

COLONIAL.

LOWER CANADA.

PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT. HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Monday, Nov. 26.

JUDGE KERR.

Mr. Gage, in moving that Lord Goderich's despatch relative to the accusation against Judge Kerr, be read, remarked that for his, Mr. Gage's part, it was his desire and intention to carry on the measure to the very end—as should be also the case with respect to another hon. Judge, who as well as Judge Kerr had been involved in accusations of great crimes and misdemeanours in his office. Though it often proved that scarcely any session was long enough to carry any important measure, through the lengthened discussions, through—and this session might be short or long—no one could tell—it was meant to go on with this. It was necessary to refer the matter to a committee, that enquiry might be made as to what Lord Goderich stated. He had referred this House to the case of Sir J. Barrington, who had demanded to be heard at the bar of the House of Commons, but the Minister ought not to take place here. One great defect in our constitution is the want of a tribunal before whom judges or other public functionaries who are guilty of malversation can be brought to trial, and for want of which they might do all things with impunity. There was no parliamentary precedent or rule by which the House could call a judge to their bar—and as to demanding to be heard, the honourable and worshipful judge had not done so till the twelfth hour was past. The impunity which had attended his proceedings, malversations occasioned other and more very remote instances. The hon. Judge had given three different judgments in the same case; if it was told in Turkey that two different judgments had been given in our courts, it would laugh at us—but if three such were named, it would not be believed. Having the hon. Judge been suspended without having been heard, it would have been no more than what that hon. Judge had done with respect to others.

Mr. Stuart considered that a reference to a Committee of the whole House would be the best method of proceeding—for the House had the whole matter before them, special committees were intended chiefly to enquire into particular facts, and circumstances for which there was no necessity.

Mr. Vanelsdonk offered a special Committee, and on which the matter could not properly be taken into consideration—every thing here was new—first an enquiry as to the right of the House to impeach—secondly, as to rendering judgment—the very forms of impeachment, giving evidence, of finally deciding—all were to be considered. The case of Sir John Barrington was not at all similar—he had demanded to be heard—Judge Kerr had not done so.

Mr. Power thought the House could do nothing until the honourable Judge had been heard in his own defence, and for his own part he could not see, in the whole course of the proceeding on this subject, that the hon. Judge had been guilty of anything beyond the little ebulliences of temper, and passion to which all mankind are at times subject. He thought that any one rather than the honourable member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Gage) should have undertaken this matter—it looked in his hands too much like prosecution and persecution.

Mr. Gage thought the only question was whether the hon. Judge had an opportunity of defending himself. Last year he had prayed to have a moment given, in his case, this was an opportunity that there was a tribunal before which he could be arraigned. If he had not thought that this House had a right to pronounce judgment he would have peremptorily refused to fight it; he therefore thought we had a right.

Mr. Duval expressed his anxious wish that the malversation committed by the hon. Judge, many of which he had himself witnessed, should be punished; but he did not believe that the matter could ever be brought to a conclusion as long as it remained in the hands of the hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Gage).

Mr. Gage would openly ask, who in this House, if he did not carry on the matter, would undertake it? It had been asked why he had not asked the hon. Judge before us—he had asked every where, and could not find any parliamentary usage that would have authorized it. The Minister seemed to think that the best evidence that could be got had not been adduced—he thought otherwise, and that no unprejudiced man who had read the evidence would say there was not fully enough to condemn the hon. Judge. But only let it be shown how we can get the hon. Judge to the bar of our House. He, Mr. Gage, had seconded the motion for receiving the Judge's petition last year. As to the propriety of a special Committee, these were besides the main question many incidental points to be inquired into; such as whether or not Lord Goderich's Despatch was constitutional or not—and, another thing, it was only before a special Committee that the hon. Gage could prove his own suspension from the House. It was his duty as a public man to carry through these accusations—but it was a duty he owed also to himself, for if he did not, the hon. Judge was determined to ruin him, and he did not do all he could towards it. In the same time, and during all these delays, opportunities were lost—witnesses died, others left the place—and it put him in mind of the story of the king who promised one of the wise Kings of the East to make a jackass speak in ten years, and when asked how he could risk such a rash promise, replied that in ten years time, either the jackass, or the king would die, and the promise would die with either of them.

