

COACH & ACCOMMODATION COACH, St. John and Fredericton.

COACH "PERSEVERANCE." COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

COACH will commence its regular runs on the 18th inst., three times a week, by the route via St. John, St. John's, and Fredericton every Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at the same hour.

To the Public.—During the Legislative Session we intend to publish a full sheet semi-weekly, which will contain impartial reports of the debates of both Houses, and as far as possible, of the debates of the Executive Council, of closely printed matter. No extra charges will be made to our subscribers. Non-subscribers to the *Loyalist* will obtain the paper during the publication of the debates (probably about 20 numbers) by forwarding their names to the publishers, accompanied by five shillings in advance; but no such orders will be attended to unless accompanied by the cash or taken from the Post-office under post-paid.—Terms, 12s. 6d. in advance for one year's *LOYALIST*, with extra Nos. containing the debates. Donk & Hill.

THE LOYALIST, AND CONSERVATIVE ADVOCATE.

Vol. 2. FREDERICTON, N. B. MONDAY, MARCH 25, 1844. No. 48.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

THE ELECTION BILL.

Mr. FISHER explained the general principles of the Bill. He said it was the same as that passed by the House at the last session, with one exception, which was amended to meet the objections of the Colonial Secretary. The objection to the Bill of last year, and which had been the subject of much discussion, was that the power given the Speaker to issue his warrant for new elections in certain cases was not satisfactorily defined. He hoped the House would not object to narrow down the Speaker's authority as far as vacating seats of hon. members who accepted seats in the Executive Council was concerned.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said he had no disposition to oppose the Bill, but he arose to point out to the hon. member what he (Mr. H.) considered a defect in the Bill, and which he thought the Speaker, except in certain cases, should not issue his warrant for a new election, until ordered to do so by the House in session; now if a member of that House should be appointed to an office of emolument, under the Crown during a recess, he could not go back to his constituents to be re-elected until the House had met and determined on the same, consequently he would be excluded from the House for one session.

Mr. FISHER said if the hon. and learned member had waited until the Bill was read through he would have found this contingency provided for, as there was a clause which authorized the Speaker to issue a warrant for a new election in case of resignation, and any member appointed to an office under the Crown could tender his resignation. In further explanation of the Bill the hon. member explained the precise nature of Lord Stanley's objection to the Bill as it passed last session; he said His Lordship had no objection to the Bill if the words "or otherwise" were struck out; a suggestion he (Mr. F.) had complied with in the Bill then before the Committee.

Mr. HANINGTON moved that the words "Executive Council" be introduced, so that members accepting offices of emolument, or seats in the Executive Council, should be obliged to go back to their constituents and stand a new election. He said that he interrupted him by saying there was a separate Bill for the settlement of that question likely to come up during the session; if so he (Mr. H.) wished to see it disposed of first.

Mr. PARTELOW would ask the hon. and learned member of the Bill if he had paid any attention to a Registry Bill, for he thought the two should go together, and the absence of any provision for registration was his (Mr. P.) only objection to the Bill last year.

Mr. FISHER said the registration of hon. members was a measure which had been talked of, but as the Bill passed last year without such an appendage he had no doubt but it would do so again. However, hon. members would have an opportunity of passing a measure of the kind before the election was over, for he understood the hon. and learned member for Northumberland was preparing a Bill; but it was an important measure, and would require serious deliberation.

Mr. HILL said that hon. members who opposed the Bill on the ground that it did not provide for registration, did so merely as an excuse; they were opposed to the principles of the Bill. Registration was unnecessary, and the principle of simultaneous elections had been carried out in Canada without it. To have the election concluded in one day instead of a fortnight would save much time and expense to the country, and he thought they should have no hesitation about passing the Bill, whether they had a Registration act or not.

