

I was boarding at the time. While there, he entered into conversation, during which he told me he wished to get some land for a son or two of his. I told him he would call at my office next morning. I would introduce him to Mr. Inghes, who would give him all the information he desired. He came down, and we went into the Crown Land Office. I introduced him to Mr. Inghes, who showed him the plan of the land, and told him that he was to give him all the information he desired. I think Mr. Inghes made him a little plan, such as are frequently made in the office, showing the lands that were open, and those taken up. I don't know whether he made any applications or not. After he returned to St. John, he wrote me, that he had been making some enquiries, and that a number of persons in St. John wished to apply. He asked me to send him a number of blank applications to put the names in. This was in 1857. I got about twenty blank forms from Mr. Inghes. I forwarded them to him, at his request. He returned them to me, I think, to land into the Crown Land Office. I think I took them in, and left them with Mr. Inghes. I do not recollect distinctly now. I wrote Perkins at the time, that the conditions of the LABOR ACT would be strictly enforced. I think it probable, however, that he was not satisfied with the conditions. Upon enquiry from Deputy Wilmot, he wrote me, that he had not improved before the putting up of a lumber camp. When Steves applied, he said that he (Deputy Wilmot) afterwards told him, it was a cheat, and an imposition, and Steves admitted it, wishing, if possible, to prevent Steves from getting a license for lumbering all around, I waited the full two years from the approval of the petition, and then applied, and Mr. Wilmot refused to purchase it for me, in the name of JOHN J. FRASER. The purchase money was paid, Deputy Wilmot wrote me he put up notices, and the sale was duly notified. At that time, my agent, John S. Trites, reported that Steves, as I expected, had cut a considerable quantity of lumber on the land, and removed it by rail to Moncton. The grant not being out, Deputy Wilmot refused to purchase it. He gave me his note for it, but I have never seen the note or its results yet. Mr. Trites wrote me, that the demand was made in consequence of Steves' own statement, that the timber was cut on that lot. The day after, he came to the office, if possible, to escape, that it was cut on the land adjoining; and in this not very creditable way of attempting to escape, instead of bettering his condition, he has made it worse, which I intend to show him, as the adjoining land is granted land, while the lot he has control and in which no interest. This was in 1857.

"Before I heard of this singular attempt of his to escape, I had written to Mr. Trites, and also to Mr. Wilmot, that I had no wish to be served with him, and that, as he had agreed to pay stumpage for the first portion, I was satisfied unless he chose to pay more himself. The amount of the note was \$38.00. This does not include a larger quantity, which has been hauled out by him. This is the kind of improvement made by a large number of the applicants under the LABOR ACT, in that quarter.

"This is not very satisfactory unless, as I have heard, Mr. Wilmot called upon Judge Wilmot, that cutting and carrying away the lumber was clearing the land!

"The statement produced, I believe to be correct."

"[This statement is in relation to a quantity of land sold to different parties, and as your Reporters understood, granted to JOHN J. FRASER. It is of too great a length to admit of its being copied in time for the mail, and at the same time is not very important.]

"These lands were sold under the instalment system about eight years ago, to the parties named, and since granted to Mr. John J. Fraser, under transfers. There is another thing, which has been done, and that is, the sale of the same lands, in these cases the purchase money has been paid within some reasonable time, while in most other cases, it has not."

"The Committee here adjourned until tomorrow."

"The SURVEYOR GENERAL resumed this morning, and handed in the following statistics:—

THE INCOME OF THE CROWN LAND OFFICE.

Year.	Income.
1851.	26,085
1852.	28,394
1853.	18,848
1854.	18,009
1855.	9,940
1856.	10,360
1857.	6,242
1858.	6,296
1859.	11,180
1860.	11,065

The gross expenses in each year, were as follows:—

Year.	Amount.
1852.	22,423
1853.	2,384
1854.	2,384
1855.	1,382
1856.	2,341
1857.	2,509
1858.	2,499
1859.	2,374

"This includes the whole of the indoor expenses, such as printing, contingent expenses, &c. The expense of printing in other papers besides the Gazette, was as follows:—

"I cannot go back of 1855; that is the first year I can give:—

Year.	Amount.
1855.	218 0
1856.	387 0
1857.	586 0
1858.	551 0
1859.	608 0

Total expense of five years } £2312 0 0  
Printing by Gov't papers, } £2312 0 0

"This is all I have, and all correct, except that the old shillings are left out, I have stated all about the introduction of the Association System, and that there is no formal Record, except the names of the persons who have been made."