A motion to pass on Mr. Gage's motion, which was carried by a majority of 42 to 8, and a special committee appointed.

ROBERT CHRISTIE.

Debate of Wednesday 25th and Friday the 26th November.

Mr. Morin moved a string of Resolutions, five in number, which have appeared in the paper, upon the subject of Lord Goderich's Despatch relative to the expulsion of Mr. Christie. He greatly blamed the Colonial Minister for having, in his despatch, that were exclusively our own, instead of confining himself within the proper bounds of suggestions, he proceeded to censure, and told us one after another what was wrong. It was only in writing that this House could be impeached, and this had been done.

Mr. Nelson said it was a matter of inevitable necessity that all communications between the three branches of the Legislature should receive the most favourable construction; the hon. member for Belchasse (Mr. Morin) had put the most unfavourable construction he could upon the Despatch of Lord Goderich. There was no doubt that His Majesty's government was wrong in their construction of the affairs of Mr. Christie, but yet this, he had no doubt

was without the least intention of injuring or offending. No legitimate Government could refuse to reply to every application for a redress of grievances, whether from a private individual or from an entire Province. If such an intimation as we had received could be made an infringement of our privileges, it would render each branch of the Legislature inaccessible to the other, so that all public business must stand still. There was nothing more certain than that the complaints from Gaspé were unfounded—the contempt of this House by Robert Christie was manifest and notorious, and Gaspé had become an accomplice in the contempt, by returning him over and over again; nor could it be denied that this Parliament had a right, if they choose, to adopt the proceedings of a former one; but shall it be said that the King's Government shall not listen to a complaint founded or unfounded? We should not desire it to be enquired into? We should receive such communications respectfully, and not cavalierly; respect is due to each other in all classes; but were we even to think that due respect was not paid to us, we should be wanting in respect to ourselves if we did not reply respectfully. Let us respectfully state that our resolutions with regard to Mr. C. were well founded, and that we will firmly maintain them, but not accuse the King of violating our privileges, when nothing was farther from his intentions. The message simply referred to us the complaint made by the County of Gaspé, and in fact Mr. Christie was not in question. If there should be any words made use of that may be against our feelings, shall we quarrel about mere words? This was not the mode to live in peace and amity. His Majesty's Government in England is part of this, and the Administration here is a part, and the Legislative Council is a part, and we are a part, and we eternally dispute about an ill-expressed, or ill-understood word, there would be an end to all Government; and we may find to our cost that the Government in England will go their own way without us. Both in public and in private life the best interpretation should be put upon words, by that system we had succeeded and should continue to succeed in obtaining what we wanted—it was what we prayed for at the opening of every Session, that all we did should receive the most favourable interpretation, and undoubtedly we owe it in return, to put the most favourable interpretation upon all that comes from His Majesty's Government.