Mr. HANINGTON was still of opinion that Executive Councils should be included in the Bill, and he would make a motion to that effect.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said he could perceive plainly the object the hon. member had in view in making the motion, it was to defeat the Bill. They knew well the Colonial Secretary was a measure which would do them no good, and once already told them such a measure would not be allowed; and already a proviso were introduced into the Bill then before them it would ruin it, for it would never be allowed at home.

Mr. FISHER said he had some doubts whether Lord Stanley would really object to hon. members going back to their constituents when they were appointed to seats in the Executive Council; he thought the hon. member was a little too certain. But that had nothing whatever to do with the Bill then before them; it must rest on its own merits, and stand or fall. But it had passed last year, when hon. members were fresh from the elections, and had just witnessed the events of the present system, and he had no doubt but it would pass again—he had no fears for the result.

Mr. HANINGTON said that before the session closed the measure referred to requiring members to vacate their seats when appointed to the Executive Council would be carried; but he thought it would not do to put both Bills together. He had no doubt but this Bill would pass if it was put as it stood, but he did not know what might be the fate of the other, although he would go for it himself, and he thought it would pass that House.

Mr. HANINGTON was still of opinion that the Executive Councils should be included in this Bill.

Hon. Mr. SIMONDS said he believed the hon. member had given his support to the address to Sir Charles Metcalfe. (Mr. HANINGTON.—Yes.) Then he did not know how the hon. member could move for the Executive Councils to be included in this Bill.—That House had addressed the Governor General in support of the prerogatives of the Crown, and on that ground hon. members had voted for it. Now if the hon. member wished to interfere with the prerogatives of the Crown, let him call to Her Councils whomsoever he pleased, and the motion the hon. member had made was to prevent the free exercise of that prerogative in this Colony; he did not see how he could reconcile the motion with the support he had given to the address. Besides, it was well known that if the Bill contained any such provisions it would not be allowed at home. (Hon. Mr. HANINGTON.—Yes.) Mr. SIMONDS had no interest in the measure, and did not care whether it was carried or not, but he wished the House to be consistent.

Mr. EXO said the hon. member had just sat down wished the Committee to understand that he cared nothing about the affair, and he affected great indifference as well in his manner as in his words; but he (Mr. EXO) did not think the hon. member would have such a speech as he had just done if he was perfectly careless about it. As to the measure before the House he could perceive nothing in it to interfere with the prerogative of the Crown. He had remarked one beautiful sentence in the reply to the address to Sir Charles Metcalfe, which had just been read; it said no true friend of the people would attempt to pull down the prerogative of the Crown, and to this sentiment he (Mr. EXO) fully responded; but he did not think the measure before them would do it. If the Crown wished to appoint members of that House to the Executive, let it do so, but they should then be sent back to their constituents to see whether they approved of the step their representative had taken. Members of that House were elected to serve their constituents, and to look after their interests, and the three branches were intended to be each independent of each other, and he contended that the constituents should have the power to judge how far their interests were compromised by a member of that House accepting a seat in the Executive Council. He would ask hon. members of the Government if Lord John Russell's despatch had ever been carried out in this Province (Mr. WILMOT.—No; and I am very sorry for it.) Is that answer direct or equivocal? If it had not been carried out by (Mr. EXO) was very glad of it.—The hon. member (Mr. WILMOT) would not tell him that manner; he said something before the session was over which would give him occasion to frown, were it not for what had fallen from the hon. and learned member for St. John the other day. He would repeat that he was glad Lord John Russell's despatch had not been carried out, as that despatch provided that all servants of the Government and members of the Executive Council should pay implicit obedience to the commands of their superiors, and yield an unconditional support to Government measures. As to Executive Councils not coming under the rule for vacating seats in certain cases, he contended that no argument had been adduced why members accept-

