

the cattle came and destroyed it. If at any time the House addressed the Government on the subject the Indians arose in a body and petitioned Government not to break up the reserves. The hon. member for Northumberland had prepared a Bill which had cost him much trouble, and he (hon. Speaker) would go for something of the kind. He thought Government should set off the sites for the Indian Villages in small lots on which they might settle, and sell the rest and let the proceeds form a fund; this would be impossible to reclaim their wandering habits. As to their education he thought much could not be done, although they might effect something. There was a school established for their children in the County of Kent at which several attended; they were rather wild at first, but after a time made considerable progress. The Indians in this Province were not so numerous as they were when the reserves were set apart, they had decreased about one half during the last eighteen years. They suffer much by exposure, drinking ardent spirits, &c., they were unfortunately ever ready to adopt the vices of the whites whenever they came in contact with them, but their virtues they neglected. He did not think any appropriation from the fund would be necessary in affording them medical aid, for the old Squaws were skilful, and in most cases superseded the necessity of regular medical practitioners; but nothing appeared likely to prevent their further decrease, and he had no doubt but they would decrease thirty per cent. during the next ten years. The lands as matters stood were being denuded of their timber, and they were receiving no benefit from it. He thought probably the Bill would not pass as it was, but it would be amended in any point which might be found necessary when they went into details. As to the management of the fund he thought it should be left to the discretion of the Executive. It would do the Indians good to break up the reserves, as it would have the effect of confining them to small space, where they would have an inducement to cultivate land, and fence it.

Mr. Brown thought before they pass this bill to sell the Indian reserves they had better look nearer home. These were large blocks of lands scattered through the Province—and some of it the very best land in the Province—who had been granted to individuals, and remaining uncultivated retarded the settlement of the country. This he thought was one of the principal reasons why the Americans had got along better than we have, for there every facility was afforded to settlers, while here a great part of our very best lands are locked up. Of course the Indian Reserves formed a part of those blocks, and their settlement would afford some relief. (He Mr. B. feared the Indians in this Province were not so easily reformed as some of the Indians in Canada; he had lately fallen in with a work wherein a traveller had given a description of a settlement of the Six Nation Indians in Upper Canada, an extract from which he would read. (Here the hon. member read a description of the Indian settlement, Township of Brandt, on the Grand River, Canada West.) He feared our Indians would never be civilized in this manner.

Hon. Mr. Wilton said he had heard no hon. member answer his hon. and learned colleague (Mr. Fisher.) When the lands were reserved the title was not vested in the Indians, but in the Crown, but what were the reserves for? did hon. members believe they were reserved for the Indians to settle on? No; but the large blocks were reserved as hunting grounds, and the smaller ones as fishing grounds. In the County of Northumberland there were nearly 33,000 acres reserved, while the Indians in that County were rapidly decreasing; now suppose they decrease until there is but twenty or thirty in the County, would they be entitled to the whole of the 33,000 acres, or to the whole of the profits arising therefrom? He (Mr. Wilton) had been informed that some of the Indians drew large sums from these lands; he had been informed that an Indian Chief in the County of Northumberland drew an annual income of £200 for rent from the lands ("No!" from Messrs. Rankin and J. A. Street.) Well, the hon. members might be correct, but he had received his information from very good authority. He had heard also that the Whites had got possession of the most valuable of the reserves in that County, and he would go for a measure which should compel them to give it up. As to the lands in Northumberland reserved for the Indians residing in that county, he found by reference to public documents that one block of 3,000 acres was reserved for John Julian and his tribe; but next he found a block of 10,000 acres which were merely said to be reserved for the Indians. Now he would ask hon. members if they thought that block had also been reserved for John Julian? No; although the reserves were worded differently, it was evident they were intended for the benefit of all the Indians in the Province; they were intended as much for the benefit of others as they were for John Julian, although being a Chief his name was mentioned. He was perfectly willing to give the Indians all the lands they required for fishing grounds, and as much as they would be likely to cultivate, and dispose of the rest for the benefit of them all. The infirm and indigent could be relieved from the fund, and a part might be appropriated for educational purposes; for although any efforts were made for the purpose have been hitherto futile, he thought they should not yet despair. He would warn hon. members against passing the bill as it stood, for it was as the Lieutenant Governor would not be able to give his assent to.