Mr. Speaker Papineau was surprised the hon. member for the County of Quebec (Mr. Nelson) did not see that the Government in England and the administration here were playing with us. Lord Goderich is supposed to speak with candour and frankness—he has the talent, it seems, of saying a great deal, speaking frequently, and speaking too much. After alluding to former Messages, Mr. Speaker expressed his surprise that a Minister of the Crown in England, should, at so critical a period, occupy himself with the trivial and unfounded complaints of Robert Christie; it showed a meddling disposition inconsistent with a proper system of Government. If we were to enter into so verbose a communication with the Colonial Secretary as he seemed inclined to do with us, we should probably be obliged to reply to him in a more offensive manner than he had used towards us. As a constituted Legislative body, he schools, and tells us to rescind our resolutions. This House depended alone upon, and was the sole organ of the will of the people, and could not submit to the dictation of a Colonial Minister. Lord Goderich refers us to precedents that have no relation to the expulsion of Robert Christie; he seems to think so simple and ignorant as not to know of those precedents, and that we consider that expulsion alone creates disqualification. We know better—if a member is expelled for bribery and corruption—that does not disqualify him, but infamy does—and here is the mark of infamy—his sentence declares him unworthy of sitting or voting in this House—nor can he be relieved from that infamy, until by his submission and acknowledgement of his guilt he purges himself of it, and then only at the option of the House. He descended from his rank as a Legislator, cast away the only thing that ever was an honour to him, to become a spy. His case is not to be likened, as the Minister does, to that of Wilkes, who was expelled for being the author of libels—and that too by a small majority. He had besides five-sixths of the people of England in his favour—but the House of Commons went so far as to say that the Electors of Middlesex had no right to vote for him, when he had 1500 votes against 300, who were for Colonel Luttrell. In that case it occurred once for all in England that the minions of power gained the day, and the minority ruled the majority. Unfortunately there is a party in this country who believe and maintain that the minority ought to rule the majority, and whose representations are too much believed at home. Here a single individual has calumniated the greater majority of the people; and the calumnies have taken root, and been propagated by a portion of the press of the country. His insults are before us, and he has found means through the Colonial Minister to get his *diatribes* recorded in our journals. If, as was not the case, he had suffered injustice, it was by petition to us, he should have proceeded. It is a matter of privilege, and it does not become a Colonial Minister to interfere with it. Another thing, the Minister in his despatch acknowledges the existence of two parties—it was the Administration who created these two parties. They make distinction of religion, language and origin parties, and recognise a principle of superiority in the minority—the same system which has been all along prevalent in Ireland—that great blot in the British History.

Mr. Stuart remarked on the wide field taken by the hon. Speaker, (whose speech was taken by all others, we have of course been obliged considerably to curtail) and the matter he had entered into, which had been heard a hundred times over in this House. He had spoke of Lord Goderich as saying too much, but he thought the hon. Speaker might apply to himself the saying that he who speaks a great deal often says too much. The hon. Speaker tells us of the verbiage of the Colonial Minister, and used terms scarcely consonant with the proverbial and well known politeness and decorum of the people of this country. The hon. Speaker, he would tell him, was wanting in decorum; he was not now in the chair, but a member of a committee, into which he comes, however, invested with his gown and dignity; and the Mr. S. wished to throw that want of decorum from off the shoulders of the House, and leave it where it belonged, upon those of the hon. Speaker. Mr. S. professing his entire devotion to promote the interests and prosperity of this country, saw—if there be an enemy to this country, he must be found in the hon. mover of these resolutions, and the hon. Speaker who supports them. They would bring us into direct collision with England. It was perfectly children's play, and what would be the end? It was perfect insanity. Now, as to this particular Message, he, Mr. S. would say that it was founded in reason and in right; and if Lord Goderich had not sent it, he would have been wanting in his duty. He, Mr. S. had before predicted that if the conduct pursued by the House was persisted in, the district of

Gaspé would be severed from this Province. The cry of blood was against us!—and he said again, it would be severed if we so went on. Mr. S. then went into a review of the proceedings with regard to Mr. Christie, which it is unnecessary to repeat. He characterized them as playing the game of power against right; but the consequence must be, that in the end right will prevail. There is nothing more clear to him than that all the proceedings in the case of Mr. Christie were contrary to the law of the land. The doctrine of privileges was exceedingly misconstrued by hon. members. Privileges of the House there were undoubtedly; but in no instance was any thing to be done by arbitrary power alone. They must be exercised with discretion—discernere per legem. If you tell me you have a power of privilege which is above the law, you may as well tell me I am living at Constantinople. Part of the British empire has complained of a grievance, in being deprived of its elective franchise, and in invoking the interference of Government, Government desires to look into it. It was the duty of the British Government to take cognizance of every alleged grievance, to receive all documents, good or bad, wise or foolish. Now Gaspé asks to be separated from us and this is, in courtesy, communicated to us. What answer do give? We won't enter into the question: we shut our mouths. Our enemies will rejoice at this. He relied much on the coldness, firmness, and justice of the British Government; but if these resolutions passed, (Mr. Morin's) it would lead to the separation of Gaspé from Lower Canada, and have a decided tendency to forward the views of Mr. Christie, which no man deprecated more than himself. He should hope that some hon. member would move to rescind the resolutions as to Mr. C.