ing offices of emolument should vacate their seats, which did not apply with equal force to members accepting seats in the Executive Council. (Mr. Parterlow here intimated to the hon. member that he was speaking on a subject which was not before the House; and then informed him how the debate stood.) Mr. End continued and said that having just come in he had supposed from what he had heard of the debate that the Bill relative to Executive Councils vacating their seats was then before the Committee, and it was to that he had spoken. He thought hon. members must have wandered far from their subject to have made the remarks he heard on his entering the House, and the Chairman must have allowed them great latitude. You sir (addressing Mr. Palmer, who was in the Chair) should have called order? (Chairman—"Order!" Much Laughter.) He wished the Chairman had called order before, for he thought they had another Bill before them, and had just then learnt it was the Election Bill; but as he found a motion had been made to introduce a clause to provide for members vacating their seats on accepting seats in the Executive Council, he hoped the motion would not be pressed, because the measure should be kept separate, and not mixed up together. He should go against the Bill then before them on the same ground he had taken last year; he was opposed to simultaneous elections. He should postpone any further remarks on the question of Executive Councils going back to their constituents, until the Bill came up; when he would be prepared to meet the hon. member for York (Mr. WILMOT) either as his looks indicated—in Parliamentary war; or as hon. members of that House should meet each other, when they discussed measures which came before them with a view to the good of the country.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT said that was the way he intended to meet the hon. member when the question came up. He should say nothing now, but when the proper time came the hon. member might depend upon it he would put him on his trial. He would call upon him to prove the constitutionality of the doctrines he advanced.

Mr. J. A. STREET argued in favour of the Bill as it then stood; he said he was in favour of simultaneous elections, as it would not only save time, expense, &c. but would in his opinion prevent quarrelling and riots.

Mr. FISHER in explanation said that by the Bill as it passed last year, the Speaker was endowed with extraordinary powers, but that the Bill as it then stood would reduce his power to its former limits.

Mr. PARTELOW enquired of hon. members of the Government if they were certain that the parts objected to by Lord Stanley had been removed; if this could be shown he was in favour of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. WILMOT showed what were Lord Stanley's objections, and could assure hon. members that the objectionable part had been struck out.

Mr. BORSFORD said he had hoped to have seen a Registration measure introduced with this Bill, as he thought it was needed; but he liked the Bill and would go for it as it was.

The Bill was then agreed to without a division.

Saturday, March 16.

INSOLVENT DEBTOR'S BILL.

Mr. J. A. STREET moved the motion of the Bill explained its general principles. He said it would supersede the necessity for a Bankrupt Act, which that House had recently rejected. It would also assist the poor but honest debtor, for there might be many such in the country who would gladly compromise with their creditors, and whose creditors were generally disposed to compromise with them, but were prevented by others who would not agree to the arrangement, and two or three obstinate creditors could prevent a debtor from settling his affairs, as the law stands at present, for they could not be compelled to enter into any compromise, and if the debtor settled with the others he was liable at any future time to be pounced on by them and everything he possessed sold for their debts. In fact if a debtor could not prevail on all his creditors to become parties to the arrangement he was prepared to make with them, they could prevent him from ever rising again from poverty, notwithstanding his energy or industry. This state of things the Bill he had introduced would prevent, and he could say that it was highly necessary, for as a general thing creditors when they believed the debtor honest, and willing to give up all his effects, were disposed to accept what divided his estate after he had made a full disclosure. And he (Mr. STREET) had found by his professional experience that the Sheriff of the County, when he had hundreds of lawsuits against insolvent debtors, were insisting on a few obdurate individuals. If the Bankrupt Act should not be passed, a debtor who thought this Bill would prove valuable, as there would be no more machinery about it, and individuals would get through with little expense who would otherwise have to go into the Bankruptcy Court. This Bill would empower an insolvent to call a meeting of his creditors, and the Sheriff of the County, when he would produce a statement of his affairs, and deliver up his estate. If three-fourths of the creditors present agreed to his proposal, the same, and acknowledged his insolvency, the others would be obliged to submit, and the debtor would get a discharge, while trustees would be appointed to manage the estate on behalf of the creditors. It was not like the suicidal bankruptcy law that the Bill; they were not new, but similar to those now in use in the Mother Country. If the Committee were disposed to carry out the general principles of the Bill he (Mr. STREET) was prepared to carry out the details, and they could be amended, and the blanks filled up, as the Committee thought proper.