Mr. J. A. STREET said the hon. member of the government says the governor will not give his assent to the Bill if it passes the House, but he did not state his reasons why. It was a common practice for hon. members of the House to come down to that House and tell them it was of no use for them to pass this or that bill, because the governor would not yield his assent! Now he (Mr. S.) thought there was too much of this—that it looked like intimidation, and he hoped the House would go on and legislate without asking themselves whether or not it would meet the views of the Executive; they should pay no attention to these threats. The hon. and learned member for the City of St. John had waxed warm on the subject, and treated the bill as an absurdity; he had also said he supposed all the hon. members from Northumberland, Kent, Gloucester, and Carleton, would go for the bill. He supposed the hon. member had judged them from his own motives, and as he opposed the bill because there was only about 15 acres of reserves in the Co. St. John, so he thought the hon. members from the counties he had enumerated would support the bill because there were large reserves in their respective counties. But the seventh member from St. John was also against the bill. It was admitted on all sides that the measure was necessary to a certain extent, and he would endeavour to justify the details. The Micmac tribe inhabited the northern part of the Province, and they were much more numerous than the Miclicet tribe who resided in the south; well, the reserves were much more extensive in the north than in the south; it was conclusive therefore that government when it reserved these lands did so with the intention that those in the north should be for the Micmacs, and those in the south for the benefit of the Miclicets. This was also perfectly understood by the Indians themselves, and if a Miclicet should go over to the north of the Province and attempt to settle on any of the reserves in that quarter, he would certainly be driven off. Or if the lands were sold and the proceeds of the reserves at the north, or any portion of it, be appropriated for the use of the Miclicets, it would create a hostile feeling between the races, and occasion for the future jealousy and sectional feeling among them, which it would be judicious to avoid. They were very exclusive with reserves to each other, holding but little intercourse, and considered the land on the other side of the Province as belonging to the Micmac tribe. He (Mr. S.) had no doubt but if the Miclicets were to go over there and settle on this land but they would be driven off, and that war between would be the result. He was not wedded to the details of the bill, provided its general principles were carried out; but he wished to do justice to the Indians; and let them do what ever they would they (the Indians) were sufficiently shrewd to understand it, and would soon know the whole.

Hon. Mr. Hazen said that he had applied the term *unjust* to the Bill, but that when he made use of the term "absurd" it was not in debate, but in reply to the hon. member's colleague (Mr. Rankin) who had crossed the House to convert him (Mr. H.) to his own way of thinking. As to the term "unjust" he would repeat it! Who, he would ask, were John Julian's descendants? Where could they be found? Would hon. members say the tribe now located in Northumberland were the descendants of John Julian? Why they might as well try to trace the genealogy of a flock of partridges! (Much Laughter.) They were crossed with white, black and red! They might close to call themselves descendants of John Julian and his contemporaries, but who knew they were so? He could ask the hon. member again where he could find John Julian's heirs at law? The hon. member had said that if the lands were divided among them they would fight with each other; well, let them fight, it would not affect us. But suppose some of those Indians in the counties where the reserves lay, should immigrate to other parts of the Province, they might die of starvation, and yet according to the bill the Governor's hands would be tied up, and he would not be empowered to afford them any relief.

Mr. Esq said that although the hon. members of the Committee had thought proper to return thanks to the hon. mover of the bill for introducing it, he (Mr. Esq) thought he was not divested of all local feelings on the subject. He (Mr. Street) had made allusions