Ans. "Generally speaking it is, but not always."

Qu. "When any new appointment is made, are the members of the respective Counties in which the appointment is to be made, consulted, and if so, are the joint recommendations of the members regarded?"

Ans. "No, there are no local appointments made on the bare recommendation of one of the members of the county to which the appointment is made, when all, or more than one of them, are on the same side of politics, or are of the same party."

Ans. "In reference to myself, there are three members opposed to the Government and one supporting it, and the latter recommends a party. I myself would act on the recommendation of the members of the county, if they were of the same mind. As to the course pursued in making appointments, I can lay down no rule. In cases where there are four, and one against the Government, I don't know what would be done, as I know of no case of the kind. When two members of a County disagree, and one shall be appointed, it is not a principle, that when they do agree, no person shall be appointed, but the Government will take such course as they think proper, according to the requirements of their Office."

Mr. Inghes here said, "Mr. Tilley has stated, that the lands for D. H. Hall, were applied for in his own name. I have shown, and stated, that they were applied for in fictitious names, in the name of Mr. Tilley, and it has an application, not only to this case, but to others also. I am advertised in these fictitious names. I do not purchase them; the party, or agent, who names them, to be applied for, takes measures to get them put in the name of the person named in the application. I have seen many of these names, and I could not be otherwise. The names appeared in the Gazette, and the names must have noticed."

been done, and made every possible enquiry, and we have never sanctioned any such sales."

"With regard to the Indian Reserve, in Madawaska, I stated, in the forenoon, that Hebert's Point had been reserved; but I could not say, as we have no record of it. I have since referred to the oldest Map of the River St. John, that I know of, and the word Indian Village is written at that place, or opposite to it. On the first great plan of Madawaska, there is an entry across the river, and the word INDIAN RESERVE, and a note that Hebert got his lease of occupation in 1826, in consequence of his purchasing a lease from the Indians. That puts him somewhat in the position of Mr. Hart, only in a greater degree, as his claim compasses the whole; but I have only a few acres."

Qu. "Has any land applied for by persons of the name of Steves, in Salisbury, under the LABOR ACT, been recently sold? If so, who was the purchaser or purchasers?"

Ans. "I know of the Land referred to, and will submit a letter in reference to it, from Deputy Wilmot. I have not the letter here, but will state that it was sold to the Land in Salisbury, in 1857. Upon enquiry from Deputy Wilmot, he wrote me, that Steves had not improved before the putting up of a lumber camp. When Steves applied, he said that he (Deputy Wilmot) afterwards told him, it was a cheat, and an imposition, and Steves admitted it, wishing, if possible, to prevent Steves from getting a license for lumbering all around, I waited the full two years from the approval of the petition, and then applied, and Mr. Wilmot refused to purchase it for me, in the name of JOHN J. FRASER. The purchase money was paid, Deputy Wilmot wrote me he put up notices, and the sale was duly notified. At that time, my agent, John S. Trites, reported that Steves, as I expected, had cut a considerable quantity of lumber on the land, and removed it by rail to Moncton. The grant not being out, Deputy Wilmot refused to purchase it. He gave me his note for it, but I have never seen the note or its results yet. Mr. Trites wrote me, that the demand was made in consequence of Steves' own statement, that the timber was cut on that lot. The day after, he came to the office, if possible, to escape, that it was cut on the land adjoining; and in this not very creditable way of attempting to escape, instead of bettering his condition, he has made it worse, which I intend to show him, as the adjoining land is granted land, while the lot he has control and in which no interest. This was in 1857.

"Before I heard of this singular attempt of his to escape, I had written to Mr. Trites, and also to Mr. Wilmot, that I had no wish to be served with him, and that, as he had agreed to pay stumpage for the first portion, I was satisfied unless he chose to pay more himself. The amount of the note was \$38.00. This does not include a larger quantity, which has been hauled out by him. This is the kind of improvement made by a large number of the applicants under the LABOR ACT, in that quarter.

"This is not very satisfactory unless, as I have heard, Mr. Wilmot called upon Judge Wilmot, that cutting and carrying away the lumber was clearing the land!

"The statement produced, I believe to be correct."

"[This statement is in relation to a quantity of land sold to different parties, and as your Reporters understood, granted to JOHN J. FRASER. It is of too great a length to admit of its being copied in time for the mail, and at the same time is not very important.]

