

"Hic! a-hic-poney! He's a hic humbug!" (laughter).

Dr. Sangrado. I wish to know from Johnny Raw why he did not fully avow his sentiments before the last vote was taken?

J. Raw. Because we should then have lost your vote, and perhaps Dr. Wiseheart's.

Dr. Sangrado. Then Sir, your conduct was as disingenuous as your present avowal is candid and unblushing.

J. Raw. I was merely practising House of Assembly tactics! Since you aspire to the honour of a seat there, it is time that you learnt them.

Joe Porkleg. Sire, I think there has been quite enough of angry recrimination here for one night, I therefore move an adjournment.

Rep. Dr. Wiseheart. I second the motion.

(The motion is put and carried, and exeunt severally with much disorder and confusion).

THE AMARANTH.

FREDERICTON, THURSDAY, AUGUST 1, 1850.

PARLIAMENTARY SKETCH.

The Hon. L. A. Wilmot has so often courted an investigation of his public career, and dared any one to prove him dishonest, inconsistent, tyrannical, partial, unjust, slanderous, or extravagant, that neither he or his friends can take the slightest umbrage at our taking up the gauntlet he has so fiercely thrown down. It is our intention, then, to examine the most prominent of his public acts since he first entered the Legislature. He plumes himself upon his consistency, his sincerity, and conscientiousness. We may, perhaps, be enabled to prove that he has been inconsistent, insincere, and politically dishonest. He emulates the character of a Statesman, an Economist, and a Saint. We shall closely examine his claims.

Mr. Wilmot was first returned to represent the county of York at the general election which took place in December, 1834; and first took his seat in the Assembly on the opening of the Session, the 20th of January, 1835.

On the 27th of January he called the attention of the House to the unsettled state of the North-eastern Boundary question, and moved an Address to the Lieut. Governor, praying for information respecting the progress of the negotiations. On the next day he informed the House that His Excellency had no information on the subject to lay before them. At a subsequent period he moved for a joint Address, from the two Houses, to the King, on the subject, which was agreed to, and Mr. Partelow was united with him, on the part of the House, to prepare the Address, which is recorded on page 471 of the Journals for 1835; the first paragraph contains these words: "feeling that the interests of this Province are deeply involved in the question now in dispute, between your Majesty and the United States of America." We are particular in calling public attention to this subject, because it was the first that claimed Mr. Wilmot's notice when he became a legislator—because he took an active part in passing the Civil List Bill, and was perfectly acquainted with the fact that a large tract was "in dispute" when the casual and territorial revenues were delivered up to the Local Government—because he was one of the men who made the bargain, with his eyes open, and would now break faith—repudiate—on the ground that part of *our territory* (that in dispute) has been given to the Yankees! This is one instance of his political honesty.

On the 10th of February, 1835, a petition was presented to the Assembly, from E. D. W. Hatchford of St. John, against additional duties being levied upon imported goods. This petition was rejected, by a majority of one, and we find Mr. Wilmot's name thus early recorded against the right of petition! Whether he was then a rabid protectionist, or whether he considered the harmless petition a breach of the privileges of the House, we have no means of ascertaining; we only notice it as indicative of that haughty, overbearing career then just commenced, and of which we shall have many instances to relate, ere our task is done.

At this time the majority of the members in the Assembly had cast wistful eyes towards the treasure accumulated in the Crown Lands Department, and had already determined to obtain and squander it. Of course all who

opposed their design came in for a share of their deadly enmity, and of these the Governor and the Commissioner of Crown Lands were the chief. Into the views and the feelings of this majority Mr. Wilmot entered with all the fervour of his impulsive nature; accordingly, we find him one day (Feb. 13,) voting for paying the Adjutant General, Quartermaster General, Adjutants, and Sergeant-Majors of Militia, and against the ordinary grant for Provincial Contingencies.

A dispute arose this year betwixt the two branches of the Legislature, thus; the House of Assembly made appropriations to pay the Speaker £100, and each member £30, besides his travelling expenses; and they refused to make any similar provision for the President and members of the Council. They also made a wide difference in the sums appropriated for their own Clerk, and Clerk-Assistant, and those they appropriated for the Clerks of the Council. The Council remonstrated; a committee was appointed to take that remonstrance into consideration, and our hero, as Chairman of that Committee, reported it to be a *breach of privilege!* On the 11th day of March Mr. Brown moved a resolution, setting forth that "the House of Assembly of this Province possess the sole right of granting public monies, and of *modeling the Supplies as they think proper!*" with other resolutions following, in which it was quaintly stated that the members pay could not be discontinued "without abandoning some of the most essential rights and privileges of His Majesty's Loyal and faithful subjects in this Province!" Mr. Wilmot was one of the foremost supporters of this doctrine of *essentials*, and the resolutions passed by divisions of 14 to 8. On the next day an attempt was made to carry the spirit of the resolutions into effect, by embodying all the appropriations of the Session in one bill, with clauses introduced securing £100 to the Speaker, fifteen shillings per day to each member, and fifteen shillings for every twenty miles as travelling expenses. This nefarious scheme was supported by Mr. Wilmot, —a simple remonstrance from the Council was construed into "a breach of the privileges of this House," while there was not the slightest impropriety of carrying it into effect. It was twice rejected by the Council, with the supplies for the ordinary services of the country, and compelling that body either to succumb, or withhold all the other grants! The Council, however, would not be coerced; they rejected the bill, and all the appropriations of the Session were lost! Thus closed Mr. Wilmot's first Session.