to him as being the seventh member from St. John, but he (Mr. Esq) could look after the interests of his constituents in that House as well as though he resided in the County, and he did not think the smoke of St. John would influence him to the contrary. But though the hon. mover might deserve thanks for his labour, he (Mr. Esq) did not think he deserved much, for labour was nothing to him; they might apply the words of the Cook to him, who was scolded by his mistress for skinning eels alive; when asked why she did so she replied "Oh! madam, they *likes* it!" It was with the hon. member for Northumberland, he *likes* labour! (Laughter.) With regard to the bill he found that in the County of Northumberland the Indian Reserves amounts to 32,408 acres, while the Indians in the County amount to but 402; now, he would ask if the hon. member contended that these 402 Indians should divide betwixt them thirty-two thousand acres of land, while the Indians in Westmorland and other Counties get nothing! The Indians in the northern parts of the Province were all Micmacs, and he thought they should be all participants in the benefit to be derived from the lands, and should not be subdivided. But the Miclicets were a different tribe, and he thought the funds of the two tribes should be kept separate.

Mr. J. A. STREET arose to explain: he never intended to make any subdivision of a tribe, but to appropriate the funds arising from the reserves in the north of the Province to the use of the Micmacs, and the reserves in the south to the use of the Miclicets. If hon. members thought differently they had misunderstood him. As to hon. members of the Government interfering with the debate by saying the Royal assent would be withheld, he thought it looked like intimidation, and was altogether unparliamentary.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said if he had misunderstood the hon. member, he had not misunderstood the Bill, for he had been guided by that, which expressly said "Counties." As to the members of Government they never intended to intimidate any one in that House, but when a measure came before the House which was such as they knew the Governor could not consent to without disobeying his instructions, the members of the Executive had a right to say so.

It was then moved that the Committee report progress, which was agreed to.

Tuesday, March 19.

Hon. SPEAKER said the Bill relating to the streets and highways in the town of Fredericton was returned from the Council amended, and asked what it was the pleasure of the House should be done with the same.

Mr. FISHER asked what was the Parliamentary rule in such case.

Hon. SPEAKER said the Council had a right to amend it so long as they did not interfere with the assessment or expenditure; they had a right to make what amendments they chose in a bill so long as it did not affect money matters.

Mr. FISHER said the amendments did interfere very materially with the money interests of the bill, and must in consequence be lost. He (Mr. Fisher) had ever done his best to pass local measures for the benefit of Fredericton, but they were always thrown out by the Council; it was impossible to get the most insignificant parish bill through the upper House. In the present case they had interfered with the side-walks in opposition to the wishes of those who were directly concerned.

INSOLVENT DEBTOR'S BILL.

Mr. J. A. STREET offered some amendments with regard to the phraseology of the Bill. He then observed in further explanation of the measure that the meeting of creditors was to be held before the sheriff, and that if the claims of any creditor were disputed by the debtor, it would be left to the decision of the sheriff.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said there was certainly a radical defect in the Bill. He would ask how the sheriff could be expected to decide in an intricate case whether the claims of the creditor were valid or not? There might be cases come before him which would puzzle the best lawyer in the land. They would come before the sheriff and counsel would say to the sheriff "you owe me so much, and another so much, &c. which perhaps the debtor would deny; how then could the sheriff be expected to give a summary decision? He was not opposed to the bill, but merely threw this out for consideration.

Mr. FISHER said he agreed with the objection which had been started by the hon. and learned member for St. John. The result would be law-suits, and then who would pay the cost? The creditor would of course say it should be paid out of the estate.

Mr. J. A. STREET said he could not see the force of the objection. It was not a question of law, but of fact; it was impossible to legislate for no claim could be determined without an action at law. The bill was merely to afford relief to the poor but honest debtor; it enabled him to call a meeting of his creditors and give up to them his property, if he had any; he would then say "there, gentlemen, you have got the whole," and if three fifths of them agreed they would give him a discharge. If there were claims brought forward at this meeting which the other creditors might think were not just, the sheriff would adjust the same would be in the hands of the trustee, who would take the advice of the creditors whether he should defend such action as might be brought, or admit the claims. It was impossible to face a creditor to submit his demands to arbitration. But if three-fifths of the creditors agreed they would give the debtor a discharge, and he would have no more to do with it. As to the cost, it would of course have to be paid by the loser, and if the trustee should be instructed to contest a claim, and failed, the cost would have to be paid by the estate.