Mr. QUESNEL was convinced full justice had been done to Mr. Christie, he had been fully heard—he had here in his place said, that what he was accused of, if he had to do it again he would do it. The insult to the House was too much to bear. Yet that was not the question under consideration. He could not vote for these resolutions. This was not the way to reply to the Sovereign. Every British subject had a right to appeal to the King if he found himself aggrieved, and the King's bounden duty was to attend to it. Nor can we, nor ever did we, complain of a message from the Crown being an infringement of our privileges. But as to Mr. Christie, he was adjudged as a spy—and that was an infamous character he would never lose; and a new judgment of the same nature had been given against him by a new Parliament composed of many new members.

Mr. De la Roche had no doubt that the despatch was an infringement of the privileges of the House. It was a dictation to the House as to the measures to be pursued. After going over the same ground as had repeatedly been urged as to the treachery and unworthy conduct of Mr. Christie, as well as the question of a new parliament not being competent to expel him again, Mr. De B. concluded that it was necessary that we should resent with energy the insult offered by the Colonial Minister, in desiring us to sit again by the side of such a man, and to give credit to the false assertions and insinuations contained in the pretended resolutions of the County of Gaspé. If we did not we should be nothing else than the tools of arbitrary power.

Mr. Papineau in explanation of what Mr. Stuart had stated as to his departure from the customary urbanity and decorum of Canadians, an eulogium justly due to them, considered the hon. gentleman was himself liable to the same reproach, for he had designated what had been said on this side of the House as unqualified nonsense. The whole result, however, of that hon. gentleman's argument was that we must fear and bend before the exertion of greater force—but we ought to be afraid alone of sacrificing the true interests of the country, and rely more on justice than be afraid of forcible injustice. As to the supposed probability however of the separation of Gaspé, he was surprised hon. members were not undeceived. The pretended resolutions communicated to us were adopted far from the central and populous part of the country, and were framed with the intention of cheating and deceiving His Majesty's Government; whilst other and contrary resolutions have been entered into by a far more numerous body of the inhabitants of Gaspé. There was nothing but justice in the resolutions now submitted to the House, and where there was justice we should not look at danger.

Mr. Stewart again in explanation as to what he said on the want of courtesy in the hon. Speaker, had no intention of alluding any how personally to him, but it was the want of courtesy towards the Colonial Minister, and his Majesty's Government in the resolutions now proposed, that he had to complain of. If the Imperial Parliament had passed an Act to sever Gaspé from Lower Canada, we might have justly and loudly complained; but this candid, open, plain, communication required different treatment from what it met with.

The hon. Speaker seems to think that the majority of the inhabitants of Gaspé are against separation; he hoped it was so, but where was the proof? This communication from the Colonial Minister, was for the purpose of giving Lower Canada the opportunity of stating objections to that of separation, and it had been met in a manner which he should not attempt to characterize.

Mr. Vanelsdonk, towards the close of Wednesday's debate, wished, from many considerations, to give members more time to decide on such an important matter, and moved that the Chairman do leave the chair, report progress and ask leave to sit again. It was a constitutional and just maxim that the King could do no wrong—but it did not follow that his Ministers could not—and that was what we were now enquiring into, which should be done most deliberately and maturely. We must consider not only whether there is any infringement of our privileges, but whether it is an intentional infringement. An hon. member had properly said that we must avoid all collision with the Mother Country, but he recollected that in 1816, when a message was received relative to the accusations against the Chief Justice, that hon. member did not then stand in fear of such a collision and engaged in violent resolutions so violent that the Parliament was dissolved in consequence. The hon. learned gentleman then went into the merits of the case as between the House and R. Christie, but did not argue much that was new. The pretended disfranchisement of Gaspé was not any—it was the contrary—the House by upholding its own privileges—its respect—its liberty of debate—were upholding the elective franchise of every part of the country. He also dwelt on the case of Wilkes, which had been adduced by the Colonial Minister, but which he considered as having no analogy with the present case. The hon. member for the County of Quebec (Mr. Nelson) had stated that we must put a favourable interpretation upon all communications made to us—he perfectly agreed with him

—but there might be occasions when it was necessary to protest, and such an occasion had lately occurred with respect to the speech delivered at the close of last session.