Mr. FISHER said he was in favour of the Bill and hoped it would pass, especially since the Bankrupt Act had been repealed by the House; but he thought hon. members would find that before it went into operation it would be necessary to amend it, and he was very similar to the Bankrupt Bill. There was one provision in this Bill which he thought extremely objectionable; it provided that the debtor should notify all of his creditors to attend the meeting wherein he wished to disclose. Now some of these creditors may be in England, and before they could be duly notified the debtor might be dead, and the effects all taken from him. He had expressed himself to this effect to the hon. member of the Bill in private conversation, and therefore supposed he was prepared to meet the objection. He (Mr. F.) thought if the Bankrupt Act had been retained, a Bill of the nature of the one before them would have been valuable as affording means of relief to the debtor who owed less than £200.

Mr. J. A. STREET said he did not think the hon. and learned member's objection entitled to much consideration; the facilities for communication with England were now very great, and at all events, though difficulties might sometimes occur as to the debtor being sued before he got his discharge, the same difficulty existed with regard to the other courts, and no legislation could avoid it. But how was it at present? why, if only one creditor refused to accept of such terms as might be offered as a compromise, he could sue the debtor at any time, and would suit his convenience. He (Mr. S.) saw no more difficulty in this Bill than the parties were subjected to in notifying the creditors under the bankrupt bill, only it required more time, for under that law the debtor was liable to be sued at any moment before the fiat was issued. This Bill would prevent the insolvent from laying by after he had obtained a discharge, and he would be bound to pay his creditors. He would be induced to call an early meeting of his creditors, and give up all his effects without reserve, as it would depend on his being able to convince the creditors that he had acted fairly and honestly whether they would agree to his discharge or not; it would be an inducement to them to use all like, whereas now they were very apt to pay certain claims before they disclosed the state of their affairs. At this meeting he would secure the property if he had any, to the whole of the creditors, and no man could sue him afterwards.

Mr. FISHER said the Bill would be different in its operation from the Bankrupt Bill in affording time for suits to be instituted against the insolvent, because under the latter a fiat could be obtained in ten days.

Hon. SPEAKER said he really thought the Bill would effect a great improvement, and he would support it as it would relieve poor but honest men.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said it was a very important Bill, and though he felt no hostility against the measure, he wished hon. members might be allowed a little time to consider of it, he hoped they would report progress and order a number of copies printed for the use of the House.

Mr. J. A. STREET said that as two hon. members (Messrs. Hazen and Wilmot) was not at the commencement of the debate, and consequently had not heard his explanation of the Bill; and as the Committee appeared generally to be in favour of the measure, he had no objection to their reporting progress. But as the Bill had been read section by section it was too late to get it printed.—Progress was then reported.

BISHOP'S FUND.

Mr. PARTELOW offered the following resolution:—
Resolved.—As the opinion of this Committee, that although the Hon. the Bishop of the Province of New Brunswick, by his Excellency's Honours of the Province of New Brunswick, last for investing the Fund raised for the endowment of a Bishop, in the Provincial Securities, yet as such investment must necessarily be a permanent one, it is not considered expedient to recommend the same to the House.

Hon. Mr. SIMONDS said he should say but little about the matter, as a former debate he presumed hon. members had generally made up their minds; but he would remind them that £25,000 received in this manner would affect a saving to the Province of £500 a year, and this saving would continue every year until the loan was paid, though it should be fifty years.

Mr. SCULLAR said he was against receiving the money as a loan, but he hoped the hon. member for St. John would not press his resolution in a thin House.

Mr. BORN said the Fund was offered the Province at a great advantage, and people generally would expect them to accept of it; they would soon enquire of them what they have been about, if they borrowed money at 6 per cent and refused money offered them at 4 per cent.—The repayment of the sum would never be expected, they would only be required to pay the interest.