Mr. FISHER said he understood at last. It was intended that at the meeting of creditors the sheriff should have the power to adjudicate on the claims merely for the purposes of that meeting,—to say who were the three-fifths. (Mr. Street—That is precisely what I meant.)

Some further objections were then pointed with regard to the phraseology of the bill, in consequence of which the Committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. HILL offered a resolution that a humble address be presented His Excellency praying him to collect such information as was in his power respecting the financial affairs of the Province, and transmit the same to the House as soon as possible after the next meeting of the Legislature.

Mr. Esq said he should oppose the resolution; he saw no necessity for it. He was extremely jealous of the rights of the House, and not the less so when he saw where the resolution had originated. Attempts had been made before to interfere with the rights of that House as being the constitutional guardians of the public chest, and he looked upon this as a left-handed measure to effect the same object—an entering wedge which if once admitted would be driven further. He suspected the hon. member who had moved the resolution, and yet offered an amendment to the effect that the House wanted no information on the subject.

Mr. PARTELOW said the resolution was not needed, neither was the amendment. He would move an amendment to the amendment, that the House feel confident all necessary information will be laid before them without an address.

Mr. S. EARLE spoke against the resolution, he thought it altogether uncalculated for.

Hon. Mr. STREET said the resolution was unnecessary, for it was the duty of the government to lay before the House such information as was within its power whether it be called for by an address or not. For his part he felt quite careless about the resolution, as he considered it quite immaterial whether it passed or not.

Mr. Esq said he considered it an indirect method of undermining the privileges of the House. It was time, he thought, to protect their privileges, or what with Executive influence, Judges, &c. they would have none left. Libellors who were committed by the House were freed by the interference of a Judge, and he thought the time was come when they should be jealous of any thing likely to affect the privileges of the House.

Mr. FISHER said it was quite unnecessary for the hon. member to work himself up to that state of excitement he appeared to be in. He was not in the least in a hurry to pass the resolution, and he would not be in a hurry to give up the Executive the initiation of money grants. His (Mr. F's) opinion on that subject were well known, if he should ever move in that direction he would do so openly; he would be no party to left-handed work. But there was nothing of the kind in the resolution offered, as any one could perceive who understood plain English.

Hon. Mr. STREET said the hon. member for Gloucester seemed to direct his remarks to him; but he would accept the challenge and meet him whenever the proper time came. As to their privileges there was nothing in the resolution likely to affect them; it was merely asking for information respecting the financial affairs of the Province, precisely of the nature with what had been sent down during the present session, and which he then held in his hand. It was an address from the treasury showing the present state of their financial affairs.

Mr. Esq said he was ready to meet the hon. and learned member for York at any time—he would not be frownd down. As to the document which had been sent down during the present session, this was the first time he had seen or heard of it; he did not

know where it could have been kept—hon. members on the other side of the House had kept it among them.

Mr. PARTELOW said it was unjust for the hon. member to taunt them with not having seen the document from the Treasury, while it was secreted on one side of the House, and hon. members kept it locked up in their drawers. At all events this was the first time he had ever heard of it. As for the resolution it was not wanted at all.

Hon. Mr. HAZEN said he deprecated the senseless debate that had taken up the time of the House nearly two hours; it was all uncalculated for. As to the document hon. members expressed their ignorance of it, they would refer to the journals they would find it duly recorded as having been brought down in a message from his Excellency by the hon. and learned member for York, (Mr. Wilton). It was then as a matter of course laid on the Clerk's Table, where hon. members who wished to see it could have found it; or if it could not be found there the Clerk was accountable for it.

Mr. WANK said the document in question had been in the House for some time passing from one to another; it had also been in the Committee room, where he (Mr. Wank) found it the evening before and bringing it therefrom among some of his private papers he had accidentally put it in his drawer; but with no intention to secrete it.

Mr. HILL said the resolution was necessary, for though government might be disposed to give all the information required, after the reception one of its voluntary documents met with last year it was uncertain how far the Government would act in the case again, unless in answer to an address. As to the suspicions of the hon. member for Gloucester, he (Mr. Hill) had no object in view but what was stated in plain terms in the resolution.