(To be continued.)

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL'S SALARY.

A fortnight since we copied a paragraph from the *Head Quarters* announcing that a Despatch had been received from Earl Grey furnishing instructions relating to the salary of the Surveyor General. We reserved our remarks until we were fully acquainted with the subject. His Lordship states

1st. That he has carefully perused all the documents connected with the case.

2nd. That as his predecessor, Mr. Gladstone, gave his assent that the subject should be referred to the House of Assembly, whether the salary should be paid in Sterling or Currency, he is bound to abide by their decision, *even if erroneous*, and that he sees no reason to differ from Lord Stanley's interpretation of the arrangements on which the salary is based, viz: that it should be currency.

3rd. He concurs with the resolution of the Assembly that Mr. Baillie should refund £513 9s 4d, alleged to have been overpaid him in 1847, on the ground that the said payment was unauthorized both by the House of Assembly and the Secretary of State.

4th. He states that his Despatch to Sir Wm. Colebrooke, dated the 22nd of June, 1847, which authorized Mr. Baillie's salary to be paid in sterling, was founded upon "erroneous impressions," and while he authorizes the Local Government to call upon Mr. B. to refund, he confesses that it would be *hard* upon him to enforce it.

5th. Considers it "hard upon Mr. Baillie" to make him refund any more than the sum of £513 9s 4d aforesaid, as under the circumstances, it was likely that he considered the matter settled. He leaves it, however, to the House of Assembly.

6th. He instructs the Lieut. Governor to complete the recovery of the sum of £513 9s 4d aforesaid, to reduce at once Mr. Baillie's salary from sterling to currency, and, *if necessary*, to make the reduction retrospective.

7th. His Lordship says, "In the absence of any explanation of the circumstances under which the Assembly passed the further Resolution which you quote in your Despatch dated 26th April last, I will only for the present remark in reference to that Resolution, that Mr. Baillie's salary being on the Civil List cannot be altered by Resolution of the House, and that although the particular question of Currency or Sterling was referred by my predecessor to the Provincial Legislature, and has not been withheld from them myself, I am not aware of anything having passed which would imply it would be just to Mr. Baillie, or competent to the Assembly, to reduce that gentleman's salary below £1200 Currency."

8th. His Lordship declines bringing the matter before a Judicial Court, as requested by Mr. Baillie, but intimates that Mr. B. may commence a suit if he considers himself wronged.

9th. Has reference only to the question of Mr. Baillie's retaining his seat in the Assembly.

10th. Reads thus:—"As you seem to assent to Mr. Baillie's statement that the Executive Council were unable to agree to any resolution at their second meeting for considering his case in 1838, I must mention to you that a report of a Committee of Council dated the 4th June, 1838 was received in a despatch from Sir J. Harvey to Lord Glenelg of the same date; that this report professes to confirm the previous one of Nov. 1837, but in naming the sum £1200, adds the abbreviation "Stg," written upon a manifest erasure, while the context and whole tenor of the report requires "Currency,"—and also that it is to be inferred from subsequent communications from Sir J. Harvey that this report received the support of the Executive Council as a body."

11th. Recommends that Mr. Baillie be induced to retire on a pension.

The above is the substance of Earl Grey's Despatch, upon which we shall make a few remarks. His Lordship sets out by stating that he has given the documents a careful perusal. This we very much doubt, or he must have arrived at a different conclusion; we fear that his Lordship has so many things to attend to, that what he calls "a careful perusal" is but a hasty glance: hence his manifold blunders in colonial affairs.

