

THE NORTHEASTERN BOUNDARY.

While the diplomacy of all Europe has been immersed in questions purely European, and while the King of the Netherlands may have been supposed the most occupied of all the individuals whose interest they affect, a matter has been for some months past debating at the Hague, under the monarch's auspices, of a nature very remote from all those to which his attention might be thought exclusively devoted. We allude to the American Boundary question, let, as it will be recollected, some two years since to the arbitration of King William. The 20th of this present month was the day to which his Majesty was limited by the terms of the arbitration; and while the ambassadors of England and the United States, at the Hague fully expected the decision would, from late circumstances, have demanded an extension of a few days ago, by a notification, the decision was already formed, and that it would be delivered to them for the information of their respective governments on Monday last the 10th inst. On that day the King accordingly handed to Sir Charles Dugot and Mr. Preble duplicates of his award. On a point of such consequence we feel it necessary to speak with caution, as the question may eventually become of national importance far greater than that which seems implicated in it now. But if the information be correct, and we may almost venture that it is so, the King of the Netherlands has decided the points submitted to him in a way that must give ample satisfaction to British interests, as far as they may be considered involved in the matter at issue.

It would be, perhaps, premature to state precisely the terms of the decision. That the principal point at issue, the Northeastern boundary of the United States, is decided in favor of English claims, and contrary to American pretensions may be relied on as to the result. To the provinces of New-Brunswick and Canada the decision will be deemed of vital importance. How it may be received by the Government of the United States we do not undertake to prophesy.

Increase of the Navy.—It is understood that Ministers have resolved upon an immediate increase of the naval force of the Empire, and that five ships of war are to be put into commission. Yesterday there was a report current that orders had been sent down to the coast, for the purpose of having ready 3,500 of the Coast Blockade, to make up the complement of men required for such vessels of war.

ARREST OF MR. O'CONNELL.

DUBLIN, JAN. 18.—This day, at 12 o'clock, Mr. O'Connell was arrested by Mr. Steele, who was brought to the Head Police Office, in custody, on a warrant, charging him with combining with others, at various meetings, to evade the law, and holding meetings in defiance of the Lord Lieutenant's proclamations of various dates. A few minutes after these gentlemen had appeared, Mr. O'Connell arrived in custody of Mr. Farrell, chief constable, upon a similar warrant. Mr. O'Connell's arrival was announced by the loud shouting of the people, who followed him to the outer gate of the Police office.

On entering the office Mr. O'Connell addressed the magistrates, requesting to know if it was upon their own responsibility, or upon orders from their superiors, that a warrant had been issued against him, and that he, a householder of Dublin, and a member of the Imperial Parliament, had been dragged from his house, and through the streets, by the common thief catcher.

Alderman Darley said, they had acted under instructions. Mr. O'Connell requested the information to be read. After a short consultation between the magistrates, the clerk was instructed to read the informations. The informations were the joint informations of Robert F. French, J. B. Smith, gentlemen of Grafton-street; they set out by stating, that they had attended a meeting at the Parliamentary Intelligence office, on the 10th of January, upon which occasion Mr. John Redmond was the chairman: that at said meeting the proclamation of the Lord Lieutenant was declared by Mr. O'Connell an act of despotism, a new crime against his unfortunate country, and continued to recite the speech nearly as it appeared in the public journals—proposing the three different associations. The clerk was proceeding in reading the informations, when the magistrates stopped him; and read the informations to the jury, and as it was a matter of right, they could not allow the public time to be occupied.

Mr. O'Connell contended he had the right. He said he saw the hint given by Major Sirr; they refused the reading of the informations, because they found they did not bear out the warrant. He demanded the reading of the warrant; it was accordingly read, after which Mr. O'Connell entered into a long legal argument, contending that the warrant did not charge him with any offence for which he could be called upon to give bail; the act itself upon which they proceeded did not contain any offence; the parties attending a meeting refused to disperse in fifteen minutes; Alderman Darley interrupted Mr. O'Connell, and said they had but one duty to perform—that was, to demand that he should give bail: if they acted illegally, they were answerable.

Mr. O'Connell said, that he should give bail, at the same time protesting against the proceedings as an act of despotism. He had resolved upon going to Newgate, but he would give bail, because he could not endanger the peace of the city. Alderman Darley said, the bail required was a bond, himself in £1,000, and two sureties of £500 each.