The question was then taken on the amendment to the amendment, which was negatived; the question was next taken on the amendment, which was also negatived. On the question being then put for the original resolution, it was negatived by a division of 16 to 14.

Mr. Brown from a Select Committee appointed to take into consideration certain petitions praying for relief in consideration of sums forfeited in the purchase of Crown Lands, said the committee had prepared a report which he read; and which was to the effect that purchasers of blocks of land exceeding 500 acres, since the beginning of the year 1833, who have only paid a portion of their purchase money, be allowed to have land at the price of their original purchases, to the extent of their several payments. This report he followed up by a resolution instructing the Executive to carry out the report. After a brief debate this resolution was carried by a division of 16 to 14.

Wednesday, March 20.

This day was occupied chiefly by a debate on a bill introduced by the hon. Mr. Wilton for the consolidation of the Revenue Departments. The principal objections urged against the Bill were that the Province had no power to compel the officers of her Majesty's Customs to collect the Provincial Revenue; especially as the hon. mover of the bill contended that they should perform that duty without any further remuneration. We are unable to publish the debates on this measure, having a press of other and more interesting matter on hand. After several hours' discussion the Bill was rejected by a majority of 22 to 9.

The Bill for the relief of insolvent debtors was finally passed on this day, and ordered to be engrossed.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, March 14.

His honor the President took the Chair at half past 12 o'clock. The Journals of the preceding day having been read at the Clerk's Table, the following members were present.—Hon. President, Messrs. Shore, Cunard, Saunders, Robinson, Saunders, Botsford, Attorney General, Chandler, Street, Wier, Hatch, Kinneir, Johnston, Crane, Owen and Minchin.

The house went into a committee of the whole in consideration of a Bill to authorise the Justices of the Peace for the City and County of St. John, to levy an assessment to pay certain debts due by the said City and County.—Hon. Mr. Cunard in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. KINNEAR said this Bill was the same as the one that had been before the lower house, with the exception that, this Bill went only for £3000 while that before the lower Branch went for £4000. The county was in debt, a great part of the debt had arisen in consequence of several public buildings that have been built within a few years, such as the Penitentiary, the New Jail, and Court House, and it was absolutely necessary that a sum of money should be borrowed, and that the Magistrates should have the power to levy an annual assessment for its liquidation. The Magistrates had not the power to make such assessments, without an act of the Legislature. It was said by some that the corporation should pay the debts. As for that it was in a state of bankruptcy, so far that its property was in the hands of Trustees. The money must be had in some way, as there was money due private individuals, who were much in want of their pay, and thought it extremely hard to be kept out of it so long. He would not say further as there could be but one opinion as to the necessity of the bill passing.

On motion of the hon. Mr. Kinneir the Chairman left the chair, and reported the bill as agreed to without amendment. The house went into a Committee of the whole in the further consideration of a bill relating to a legal tender.—Hon. Col. Shore in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. KINNEAR said there was a difference in the report and the Canada act, as regards the English Crown, making it 6s. while the Canada act by fixing it at 6s. 1d. made it equal in value with the sovereign. The Canada act limits British silver to be a legal tender to fifty shillings; by adopting this view it would be more certain of meeting the views of Lord Stanley, who considered by the bill sent home last year that the currency had not been correctly reckoned. As regards the dollar he did not apprehend any difficulty in increasing it to 5s. 1d. for that would not then be above its real value, for it is generally admitted to be worth that in Canada it passes for 5s. 1d.

Hon. Mr. CUNARD thought the reason why the dollars had all disappeared out of the Country was, that they were established by law to be worth no more than 5s. Establishing the crown at 6s. was a higher rate than the dollar at 5s. 1d., he should go for the dollar at 5s. 1d. and the sovereign at 24s. 4d. although he was not so anxious about the dollar at 5s. 1d., as the sovereign at 24s. 4d.