"These lands were sold under the instalment system about eight years ago, to the parties named, and since granted to Mr. John J. Fraser, under transfers. There is another thing, which has been done, and that is, the sale of the same lands, in these cases the purchase money has been paid within some reasonable time, while in most other cases, it has not."

"The Committee here adjourned until tomorrow."

"The SURVEYOR GENERAL resumed this morning, and handed in the following statistics:—

THE INCOME OF THE CROWN LAND OFFICE.

Year.	Income.
1851.	26,085
1852.	28,394
1853.	18,848
1854.	18,009
1855.	9,940
1856.	10,360
1857.	6,242
1858.	6,296
1859.	11,180
1860.	11,065

The gross expenses in each year, were as follows:—

Year.	Amount.
1852.	22,423
1853.	2,384
1854.	2,384
1855.	1,382
1856.	2,341
1857.	2,509
1858.	2,499
1859.	2,374

"This includes the whole of the indoor expenses, such as printing, contingent expenses, &c. The expense of printing in other papers besides the Gazette, was as follows:—

"I cannot go back of 1855; that is the first year I can give:—

Year.	Amount.
1855.	218 0
1856.	387 0
1857.	586 0
1858.	551 0
1859.	608 0

Total expense of five years } £2312 0 0  
Printing by Gov't papers, } £2312 0 0

"This is all I have, and all correct, except that the old shillings are left out, I have stated all about the introduction of the Association System, and that there is no formal Record, except the names of the persons who have been made."

Ans. "Generally speaking it is, but not always."

Qu. "When any new appointment is made, are the members of the respective Counties in which the appointment is to be made, consulted, and if so, are the joint recommendations of the members regarded?"

Ans. "No, there are no local appointments made on the bare recommendation of one of the members of the county to which the appointment is made, when all, or more than one of them, are on the same side of politics, or are of the same party."

Ans. "In reference to myself, there are three members opposed to the Government and one supporting it, and the latter recommends a party. I myself would act on the recommendation of the members of the county, if they were of the same mind. As to the course pursued in making appointments, I can lay down no rule. In cases where there are four, and one against the Government, I don't know what would be done, as I know of no case of the kind. When two members of a County disagree, and one shall be appointed, it is not a principle, that when they do agree, no person shall be appointed, but the Government will take such course as they think proper, according to the requirements of their Office."

Mr. Inghes here said, "Mr. Tilley has stated, that the lands for D. H. Hall, were applied for in his own name. I have shown, and stated, that they were applied for in fictitious names, in the name of Mr. Tilley, and it has an application, not only to this case, but to others also. I am advertised in these fictitious names. I do not purchase them; the party, or agent, who names them, to be applied for, takes measures to get them put in the name of the person named in the application. I have seen many of these names, and I could not be otherwise. The names appeared in the Gazette, and the names must have noticed."

been done, and made every possible enquiry, and we have never sanctioned any such sales."

"With regard to the Indian Reserve, in Madawaska, I stated, in the forenoon, that Hebert's Point had been reserved; but I could not say, as we have no record of it. I have since referred to the oldest Map of the River St. John, that I know of, and the word Indian Village is written at that place, or opposite to it. On the first great plan of Madawaska, there is an entry across the river, and the word INDIAN RESERVE, and a note that Hebert got his lease of occupation in 1826, in consequence of his purchasing a lease from the Indians. That puts him somewhat in the position of Mr. Hart, only in a greater degree, as his claim compasses the whole; but I have only a few acres."

Qu. "Has any land applied for by persons of the name of Steves, in Salisbury, under the LABOR ACT, been recently sold? If so, who was the purchaser or purchasers?"

Ans. "I know of the Land referred to, and will submit a letter in reference to it, from Deputy Wilmot. I have not the letter here, but will state that it was sold to the Land in Salisbury, in 1857. Upon enquiry from Deputy Wilmot, he wrote me, that Steves had not improved before the putting up of a lumber camp. When Steves applied, he said that he (Deputy Wilmot) afterwards told him, it was a cheat, and an imposition, and Steves admitted it, wishing, if possible, to prevent Steves from getting a license for lumbering all around, I waited the full two years from the approval of the petition, and then applied, and Mr. Wilmot refused to purchase it for me, in the name of JOHN J. FRASER. The purchase money was paid, Deputy Wilmot wrote me he put up notices, and the sale was duly notified. At that time, my agent, John S. Trites, reported that Steves, as I expected, had cut a considerable quantity of lumber on the land, and removed it by rail to Moncton. The grant not being out, Deputy Wilmot refused to purchase it. He gave me his note for it, but I have never seen the note or its results yet. Mr. Trites wrote me, that the demand was made in consequence of Steves' own statement, that the timber was cut on that lot. The day after, he came to the office, if possible, to escape, that it was cut on the land adjoining; and in this not very creditable way of attempting to escape, instead of bettering his condition, he has made it worse, which I intend to show him, as the adjoining land is granted land, while the lot he has control and in which no interest. This was in 1857.

