders briefly, notifying them of his intention not to enter into the contest, and thanking them for the support that had been so liberally tendered to him. At some future day he might again appear before them, after he had visited the different sections of the County and expounded to the people his views on various matters effecting their interests.

MR STREET'S SPEECH.

Freeholders of the County of Northumberland:—

After an uninterrupted service of upwards of 23 years as a member for this County, I again appear before you as a Candidate for your suffrages. It is not my purpose to occupy your time with a long speech full of promises of what I will do, if again elected. That I will discharge my duty faithfully and independently you may rest assured; and from my long public career and your own personal knowledge of my character you can judge of my political principles, and of my capacity and trustworthiness to serve you as a Legislator. By the past, therefore, you can judge of the future; and should you again honour me with your confidence, you may rely upon my exertion for the promotion of the best interests of the Province and of this County in particular, in the prosperity of which I need not tell you, I take the deepest interest; for here I began my public career, and here have my best days been spent. In this county my children have been born and brought up, and the stake I hold in this County makes it my interest as it is my inclination, to do all in my power to promote the prosperity of Northumberland.

Gentlemen,—I should here conclude, but that I think, under the peculiar circumstances of the present Election, it is the duty of the Candidates to explain, and your right to require of these men aspiring to the honour of representing you, their views and opinions upon the subjects now agitating the public mind. I allude to the exercise of the prerogative on the part of His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor in dissolving the late House of Assembly and his reasons for so doing. Gentlemen,—as you well know, while always desirous of promoting temperance and sobriety throughout the land by every rational and constitutional means, I have always been and still am opposed to legislative coercion, in other words to the Prohibitory Law, so called. I am quite willing to legislate against the

abuse but not against the use, as I consider that to be unnatural and a desire at infringement upon those inalienable rights inherent in the people of this free country. In addition to which I have always been of opinion that this Law could never be enforced and that it must therefore have a most demoralizing effect upon the morals of the community, inasmuch as it would lead to smuggling to an enormous extent and cause the Province to be thus flooded with alcoholic liquour of the worst description; that it would cause much litigation and bad feeling among the people, and bring the laws of the Country into disrespect and contempt. Besides, I have always felt satisfied that such a law was not in accordance with the wishes of the majority of the people. Under these circumstances I am of opinion that His Excellency was fully justified in the step he has taken and that in doing so he has acted constitutionally and in accordance with the well understood wishes of the people; and so far as my vote will go, if returned, I will sustain him in so doing. (Here Mr Street went fully into the reasons assigned by His Excellency for the Dissolution). I shall also go for the immediate repeal of the Prohibitory Law and for enacting a wholesome Licence Law.

In respect to the present Government I have nothing to do with them directly or indirectly. I never was advised with or consulted in its formation; and I now stand before you as a Candidate for your suffrages, unconnected with Government or with any party, but upon these upright and independent principles by which I trust I ever have and ever shall be governed.

MR MITCHELL'S SPEECH.

Gentlemen,—

This is the second time I have the honour to appear before you as a Candidate for your suffrages; and, although you preferred Mr Kerr to me at my former election, I had the satisfaction of seeing the principles I would have advocated carried out by him; my defeat, therefore, has become a triumph.

There are three great questions to which I shall briefly refer:—First—the Prohibitory Law. Second—the Dissolution of the House. And lastly—the Railroad.

As regards the Prohibitory Law, I consider it adverse to the rights of British subjects. I always have opposed and always will oppose it; but I consider the Dissolution of the House on this question at the present time, very injudicious. There are now four-fifths of the people opposed to this law, if it had been allowed to remain six months longer on the Statute Book there would have been five-fifths, or in other words, the people would have been unanimous for the repeal of the Law.

As regards the Dissolution, I have endeavoured to ascertain the opinion of the people on His Excellency's conduct, and after ascertaining their views and seriously reflecting on the matter, I am firmly convinced that His Excellency has done wrong for I believe there is a great principle involved in it, affecting the liberties of the people. If His Excellency had wished to take the opinion of the people he should have ascertained it. Now Gentlemen you will ask me how could he ascertain it? I will tell you!—by advertisement through the Gazette calling upon the people to give expression to their sentiments by public meetings and petitions. I am thoroughly opposed to this act of His Excellency, because there is a principle of liberty involved far more important than grog or no grog.