Hon. Mr. CRANE said it seemed to be admitted on all hands that coin should be established at as high a rate in this Province as in the United States, and if such was the case he thought the Spanish dollar should be fixed at 5s. 1d. to make it equal to the sovereign at 24s. 4d. which is about the worth of those coins in the United States, and by giving such information to the Home Government, Lord Stanley will understand why it is so. He knew that dollars were generally sought for as a remittance to the U. States—Spanish dollars were an article of trade in the United States and would frequently bring one dollar and three cents. With reference to our own coin he considered they should make it as near as possible in value to what it was worth in the United States, and also convince Lord Stanley that they Legislated correctly.

Hon. Mr. HATCH said it appeared to him they should be very cautious how they meddled with the dollar, the reason why the Spanish dollar was not in circulation was because they were not made now, when Spain held the Colonies then they were in circulation because a great many of them were made. One of the reasons why he considered they should not establish the dollar at 5s. 1d. was, because they could not carry out the aliquot parts. He thought the dollar should remain as it was at 5s., as to the sovereign that was very different it would now pass from hand to hand for five dollars, and would go with the bill to establish it as a legal tender at 24s. 4d. He wished the rate of gold to be established as near as possible to what it would bring in the United States.

Hon. Mr. CHANDLER thought they should not meddle with the dollar because they would be infringing upon private rights; for instance a person holding an office under government might receive his pay in dollars above their real value. It would not effect him as he had never received a salary from government and never expected to. As to the sovereign that was

very different and he would be willing to establish that at 24s. 4d. He thought if they meddled with the dollar the bill would be lost below, and hoped hon. members would confine themselves to the sovereign. If the dollar was established at 5s. 1d. the half dollar would be 2s. 6 1-2d. and the quarter dollar 1s. 4d. and so on, and it would be impossible as had been, observed by an hon. member, to carry out the aliquot parts.

Hon. Mr. CUNARD was not perturbed about raising the dollar to 5s. 1d. dollars were not the current circulation in the United States, but paper, and if you want dollars you must go to the brokers and buy them, as they were at a premium there and an article of trade.

Hon. Mr. STREET would be against legislating as to the dollar altogether, and thought they should confine themselves to British money only, the dollars were raised some years ago, and what was the consequence? He would inform hon. members that it caused serious losses to many individuals. As regards the sovereign he would be willing to establish that at 24s. 4d. and the crown at 6s. If dollars were fixed at 5s. 1d. each, 4 dollars and 84 cents in silver would pass for more than 4 dollars and 84 cents in gold—it was a difficult and dangerous subject to legislate upon. He had received information from Canada and was informed that the act, as far as it related to the dollar at 5s. 1d. did not work well at all, and they were very anxious to have it altered. He had conversed with some gentlemen from St. John and they told him by no means to take the Canada act for a guide.

Hon. Mr. BLACK would be for raising the dollar to 5s. 1d. and the sovereign 24s. 4d. because they were worth that in the U. States and in Canada, and that might be the means of keeping them in the country.

Hon. Mr. KINNEAR said they could not purchase a lot of dollars in the United States now at 5s. 1d. each, and for that reason he thought they should be raised; and Lord Stanley would see the necessity of passing the bill.

Hon. Col. WYER would go for the dollar at 5s. 1d. and the sovereign 24s. 4d.

Hon. Mr. OWEN thought the dollar was really worth 5s. 1d. and the sovereign 24s. 4d. and should vote for them being established at that.

On Motion of the hon. Mr. Chandler the Chairman left the chair and reported progress and asked leave to sit again. The House adjourned till 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Friday, March 15.

His hon. the President took the Chair at half past 12 o'clock. The Journals of the preceding day having been read at the Clerk's Table. The following members were present.—Hon. President, hon. Messrs. Shore, Cunard, Robinson, Saunders, Botsford, Attorney General, Chandler, Street, Wier, Hatch, Kinneir, Johnston, Crane, Owen, and Minchin.

The house went into Committee of the whole in further consideration of a Bill relating to a legal tender in this Province. Hon. Mr. CUNARD in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. JOHNSTON said the Committee who had been appointed to report on the Bill, had agreed that Gold and Silver Coin should be received as a legal tender at the following rates; viz.—Sovereign 24s. 4d., English Crown 6s., Spanish Milled Central States of America, United States of America, and Mexican Dollars 6s. 1d. each, Half Dollars 2s. 6 1-2d., Quarter do. 1s. 3d., One Eighth do. 7 1-2d., One sixteenth do. 3 1-2d.