Mr. Gage deprecated the personal tone the debate seemed to have taken. He differed from the hon. Member for the Upper Town, (Mr. Nelson) and did not think it was so easy to get into collision with the Government of Great Britain, who were disposed to give us all our constitutional privileges. He could not see any breach of our privileges in the message we had received from His Excellency. The King himself, through his minister, appeals to us himself, through his minister, appeals to us himself. If the Minister had taken upon himself to say that the petition of R. Christie was well founded, and that the resolution relating to him ought therefore to be rescinded, it would be a different matter—but the Minister infers that this House is the judge and refers the matter again to them for their consideration. There was certainly much offensive matter in the letter of R. Christie, and in the Gaspé resolutions for a yet we should have much consideration for a man who might be wrongfully conceived himself aggrieved—it is in human nature to complain bitterly. Besides this letter was not addressed to the House—therefore it was not a suit to the House. Had it come from any other quarter, or had such a one been addressed to the House of Commons in England, it would have been an infringement of their privilege.

Mr. LAPOSTOLLE did not deny the right of Mr. Christie to petition the King, and would admit the Colonial Minister had a right to take the petition and his letter into consideration, and if he had satisfied himself with merely communicating them to this House, all would have been right, but he has passed the bounds; he cites the authorities and quotations, attempts to give instructions and directions to this House; and what is in a peculiar degree derogatory of the privileges of this House, he admits the possibility of the facts stated in R. Christie's petition being correct, which is in fact admitting the possibility of the House being in error.

Mr. NELSON, after alluding to the case of Wilkes, said he was not of opinion that we should rescind our resolutions as to Mr. Christie, but certainly that we should not tell Ministers that they had insulted us, for that would be insulting them.

The question of postponement from Wednesday to Friday was carried in the affirmative, by a majority of 30 to 23 at about half past eleven.

On Friday the debate was renewed with increased vigour, yet without a great deal of novelty, excepting the substitution of a set of resolutions proposed by Mr. Nelson, for the more violent ones submitted by Mr. Morin, both of which sets have been published. Mr. Vanelsdonk had also drawn up a set of resolutions, but they were not brought forward.

Mr. Sol. Gen. Oakes could not concur in the first resolution proposed by Mr. Nelson—for though he went with the first part, "duly appreciating His Majesty's acknowledgment of the right of all his subjects for such assistance as he can afford for the redress of any grievances under which they may labour," he did not consider that any thing had been done against the privileges of the House—and he moreover denied that the House had any privilege to expel any member by resolution, and conceived that the expulsion of Robert Christie had only occurred by the exertion of an arbitrary power. He had been expelled, but he had suffered the penalty—he had been punished—and he came back here white-washed and purged from all his imputed iniquities—yet the House, by a violation of the laws of the land, and the assumption of privileges which do not belong to them, expelled him again and again.—But Mr. O. must lock well into all the resolutions to be brought forward by the hon. Member for the County of Quebec, he well knew his talent—his coolness—the way in which he led the House by adopting one resolution to adopt others, all in a row, as a necessary consequence.

Mr. NELSON spoke shortly in reply. Mr. CUVILLAIN said this was by no means the affair of Mr. Christie, it was the affair of the people.—No Minister could, without remark, infringe the privileges of this House—they were the privileges of its constituents—the King has his prerogative—the House of Lords its privileges—the House of Commons its privileges—but all must be exercised for the benefit of the people, or would degenerate into an encroachment upon their rights. The King has to put into execution the laws enacted by his several parliaments—but he would fail in his duty if he did not watch over his Parliament. Gaspé now complains of being disfranchised.—It is the right of the King to enquire whether the complaint is founded. He would protest against this being called a breach of the privileges of this House. It was, on the contrary an instance of the paternal care of the King. He was convinced as much as he was of his own existence that the separation of Gaspé was now in agitation in the mother country—but she gave us this opportunity of saying what could be said against it.