Gentlemen—I now come to Railways. When the Government propounded their Railway scheme, Messrs. Johnson and Sutton wrote to me on the subject. I advised them to accept it, although I must say I did not like it, and still find it hard to digest. What I particularly object to is the imposition of a tax of 2½ per cent on all our importations; but I am willing to run great risks to obtain great objects. My conduct in reference to this scheme would be to take it, although I only approve of it in part, and not as a whole. I am also in favor of a branch from Shediac to Miramichi, but I do not believe it will ever be built, but I think it would be unfair to build a branch from Fredericton to Woodstock, and neglect the one from Shediac to Miramichi. I do not think the Railroad will pay. Having travelled over different Railroads in the United States last winter, and making particular enquiries concerning them, I was unable to find a single road that paid. The Tax of 2½ per cent bears particularly hard upon the Shipbuilders, tends to cramp the energies of business-men, drives the poor working man out of the country, deprives the old women of their cup of tea, and adds one penny or two pence to the price of every fig of tobacco. Before five years, taxes will have to be largely increased.

Gentlemen,—I am now before you as a candidate for your suffrages. I am well known in the country, having been born and brought up here, commenced life without a shilling, have built up in Newcastle a large business to the amount of thousands, where hardly any existed before. If you do me the honour to elect me, I shall serve you faithfully, honestly, and independently.

Gentlemen,—Let me now refer to another

question, a question on which I have been basely slandered, and which has caused me injury in my Political canvass. I refer to the Bill for the Surveying of Lumber. I would not sanction any act to injure the Lumberman, though it was my duty to respect the Presentment of the Grand Jury. I do not owe them that deference to cause me to sacrifice the interests of the lumberer.

[Here Mr Mitchell entered into a statement of the manner in which the Bill came before the Bench.]

The new Bill does not differ from the old Survey Laws except in the appointment of Surveyors and reduction of fees.

[In proof of which Mr Mitchell produced a certificate from Allan A. Davidson, Esq., a gentleman of the legal profession who was employed by the Grand Jury to draw up the Bill.]

Gentlemen,—I need not remind you that there are now most important interests at stake in the Province, requiring calm and cool deliberation: I know personally what the Country requires, but I will leave the matter in your hands, only repeating that if honoured with your confidence, I shall serve you honestly, faithfully, and independently.

MR SUTTON'S SPEECH.

Gentleman Freeholders,

When I had the honor of addressing you two years ago, I did not expect to be so soon called upon to give an account of my Stewardship. I have no long speeches to refer you to during my service in the Legislature, but I will refer you to my strict attention to your interests during my short servitude, having never been absent from my post in the House; during the time I have had the honor of serving you, my name is recorded in the Journals on every division. Long speeches never obtained for you a fine Bridge costing £6,700. The £4,500 granted last winter did not take up more than ten minutes of the time of the House, and for this I take a small share of credit.

Gentlemen—I have been several times asked during my canvass through the County, how I was going to vote in reference to the act of the Lieutenant Governor in dissolving the House, and in some instances was told I was bound to support him, as I had voted for Mr McPhelim's Resolution, calling on His Excellency to dissolve the House of Assembly, but I stated and I wish it to be distinctly understood, I will not support this act of the Governor or the Government as at present constituted. I was in the minority on that vote, and according to my principles as a Liberal that the majority should rule, must oppose him, as he went with the minority and dissolved the Assembly, contrary to the wishes of his Council, who contended, as I maintain, that the majority should govern. His present advisers, with the exception of Messrs. McPhelim and Allan, are the same men whom the Assembly in 1854 declared they had no confidence in by a large majority. If His Excellency was sincere in dissolving the House on the Liquor Law, why did he take to his Council one who voted for the bill and against its repeal last winter. Mr R. D. Wilmot, one of his present advisers, voted for the bill in 1855, and against its repeal in 1856, and yet His Excellency took him to his Council. Talk about responsible Government, the men who are now advising the Governor are the same, with the exceptions I have named, who were ousted in 1854, and who put the late Government on their trial three times during the late session, and each time were signally defeated.

Gentlemen, with regard to Railways,—I voted and supported the bill introduced by the Government last winter, as I thought, and still think, the majority of my constituents, are favourable to their construction. If I thought otherwise I should have opposed them. At a meeting held a few years ago in the Court House at Newcastle, one of the largest perhaps ever assembled in the County, the man who said a word against the building of Railways in the Province, would have been denounced as an enemy to its prosperity. If the Freeholders have changed their opinion on this important question, I should like to be made acquainted with the fact, and the best way to ascertain this would be, to call meetings in the different Parishes, or at the County town, and if the majority declare against their construction, I will abide by the decision. I have no other object to serve than to forward your wishes.