Mr. Fitzpatrick, of Dame Street, and Mr. Jeremiah MacCarthy, of Dawson Street, then became sureties. Upon signing the bond, Mr. O'Connell repeated his protest against the proceedings of the magistrates. Mr. Barrett was required to give Bail himself in £200, and two sureties in £100. Mr. Stanton and Mr. Ellis were his sureties. Mr. Steele gave similar bail—Mr. T. Dolan and Mr. Callan becoming his sureties. Mr. Lawson, who was in the office, was then told that he was also required to give bail. Mr. John Reynolds was at this time brought to the office in custody upon a similar charge, and required to give the like bail. Mr. Keshan and Mr. Dolan became his sureties.

All the bail-bonds being completed, the parties left the office. An immense concourse of people waited outside, and cheered Mr. O'Connell as he left; they attempted to raise him on their shoulders but this he would not allow.

Mr. Edward Dwyer, secretary of the Parliamentary Intelligence Office, was arrested about three o'clock, on a similar warrant, and held to bail in the same sum as those required from all, except Mr. O'Connell.

On the first sitting day of term, (Monday last,) Mr. O'Connell and his co-conspirators appeared in the Court of King's Bench, to discharge their recognizances. Their trials will not come on until the sittings after term.

UNITED STATES.

The Portland Courier contains the following notice of a discussion which lately took place in the Legislature of Maine.

Disputed Territory.—A Bill was passed to be engrossed by the House of Representatives yesterday, for authorising certain persons to solemnize marriage in the unincorporated settlements of Madawaska and Aroostook. While this was under consideration, Mr. Deane, of Ellsworth, in order to show the importance of passing the Bill, went at considerable length into the question of the disputed territory, as it is called. It was important, he said, on account of the inhabitants of those settlements, that the Legislature should pass this Bill, for they were now subject to great inconveniences

wrested from them, their hearts stained with blood? It was the very principle which lies at the base of the Bill. It was because those unfortunate Acadians, having partly tasted the blessings of the British constitution, having heard that that constitution considered all its subjects alike, and imparted to all equal privileges, and having desired to be estimated in every respect as British subjects—had refused to submit to the obnoxious ordinances of the country, had refused to be considered as a distinct people; it was for this reason only, that those flagitious crimes were committed. Hon. members all knew what that crime was, what cruelty was committed. Yet the very same principle which had caused those disgraceful events, was contained in this Bill.—He (Mr. E.) had had some experience in the manners, and customs, and principles of the Acadian French. He had heard it said in this House, that it was their pride, and part of their religion, to support their own poor. Now he denied that any part of their religion required them to do so distinctly from their fellow subjects, and he contended that they had no disposition to do it. On the contrary, their great cry in the country of Gloucester has been, "Make us like other men. We differ in nothing from them, but in our religious worship. Make us grand jurors. Give us equal privileges in courts of justice. Assess us to the poor rates like our English fellow subjects, and not make us a distinct people. We have been told that the British constitution gives equal rights to all its subjects; but we are forced to become a distinct people."—Now this bill would make an invidious distinction, which the enlightened part of the Acadian French do not desire.—The hon. member from Westmorland, (Mr. Scott,) had contended, that the Acadians were the pride of Englishmen; but he (Mr. End) contended that the inhabitants of this Province are all equally British subjects, among whom no distinctions should be made, and least of all should they be made by the law.—When he (Mr. E.) had formerly seen mention of a similar bill to this in the Journals of the House, he had immediately taken great pains to learn the feelings of the French on the subject. He had asked them, if they would feel it a hardship to be assessed like their fellow subjects. They had unanimously answered, "No!—assess us like our neighbours. Make us equal with them in all respects."—He (Mr. E.) had been obliged to read the bill and to sign it, which he thought a bad one. He hoped the Committee would pause before it legalised that spirit, which, in the other Province, had been the cause of the foulest stain ever attached to a British Government.