Hon. SPEAKER would ask the Committee what assurance they had that the money could be obtained?—what evidence was there that it would be obtained? He contended that no information before them to that effect; they were not certain that any such fund would ever exist. The money was subscribed, but not yet paid in, and the Colonial Secretary would not take the responsibility upon himself that the fund should be loaned to this Province, neither had they anything before them to say such would be the case; they were legislating in the dark. As for himself he would not go for a permanent loan, and he hoped this view of the case would be taken by every hon. member in the House.

Mr. PARTELOW said that if the hon. members expected to take this Fund as a part of the loan, they were mistaken, for the Bank expected to take the loan would not negotiate for any less sum than that already determined on.

Mr. BARSBERG said he was opposed to saddling the Province with a permanent debt, neither did he want to see Church affairs mixed up with the business of the House. As to the limit which had been thrown out about the Bishop's Fund, in a few years from whence the Fund originated, and cavilling about the amount of the salary, he thought such suspicions were well-founded, for he (Mr. BARSBERG) had already heard hon. members in that House say that £1,000 per annum was too much for the Bishop, as though it was any business of theirs; or as though they would say to Bishop to this Province, and give him what they like.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said hon. members had been talking as though the sum of £35,000 was offered the Province as a loan at four per cent, and that it merely rested with that House to accept or reject it. But such was not the case; all the offer that had been made was in anticipation of money which was to be collected at home. The Lieutenant Governor here had been instructed to enquire what terms they would take it, if they could, but they would give five per cent, they are not certain they would get it. Hon. members treated the matter as though they had nothing to do but pass a resolution and receive the money, but such was not the case.

Mr. W. H. STREET said he did not think they should pass a resolution to say they declined taking the money, as such an answer would not require. His Excellency merely enquiring at what interest they would take it. But they could not wait for it;—proceeding warrants were then at 4 per cent, discount in St. John. Mr. BORN said they need not take the money as a permanent loan; a plan had been proposed that either of the parties who became dissatisfied might give ten years' notice, when the money could not be repaid. But it appeared that hon. members belonging to the Church of England, and who were desirous not to let the Province have the money, although there was no doubt but it could be obtained at four per cent, which was a good bargain.

Mr. BORSFORD said their legislating for the Bishop's Fund, was perfect folly; the money when collected would be placed under the control of the Heads of the Church, and he (Mr. BORSFORD) did not think the Province could obtain it as a loan even if they were to loan interest on a per cent, for it.

Mr. S. DALL said he did not wish to see the affairs of the Province mixed up with Church affairs. If they take the money, it must be taken as a permanent debt, and the Province would be burdened with it perhaps for ever; and on the other hand it would not relieve our present necessities, for if the money could be obtained another year must necessarily pass over before it would be in the hands of the Province.

Mr. GUNTER said he did not think our accepting or rejecting the money would facilitate or prevent the coming of the Bishop, but he was opposed to a permanent debt which would be found oppressive on posterity.

Mr. J. A. STREET said that when he had spoken on the subject before he was in favour of accepting the money, under the impression that His Excellency had authority to make the offer; but (Mr. HAZEN) he was now undeceived, and found that the Lieut. Governor was not authorized to close a bargain with them; in fact that no distinct offer had been made. Under these circumstances he thought they should pass no resolution at all on the subject.—He (Mr. STREET) would be glad to take the money when it came, and therefore thought the House should not pass their veto upon it by saying they would not take it, as that would tie their hands with respect to the future. He would offer an amendment to the resolution then before them, to the effect that as no offer had been made, they should pass no resolution on the subject, and they should leave the question open for them to legislate on at a future time.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN would ask if it was worth their while to pass a resolution that they should not pass a resolution! He thought they had better withdraw all the resolutions and say nothing about the subject.