Mr. PAPINEAU, in a speech of great energy, referring to the supposed possibility of a separation of the District of Gaspé from the Province, referred to that which had been in agitation with regard to the separation of the District of Montreal from Lower Canada, an act which could only be one of the most undeniable iniquity and monstrous injustice. If the Minister is to attend to the preposterous views of a disappointed individual, every one who cannot get a road laid out in the direct on he wants, may bring his individual concerns before the Government and before the Parliament.

The following is the Despatch and resolutions thereon alluded to in the foregoing debate:

Copy of a Despatch from Lord Goderich to His Excellency:—

Downing Street, 26th January, 1832.
My Lord I have received from Mr. Robert Christie, a letter dated 10th of October last, enclosing copies of resolutions passed by the Inhabitants of the County of Gaspé, at public meetings convened for the purpose of taking into consideration certain grievances under which they conceive themselves to labour, by the exclusion of Mr. Christie from the seat in the House of Assembly of Lower Canada, to which he has been on five successive occasions elected. I am now going to assume that the House of Assembly have adopted so strong a measure as the expulsion of one of its members without sufficient grounds. As guardians of the constitutional rights of all classes of the King's subjects within the Province of Lower Canada, that House must be supposed to be peculiarly jealous of those rights which they are thus accused of having infringed. Least of all can I consider it probable, that after the well known conflict between the Electors of the County of Montserrat, and the House of Commons, and the vote of the 3d of May, 1782, by which that great Constitutional question was finally decided, the House of Assembly would maintain that any person would become ineligible as a member of that body by the mere force of a former vote of expulsion; or in consequence of any breach of privilege upon which any such preceding vote may have been founded. It is alleged in these resolutions that the supposed disqualification of Mr. Christie arises

from an offence imputed to that gentleman against the privileges, not of the present, but of a former Assembly, a statement which still further enhances the probability of the representation. Under such circumstances His Majesty's opinion upon the subject is unavoidably suspended; His Majesty, however, acknowledges the right of Mr. Christie, in common with all his subjects, to such assistance as His Majesty can afford for the redress of any grievances, under which he may labour. Your Lordship will, therefore, call on that gentleman for a copy of his letter to myself, of the 10th of October last, and of the resolutions enclosed in it. You will communicate to the House of Assembly copies of those documents and of my present despatch, and you will signify to the House His Majesty's earnest desire, that they would take into their earliest consideration the complaints of the County of Gaspé. His Majesty will not permit himself to doubt, that if the facts be really such as are stated in these resolutions, the House will rescind the vote, by which Mr. Christie is said to have been excluded from his seat.

The efforts which His Majesty has made to promote to the utmost of his power, the welfare of his faithful subjects in Lower Canada, and to place on the most secure foundation the rights of the House of Assembly of that Province, at once entitle and encourage him to expect, that the House will receive with due attention a suggestion which is prompted by his anxiety that every class of the people of Lower Canada should enjoy a full participation in the privileges of its free constitution.

I have the honor to be, &c.
Signed
GODERICH.
(A true copy)
Signed
H. CRAIG, C. S.
AYLMER, Governor-in-Chief.

Friday, Nov. 30.
The House in Committee on the Message of H. E. the Governor in Chief, relating to the expulsion from this House of Robert Christie, Esq. being read:—

Mr. NELSON moved, in amendment to Mr. Morin's motion of the 21st instant, the following resolutions, which were carried.

1st.—Resolved as the opinion of this Committee, that this House duly appreciates His Majesty's acknowledgement of the right of all his subjects to such assistance as he can afford, for the redress of any grievances under which they may labour—but that they have seen with regret, that His Majesty has been advised to act upon his gracious intentions in this respect, in a case where the privileges of this House are concerned.