Hon. Mr. BOTSFORD said he had no doubt but that the subject had been fully discussed when in Committee yesterday; but as he was not present he was not aware what their honors opinions were on the subject. He considered it was one of the most absurd Bills that had ever come before that house, to establish the current value of a dollar above its real worth. A dollar was known to be five shillings throughout the world. To imagine that it would be the means of bringing dollars into the Country was a fallacious argument. As to the sovereign and some other coins he would not say much about; and as he considered that matter had been agreed to yesterday he would not make a speech.

Hon. Mr. JOHNSTON said that the dollar was really worth 5s. 1d. and moved that the Chairman leave the Chair and report the Bill as agreed to with the amendments.—Agreed.

The house went into a Committee of the whole in the further consideration of a Bill to repeal the Bankrupt Law.

Hon. Col. SHORE in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. KINNEAR said, in 1840 and previous to that time there was a very great call for a Bankrupt Law, to protect the debtor and creditor. He considered the creditor in England or in any other country should be protected, as well as the creditor in the Province. Previous to the Bankrupt Act passing, the English creditor was totally unprotected, when a person became insolvent in the Province, their property was generally put into the hands of Trustees, and the whole of the proceeds, after the expenses were paid for settling up the estate, went to pay the creditors in the Province, and the English creditors got nothing; and for this purpose, in order to do justice to the English creditor, it was found absolutely necessary to have a Bankrupt Law. In 1841 a Bankrupt Bill was brought in the Lower house by Mr. Partelow, and passed. It came up into this house and it took about a week to make certain amendments, and the Bill was lost. He (the hon. Mr. Kinneir) and the hon. Solicitor General, agreed to take up the matter the next autumn in St. John, when he (the hon. Mr. Street) would be down to attend Court, and take the advice of the Chamber of Commerce on the subject, to ascertain what kind of a law would answer the best purpose. When he (the hon. Mr. Street) did come down, he was so engaged with the business of the Court that it was not attended to at the time. In 1842 he (the hon. Mr. Kinneir) and Mr. End prepared a Bill; after they had got through with it they directed a letter to the Chamber of Commerce requesting that body to attend and give their advice on the subject. Many of them attended the meeting, and they considered it of great importance to have a Bankrupt Law. It was considered by many persons that he and Mr. End got £34 for their services in preparing the Bill; but he wished the Country to know that was not the case, all they ever received was five guineas each; the rest of the £34 went to pay the printing and other necessary expenses. Through the influence of an hon. member, who is not now in his place, the first Bankrupt Bill was lost. The first Bankrupt Bill that passed into a Law no person could take the benefit of it unless he owed £500, and had the consent of three fourths of his creditors. In 1843 amendments were made to it, and reducing the amount to £200, and giving the debtor the power of declaring himself a bankrupt. At the close of the session the Governor mentioned the act in his speech, and considered it one of great importance to the Country; he thought the present Bankrupt Law might be amended and make the amount £500, and improve the Insolvent Debtor's Act, to relieve persons who were insolvent in a more summary way, from £500 downwards.

They have a Bankrupt Law in Canada since 1839 which appears to work very well; he thought it very probable the reason why they had no Bankrupt Law in Nova Scotia was, that they had occupied so much of their time in discussing the principles of responsible Government, and had not time to attend to the wants of the people; he considered it would be very wrong to repeal the present Bankrupt Law, without giving it a fair trial. It had taken a great deal of time, and it cost a great deal to get it into operation, in fact it had not been into operation as long as they were in making it. If they did repeal it, it would be putting themselves on a par with some of the most disgraceful acts in the United States, where they passed a Bankrupt Law in one year and repealed it in the next. He was not surprised that so many had taken the advantage of it, for that was expected at the time it passed into a law, on account of the great depression in trade; and in St. John there had been two or three calamitous fires, which had