Mr. J. A. STREET said that the resolution offered by the hon. member for the County of St. John (Mr. Parterlow) was before the House, and they must all vote for or against it when the question was taken. He (Mr. S.) could not vote for it, and if he voted against it as it stood his vote might be misconstrued; for he did not want to vote either for or against the money, but only wish for no action to be taken by the House because there was no offer before them.—The amendment was then put and negatived; when the original resolution was carried by a division of 15 to 10.

Monday, March 18.

INDIAN RESERVES.

Mr. J. A. STREET opened the debate as the mover of this Bill, and went into a general explanation of its provisions. He said the Bill provided that a portion of the Indian reserves should be sold, and the proceeds appropriated to the use of the Indians; small tracts were to be reserved and added into lots, for those of the tribes who were so inclined to settle on, but he did not intend they should receive deeds of these lands immediately; they should first be located by tickets from the Commissioners, and when they had resided thereon for some years and given evidence that they would become permanent settlers, then they should receive title deeds. By this course he thought the Indians would be encouraged to settle. In past times no one had power to sell any of the Indian Reserves, and they had been blocking up the country; under these circumstances settlers had lessened portions of the lands from the Indians, and he (Mr. S.) thought it desirable they should be protected. He thought the lands so settled on should be sold and the purchaser be obliged to pay for the improvements; by this means the Indians would be little doubt but they would be generally bought in by the actual settlers. This would be doing justice to them, and at the same time would secure to the Indians the value of their lands.—The Commissioners must be allowed a certain percentage for their trouble, and the balance of all monies arising from the sales would be paid into the Provincial Treasury for the Indian's use; and an account must accompany the said monies showing what lands the money had been received, and what the Commissioners were to be remunerated, expenses, &c. These funds should be kept separate, such as belonging to the tribe to which the reserve belonged, as the Indians on the side of the Province belonged to the Micmac tribe, while those on South side of the Province belonged to the Miikie tribe; and they held nothing in common; he contended therefore that the reserves on the north side of the Province belonged to the Micmacs, while those on the south side belonged to the Miikies, and that the funds arising from their sale should be kept for the tribes respectively. The Bill provided for this, and the proceeds of the sales would be paid to the tribes annually; this would encourage them to industry, as it might be paid to them in such a manner as would stimulate them to the cultivation of land—in the productive than they are at present, and the Indians would reap the benefit of it; and the aged, infirm, &c. would receive relief from the fund. These were the general principles of the Bill; it was to make their lands productive, and encourage them to settle. As to their education he had not thought proper to introduce any scheme in the Bill, as he believed money expended for that object could be thrown away. He had read the work of a very able American writer, who was well acquainted with the tribes in the United States; in which the writer clearly expresses the utility of attempting to educate the Indians by means of schools. There were a few Indians in that country partially educated, but this had been effected by the Jesuits who had been among them. He (Mr. STREET) considered appropriating money for schools would be worse than useless, and in the Bill then before the Committee he had not provided for a penny to be expended in that manner.—Perhaps the details of the Bill would not meet the views of hon. members, and he should be glad to have their assistance in amending any thing which might be considered incongruous; but he thought the general principles of the Bill must meet the views of every hon. member in the House, for it was allowed by all that something should be done, and it was also recommended in His Excellency's speech at the opening of the Session.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said he did not intend to follow the hon. member through the whole Bill; he should leave that for other hon. members to do, who were better qualified. By looking over documents then before him he found that there were Indian Reserves in Kent, Northumberland, Gloucester, and Carleton, while in the other eight Counties of the Province, with the exception of a small island in the County of St. John, there was no reserve. In the County of Northumberland there were 32,000 acres of Indian Reserves; in Kent 8,000; in Gloucester 4,000; and in Carleton 16,000; but according to the hon. member's Bill the lands of Government were to be reserved for no matter what might be the wants of the Indians in the other Counties, the fund being reserved for the Indians who resided in the other Counties, and the fund was to be applied for the exclusive use of those who lived in the four Counties where the reserves lay. He (Mr. HAZEN) thought this principle could not be sustained. The lands in Northumberland had been reserved for the use of John Julian and his tribe, but he had not been exclusive right to it. Government had asked for more power, but it was to be used to the relief of the Indians in four counties while all the rest were to be neglected. The Indians had no title whatever to these reserves; the title was held by the Crown and for the benefit of all. He contended that the products of the sales should form one common fund, which Government should be empowered to apply for the use of all the Indians in the Province; and if there should exist any peculiar claims he had no doubt but Government would give them their rights. He had no doubt hon. members from the four Counties where the reserves lay would go for the Bill (Mr. END—how do you know?) but the fund should be placed in the hands of Government for the benefit of all.