"Before I heard of this singular attempt of his to escape, I had written to Mr. Trites, and also to Mr. Wilmot, that I had no wish to be served with him, and that, as he had agreed to pay stumpage for the first portion, I was satisfied unless he chose to pay more himself. The amount of the note was \$38.00. This does not include a larger quantity, which has been hauled out by him. This is the kind of improvement made by a large number of the applicants under the LABOR ACT, in that quarter.

"This is not very satisfactory unless, as I have heard, Mr. Wilmot called upon Judge Wilmot, that cutting and carrying away the lumber was clearing the land!

"The statement produced, I believe to be correct."

"[This statement is in relation to a quantity of land sold to different parties, and as your Reporters understood, granted to JOHN J. FRASER. It is of too great a length to admit of its being copied in time for the mail, and at the same time is not very important.]

"These lands were sold under the instalment system about eight years ago, to the parties named, and since granted to Mr. John J. Fraser, under transfers. There is another thing, which has been done, and that is, the sale of the same lands, in these cases the purchase money has been paid within some reasonable time, while in most other cases, it has not."

"The Committee here adjourned until tomorrow."

"The SURVEYOR GENERAL resumed this morning, and handed in the following statistics:—

THE INCOME OF THE CROWN LAND OFFICE.

Year.	Income.
1851.	26,085
1852.	28,394
1853.	18,848
1854.	18,009
1855.	9,940
1856.	10,360
1857.	6,242
1858.	6,296
1859.	11,180
1860.	11,065

The gross expenses in each year, were as follows:—

Year.	Amount.
1852.	22,423
1853.	2,384
1854.	2,384
1855.	1,382
1856.	2,341
1857.	2,509
1858.	2,499
1859.	2,374

"This includes the whole of the indoor expenses, such as printing, contingent expenses, &c. The expense of printing in other papers besides the Gazette, was as follows:—

"I cannot go back of 1855; that is the first year I can give:—

Year.	Amount.
1855.	218 0
1856.	387 0
1857.	586 0
1858.	551 0
1859.	608 0

Total expense of five years } £2312 0 0  
Printing by Gov't papers, } £2312 0 0

"This is all I have, and all correct, except that the old shillings are left out, I have stated all about the introduction of the Association System, and that there is no formal Record, except the names of the persons who have been made."

Ans. "Generally speaking it is, but not always."

Qu. "When any new appointment is made, are the members of the respective Counties in which the appointment is to be made, consulted, and if so, are the joint recommendations of the members regarded?"

Ans. "No, there are no local appointments made on the bare recommendation of one of the members of the county to which the appointment is made, when all, or more than one of them, are on the same side of politics, or are of the same party."

Ans. "In reference to myself, there are three members opposed to the Government and one supporting it, and the latter recommends a party. I myself would act on the recommendation of the members of the county, if they were of the same mind. As to the course pursued in making appointments, I can lay down no rule. In cases where there are four, and one against the Government, I don't know what would be done, as I know of no case of the kind. When two members of a County disagree, and one shall be appointed, it is not a principle, that when they do agree, no person shall be appointed, but the Government will take such course as they think proper, according to the requirements of their Office."

Mr. Inghes here said, "Mr. Tilley has stated, that the lands for D. H. Hall, were applied for in his own name. I have shown, and stated, that they were applied for in fictitious names, in the name of Mr. Tilley, and it has an application, not only to this case, but to others also. I am advertised in these fictitious names. I do not purchase them; the party, or agent, who names them, to be applied for, takes measures to get them put in the name of the person named in the application. I have seen many of these names, and I could not be otherwise. The names appeared in the Gazette, and the names must have noticed."

been done, and made every possible enquiry, and we have never sanctioned any such sales."