In the second paragraph he states that he referred the matter to the House of Assembly because *Mr. Gladstone did*, and all but admits that he has arrived at his present conclusion because Lord Stanley did! This does not look much like "careful perusal," or deciding the question upon its own merits. He should have enquired *what right* Mr. Gladstone had to refer the matter to the arbitration of an interested body, without the consent of one of the contracting parties! He should have drawn his conclusion from facts, and not from the *ipse dixit* of any man, be he Peer or Commoner. He should have read the despatch from Lord Stanley to Sir William Colebrooke, dated 28th July, 1845, where he declares it the policy of the British Government which can under no circumstances be departed from, "to maintain inviolable every pledge expressed or implied by which the Faith of the Crown is engaged in favour of any present holder of office," and adds "Such of the public Officers of New Brunswick included in the Civil List who held their place before the date of that compact are in possession of such a claim as I have mentioned on the Faith of the Crown." If his Lordship had read, and acquiesced in this doctrine, he should then have turned to the documents, when he would have ascertained that from the period when Mr. Baillie's salary of £1750 sterling per annum was first secured to him, but one subsequent agreement, to which he was a consenting party, can be found, viz: the compact entered into between his brother and Lord John Russell in March, 1841, when his future salary was fixed at £1200 sterling. We cannot now review the voluminous documents connected with the case, the reader will find them in the *Amaranth* dated December 8th, 1849. We will repeat what we have again and again asserted, that no Governor, Executive Council, nor House of Assembly of New Brunswick has ever had the proper authority to reduce Mr. Baillie's salary, and that

there is not a Judicial Court in Christendom but would, after a fair and impartial hearing, award him every penny he claims.

In reply to the third paragraph, it is only necessary to observe that Mr. Baillie merely accepted what was offered him, and justly his due. Surely a public officer is not to refuse receiving his salary until he receives special permission from a Secretary of State, or from a body of men who have no right to interfere in the matter! Besides, Earl Grey ordered the *arrears* to be paid, and that sum formed part of them. To coerce Mr. B. into refunding the money, is an act of public robbery.

In reference to the fourth paragraph, His Lordship, either through stupidity or neglect, mistook a report of a Select Committee for a resolution of the House of Assembly, and thereupon ordered Mr. Baillie to be paid in Sterling. The act was honest, although the blunder was inexcusable. After a lapse of three years, however, he discovers his blunder, and authorizes the Lieutenant Governor of this Province to call upon Mr. Baillie to refund! He admits that the case is "hard upon Mr. Baillie," and he might have added that it is *illegal*, for it is one that no Court could sanction.

In the seventh paragraph his Lordship evidently refers to the resolution which passed the Assembly at the close of the last Session to reduce Mr. Baillie's salary to £600, Currency. The doctrine his Lordship here lays down is quite correct—it is in accordance with that laid down in 1845 by Lord Stanley. Here his Lordship for once treats Mr. Baillie as one of the parties interested, and who should be a party to any compromised reduction; but if nothing has happened to authorize the Assembly to reduce his salary below £1200 currency, let us ask his Lordship, his predecessor, and those who would uphold them in their error, from whence did the Secretary of State derive the power to authorize the Assembly to reduce Mr. Baillie's salary below £1200 sterling, he being one of the officers relying upon the faith of the Crown, as described by Lord Stanley, and not being a party to the arrangement? It is a question we defy them to answer.

We shall notice no more of his Lordship's statements at present, but merely to remark that we have it on good authority that no such minute of proceedings of the Executive Council as is referred to in the 10th paragraph was ever in existence. Taking it all in all, his Lordship's conclusions are founded in error, and are most unjust. We know not whether this is the result of ignorance, or whether Earl Grey has come to the conclusion to sacrifice the faith of the Crown to please an unprincipled Colonial Assembly. Be it as it may, Mr. Baillie stands small chance of having justice done him unless he can obtain a hearing before a Judge and Jury.

PROVINCIAL POLITICS.

In an article headed as above, which appeared in yesterday's *Head Quarters*, we find the following passage:—

"While some of them (the Press) are crying out about the uselessness of the present Coalition Government, they forget to tell their readers that this coalition offered, through their leader, in the last House, to take the initiation of money votes if the House thought fit to renounce that portion of its ancient privileges, 'although in doing so there was a strong probability of their being called upon to go out of office before the close of the Session.' The House, however, did not think fit to resign the privilege, and it will now be for the new members to say whether they are determined to adhere to the decision of their predecessors."

The above is a series of misrepresentations from beginning to end. In the first place, the surrender of the initiation of money votes was recommended in the Governor's speech; and shortly afterwards the Attorney General not only declared that the Executive would endeavour to carry out all that was recommended in the Speech, but distinctly promised that a resolution for the surrender of the initiation of money votes *would be presented to the House* before the expiration of the Session. It was at a later period that, in answer to a question, he made the declaration that the Government was *willing to assume* the responsibility attached to the question, &c., *provided the House desired it*. This was a noble declaration, truly! We would like to know what right this Government, or any Government, has to refuse to perform the duties placed upon them by the Representatives of the people? But, says the *Head Quarters*, "The House did not think fit to resign the privilege."