Mr. EXO said he should disappoint the expectations of the hon. member for St. John. The Indians were all the same as one brother, and he would be held equally for the benefit of all. He would not support the Bill as it then stood.

Mr. FISHER said the reserves in the condition they are at present were no good. He wished to see the lands disposed of in some shape or other, and not let them remain in large useless blocks retarding the settlement of the country. The next consideration was what should be done with the fund? For his part he thought they should tie down the hands of the Government by the Bill then before them. There might be those who were here when the reserves were made, and if such was the case they had no right to participate in any benefit which might accrue from the same; but this is a matter which should be left to the discretion of the Executive. He (Mr. FISHER) was in favour of reserving all the reserved lands the Indians had no local claims, as the land had been reserved for the benefit of all the Indians who were at that time residing in the Province, or their descendants, and should be sold and the interest arising from the fund be appropriated for their use. But he would not go for that part of the Bill which would compel the Executive to attend to their physical, and neglect their moral, improvement. Though their efforts had been hitherto in vain in that respect, he thought the time had not far distant when a great moral reformation might be wrought among them. He was opposed to the local machinery introduced in the Bill; let the Governor General sell the lands, and let the fund be entrusted to the safe-keeping of the Executive.

Hon. Mr. SIMONDS agreed with the remarks which had fallen from the hon. member from the City (Mr. HAZEN). But there was another objection; by the provisions of the Bill they would be excluded from any appropriation being made for their education. He would ask what were the reserved lands for? they were not reserved for the purpose of making roads, because the Indians did not want them; they were not reserved for the purpose of clothing or feeding them, because that would take away the only stimulus they had to industry, and make them lazy. Surely he thought a part of the proceeds should be applied for the purpose of education; for though but little had yet been accomplished, more he thought might yet be done. He thought the fund should be applied according to circumstances as they might arise; experimental schools might be established, &c. He did go for the fund being applied for the benefit of all the Indians in the Province. He did not like legislation for local claims—they always had too much of that feeling in the House. He thought there should be placed in the hands of Government without restrictions, to be expended as it might think proper for the benefit of the Indians.

Col. ALLEN said he did not think it necessary to make any provision for the Indians settling on lands; they cultivated but a very small portion, and planted but little, and even that they did not take care of. But there were many who, not being able to purchase their own protection, had lessened them from the Indians, and he thought they required protection.

Hon. SPEAKER said the lands were injurious to the Counties in which they were reserved, as they retarded the settlement of the country very much. He thought something should be done without any further delay; it was of no use to say the Executive possessed the power to dispose of the lands, for if it had it would not be on the subject, but still nothing was done. The lands were no good to the Indians as they were, for they would never cultivate them; they planted small potatoes, but they did not fence it, and

The LOYALIST will be published, during the sittings of the Legislature, every Tuesday and Friday.

Subscribers in St. John and Portland will be furnished with copies—free of postage—by leaving their names with either of the agents.

Agents and others forwarding the names of subscribers to this paper, are requested to notice that for the future no subscription will be received for less than one year.

As the LOYALIST is circulated in St. John free of postage by carrier-bays, should any subscriber not receive his paper regularly he will please notify the agent to that effect.