Gentlemen—I voted for the new Election Law, and cannot say I approve of all its provisions, as in my opinion there is too much machinery about it. I should like every one who has resided in the County, say three years, and paid his taxes, to have a vote, as the working classes, such as ship carpenters, and others, contribute as much, and in many cases, more to the revenue, than the farmers; and why should they not have a voice in the sending of representatives to make laws for their government.

There is one question I approach with the greatest reluctance, as I think it one which should not be brought before this mixed assemblage, and had the foul slander come from one of my co-religionists, I would not have troubled you. I allude to the grant to the Roman Catholic School in St. Andrew's. A most worthy member of the Legislature, Mr

End, wrote a letter to another worthy member of this County, Judge Davidson, who are both estimable Catholics, and particularly anxious to advance the Catholic Religion. This letter contained many false charges, which were circulated throughout all parts of the County, with a design to injure me. On hearing this, I immediately sent to the Chief Superintendent of Schools for the Province, who forwarded me a certificate that the Roman Catholic Teachers in the County of Charlotte had secured their Provincial allowances regularly; and also an additional grant of £75. I can assure you Gentlemen, that the words Protestant or Catholic were never mentioned in my presence in the Assembly during the two years I had the honor of a seat there, except by that philanthropic demagogue, Mr End, purely with a desire to gain popularity with a certain party. I feel a little warm, Gentlemen, on this matter, and I am sorry I had, in justice to myself, to refer to it. I have been a Trustee of Schools for upwards of sixteen years, and who amongst you will say that I ever, by act or deed, tried to deprive the child of a poor man of education. No. I would be the last man in the County that would do it. I have done justice in that grant, and if I were to-morrow placed in a similar position, I would do as I have done.

Gentlemen—I want it to be distinctly understood, that if elected, I will not go to the House to support a Petition or Grant because the word Catholic or Protestant is mentioned in it. I will go to deal out equal justice to all parties—friends or foes. I thank you for the patient hearing you have given me, and as there are several other Candidates to address you, I shall conclude with a hope, that on Friday you will come to the polls and support me with your votes.

MR KERR'S SPEECH.

Gentlemen—I come before you for the third time to ask your suffrages. The Gentlemen who preceded me have held seats in the Executive Government, and have therefore had more experience than myself, and have more to account for. I have been your Representative for some five Sessions, and my acts and my conduct in a public capacity are known to you, and by these you must judge me. My sympathies are with the people, I am one of them, I inherited no wealth, and am indebted to my own industry for what I possess. I have a stake in the County, as all I possess is centered within it, and it is my interest as well as my duty to uphold and maintain the just rights and liberties of the people. But I feel that I will best carry out these views in also upholding the acknowledged rights and prerogatives of the Crown.

The Dissolution of the Assembly came unexpectedly upon us, and I would have been glad had it been delayed till near the close of the year. But it is admitted on all hands that His Excellency has the right to dissolve the House, and the question is whether he has in this instance, judiciously exercised the prerogative in opposition to the views of his Council. I thought it a bold measure, but under all the circumstances, I believe His Excellency had in view the best interest of the Province in adopting the course he has taken, and if I should have the honor of being again returned I will, as all the Members for this County have hitherto done, vote for the Repeal of the Prohibitory Law, and sustain His Excellency for sending the question to you to determine. I will not go over the arguments which have been used against the Prohibitory Law. The Maine Law on which it is founded failed to produce the benefits anticipated by its friends, and has been repealed. It was against the feelings of the people, and could not be carried out. I believe the Law to be oppressive, bearing unjustly upon the poorer classes, and affecting our Revenue to the extent of £30,000 a year, which has to be supplied by taxation on actual necessities. The provisions of the Law cannot and will not be generally enforced, and I find that Liquors continue to be imported in large quantities, of inferior quality, openly sold at high prices, taking out of the country large sums of money, and paying nothing to the Revenue. In a question of so much importance to the Finances of the Country, with the members of the Government divided in the Legislature on the subject, and the evils which the measure is bringing upon the country, I think His Excellency did right in sending it to the people. The late Executive Council expressed a belief that the Law, if it was found not productive of the benefits anticipated, would have been repealed by the same House: this is a mere opinion, and I should have regretted to see the repeal of the Law depend on this contingency, and probably entail a continuance of all the existing evils for another year at least.

I would have been sorry to have seen the same house meet again, and I believe such was the opinion of many other members. The contests which took place during the last two years on want of confidence motions, consumed much time and gave rise to unusual efforts to oust or maintain the existing Government, and I believe that had the dissolution not taken place we would have had another protracted and unprofitable session, and on this account I believe the Country will be benefited by the dissolution.