"With regard to the Indian Reserve, in Madawaska, I stated, in the forenoon, that Hebert's Point had been reserved; but I could not say, as we have no record of it. I have since referred to the oldest Map of the River St. John, that I know of, and the word Indian Village is written at that place, or opposite to it. On the first great plan of Madawaska, there is an entry across the river, and the word INDIAN RESERVE, and a note that Hebert got his lease of occupation in 1826, in consequence of his purchasing a lease from the Indians. That puts him somewhat in the position of Mr. Hart, only in a greater degree, as his claim compasses the whole; but I have only a few acres."

Qu. "Has any land applied for by persons of the name of Steves, in Salisbury, under the LABOR ACT, been recently sold? If so, who was the purchaser or purchasers?"

Ans. "I know of the Land referred to, and will submit a letter in reference to it, from Deputy Wilmot. I have not the letter here, but will state that it was sold to the Land in Salisbury, in 1857. Upon enquiry from Deputy Wilmot, he wrote me, that Steves had not improved before the putting up of a lumber camp. When Steves applied, he said that he (Deputy Wilmot) afterwards told him, it was a cheat, and an imposition, and Steves admitted it, wishing, if possible, to prevent Steves from getting a license for lumbering all around, I waited the full two years from the approval of the petition, and then applied, and Mr. Wilmot refused to purchase it for me, in the name of JOHN J. FRASER. The purchase money was paid, Deputy Wilmot wrote me he put up notices, and the sale was duly notified. At that time, my agent, John S. Trites, reported that Steves, as I expected, had cut a considerable quantity of lumber on the land, and removed it by rail to Moncton. The grant not being out, Deputy Wilmot refused to purchase it. He gave me his note for it, but I have never seen the note or its results yet. Mr. Trites wrote me, that the demand was made in consequence of Steves' own statement, that the timber was cut on that lot. The day after, he came to the office, if possible, to escape, that it was cut on the land adjoining; and in this not very creditable way of attempting to escape, instead of bettering his condition, he has made it worse, which I intend to show him, as the adjoining land is granted land, while the lot he has control and in which no interest. This was in 1857.

"Before I heard of this singular attempt of his to escape, I had written to Mr. Trites, and also to Mr. Wilmot, that I had no wish to be served with him, and that, as he had agreed to pay stumpage for the first portion, I was satisfied unless he chose to pay more himself. The amount of the note was \$38.00. This does not include a larger quantity, which has been hauled out by him. This is the kind of improvement made by a large number of the applicants under the LABOR ACT, in that quarter.

"This is not very satisfactory unless, as I have heard, Mr. Wilmot called upon Judge Wilmot, that cutting and carrying away the lumber was clearing the land!

"The statement produced, I believe to be correct."

"[This statement is in relation to a quantity of land sold to different parties, and as your Reporters understood, granted to JOHN J. FRASER. It is of too great a length to admit of its being copied in time for the mail, and at the same time is not very important.]

"These lands were sold under the instalment system about eight years ago, to the parties named, and since granted to Mr. John J. Fraser, under transfers. There is another thing, which has been done, and that is, the sale of the same lands, in these cases the purchase money has been paid within some reasonable time, while in most other cases, it has not."

"The Committee here adjourned until tomorrow."

"The SURVEYOR GENERAL resumed this morning, and handed in the following statistics:—

THE INCOME OF THE CROWN LAND OFFICE.

Year.	Income.
1851.	26,085
1852.	28,394
1853.	18,848
1854.	18,009
1855.	9,940
1856.	10,360
1857.	6,242
1858.	6,296
1859.	11,180
1860.	11,065

The gross expenses in each year, were as follows:—

Year.	Amount.
1852.	22,423
1853.	2,384
1854.	2,384
1855.	1,382
1856.	2,341
1857.	2,509
1858.	2,499
1859.	2,374

"This includes the whole of the indoor expenses, such as printing, contingent expenses, &c. The expense of printing in other papers besides the Gazette, was as follows:—

"I cannot go back of 1855; that is the first year I can give:—

Year.	Amount.
1855.	218 0
1856.	387 0
1857.	586 0
1858.	551 0
1859.	608 0

Total expense of five years } £2312 0 0  
Printing by Gov't papers, } £2312 0 0

"This is all I have, and all correct, except that the old shillings are left out, I have stated all about the introduction of the Association System, and that there is no formal Record, except the names of the persons who have been made."

Ans. "Generally speaking it is, but not always."

Qu. "When any new appointment is made, are the members of the respective Counties in which the appointment is to be made, consulted, and if so, are the joint recommendations of the members regarded?"

Ans. "No, there are no local appointments made on the bare recommendation of one of the members of the county to which the appointment is made, when all, or more than one of them, are