2nd.—Resolved as the opinion of this Committee, that this House, in expelling Mr. Christie, exercised a privilege frequently exercised by the House of Commons, and by the Representative bodies in the Colonies, and which is necessary for the freedom of its votes and proceedings.

3rd.—Resolved as the opinion of the Committee, that this House is the sole judge of the cases wherein it ought to exercise its privilege, and its decision thereon, cannot of right, be questioned by any other authority.

4th.—Resolved as the opinion of the Committee, that the Resolution transmitted with His Excellency's Message of the 21st instant, purporting to be Resolutions passed at various meetings of the Freeholders and Electors of the County of Gaspé, are false, scandalous, and malicious libels on this House and the Government of the Province, and form no grounds for the reconsideration of the expulsion of Mr. Robert Christie for a high contempt of this House.

5th.—Resolved as the opinion of the Committee, that the letter of the said R. Christie, and the Resolutions, stated to have been adopted by certain Electors of the County of Gaspé, transmitted as before mentioned, he expunged from the journals of this House.

The said Resolutions were carried in the affirmative—Yeas—Messrs. Armit, Arthambault, E. Bedard, Berthelet, Bertrand, Blanchard, Bouffard, Ls. Bourdages, R. S. Bourdages, Cazeau, Conat, Cuvillier, De Biery, Deschamps, De Witt, Drolet, Duval, Fortin, Guillet, Huot, Knowlton, Lafontaine, Larue, Leslie, Masson, Mousseau, Nelson, Peck, Poulin, Quessell, Raymond, Rousseau, Revard, Rodier, Scott, Semon, Thibault, Strudel, Le Tennecour, Turgeon, Valois, Vanelsdonk, Wartelle, and Young. (44).

Nays—Messrs. Baker, Caldwell, Casgrin, Hebert, Hoyle, Power, Solicitor General, Stuart, Taylor, and Wright. (10).

The Report was agreed to by the House.

ALEXANDER DRUMMOND,
BELL HANGER,
RESPECTFULLY informs the Public, that he is prepared to receive orders in his line of business, at the house of Mr. Donald McLeod, on Regent Street.
He has on hand a stock of materials, which will enable him to execute all work entrusted to his care, in the best manner. Orders from the country punctually attended to.

As Mr. D. intends to remain only a short time in this place, he requests an early application from those who may require his services.
Fredericton, 18th Dec. 1832.

JUST RECEIVED,
And for Sale by the Subscriber, Ten
Jars Grapes in Prime condition.
WM. SIMPSON
Druggist.

Fredericton, December 19th 1832.

NOTICE, is hereby given that the following Rate and Assessment has been made upon the real Property within the Parish of Mauderville in the County of Sunbury belonging to the persons severally whose names are mentioned against the several accounts of the said Rate and Assessment undermentioned; and unless the same are paid respectively without delay the said real property of such as make Default in payment thereof will be disposed of as the Law directs.

PROPRIETORS NAMES.		£	s.	d.
All the Real Estate of Hugh Johnston, Esqr.		1	0	6
All the real estate of James Hazen, Esqr.		1	4	10
All the real estate of George P. Nelson.		1	4	1
All the real estate of John Messerieu.		6	2	0
All the real estate of Samuel Nelson.		0	10	5
All the real estate of Elizabeth Bailey.		0	10	5
JOHN BROWN, Junr. } Assessors. GEORGE MILES, }				

LANDED PROPERTY FOR SALE.

THE Subscriber being authorized to dispose of the following lots of Land, he offers them for sale on moderate terms.
Lots no. 15 and 25 and a lot adjoining no. 28, situate in the Parish of Kent containing 190 acres each.
Lots no. 14 and no. 15 on the Pennyack, Parish of Douglas; containing 400 acres.
Eight Glebe lots in the Parish of Fredericton, held by Isaac from the Rector, Church Wardens and Vestry of the Parish, being the number 259 to 296 inclusive. For particulars enquire of
Wm. TAYLOR.
Fredericton, 23d April, 1833.