Mr. Wyer thought Mr. End had mistaken the object of the bill. It did not go to compel the Sessions to exempt the Acadian French from assessment, but merely gave them a discretionary power of doing so, where they might deem it expedient. Mr. Chandler observed, that this was a bill to authorize the exemption of the Acadian French from assessment to the poor rates. A similar bill had passed the House last year. A measure of this kind, he said, was a measure of expediency, and he thought that, in this case, even that motive might be allowed a little weight. The Acadian French were mostly small landholders, and very poor. They were scattered throughout the country, very promiscuously. It would, therefore, be a matter of very great difficulty to collect any assessment from them; and, considering this, and the fact that they do generally support their own poor, he hoped the bill would be allowed to pass.—Suppose we, the English, were the minority of the inhabitants, and the French were the majority: should we not feel it very hard, to be called on to assist in supporting their poor, while we maintained our own independent resources? It would certainly be a very invidious and unfair measure.—He (Mr. C.) considered it impossible to change the customs, habits, and feelings of people; and he would be very sorry to thwart the religious feeling, customs, or habits, of so happy, moral, and humane a people as the Acadian French. It was, in his opinion, a matter of justice, expediency, and good policy, to give them the relief they desired.

Mr. Speaker thought Mr. Wyer had misunderstood the observations of Mr. End. It appeared to him (Mr. Speaker,) that the hon. gentleman meant to contend, that the Acadian French should, as far as possible, be allowed to mix freely with our own people. If that were the object of the bill, he would certainly be in favor of it. But it appeared to him that it would have very little effect, either one way or the other. He felt it, however, to be good policy to do away with all invidious distinctions among the people.—It had been agreed that it was very unjust to compel the Acadian French to support our poor; and on that principle he would support the bill; as well as for the sake of the expediency of the measure, arising from the difficulty of collecting any assessment from these poor French people.

Mr. Weldon certainly could not conceive that the bill would at all tend to create such a distinction among the people, as to cause the British government again to execute such a measure as had formerly been practised in Nova-Scotia.—The days of such measures were now gone by.—He thought it quite unnecessary to advert to the history of Nova-Scotia on this occasion.—The bill only went to exempt the Acadian French from an imposition, which they complained of as a grievance.—The bill was agreed to.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

(Continued from Supplement.)

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, FREDERICTON, Friday, February 25.

ACADIAN FRENCH.

Committee of the whole, on the bill to authorize Justices of the Peace in Session, to exempt the Acadian French from being assessed for Poor Rates.

Mr. Weldon stated the object of the bill; and observed, that it had been usual in all parts of the Province, for the Acadian French to support their own poor; it was part of their religion to do so. It was unjust, therefore, that they should be assessed for contributing to the support of English poor. He presumed there could be no objection to the bill.

Mr. Slason had no objection to the bill, as far as it related to the County of Kent; but in the County of York there were a great many French scattered about, who had always been assessed, and he had never yet heard any objection to it.

Mr. Scott said the Acadian French always did maintain their own poor. He hoped there would be pride enough in Englishmen to relieve the French from the burden of contributing to the support of English poor. This was, in his opinion, a just and righteous bill; and he would go with it most cheerfully.

Mr. End brought the Committee to pause before they passed that bill. He hoped he should not be misconstrued in what he was about to say. He hoped the hon. member for Kent would not think he (Mr. E.) opposed the bill, but from a conscientious conviction of its impropriety. This was a bill to encourage the Acadian French to do a thing, the enforcement of which in former days, had caused one of the most flagitious, one of the most heartless, one of the most cruel acts that were ever perpetrated, which history ever recorded. This was the expulsion of the Acadian French from the eastern colony of Nova-Scotia. What was the reason why those harmless, inoffensive people, were expelled from their peaceful homes, their domestic retirement invaded, their possessions

anticipated a decrease of at least £7000 at Saint John alone, from the operation of the late treaty between the mother country and the United States, and of the bill now pending in the Imperial Parliament, for the regulation of the foreign trade with these Colonies. While, however, he mentioned this decrease, he congratulated the house on the general increase last year; the revenue being £17,000 more than in the preceding year. He therefore thought the country would bear the anticipated loss, without a necessity, in the present depressed state of trade, of imposing any additional burdens. The honorable member was of opinion, that all discriminating duties should be done away, and that rum, the property of a non-resident, should come into the province upon equally good terms as if it belonged to a resident. No invidious distinction in this respect existed in Nova-Scotia; neither were the exports of this Province subject to any additional tax in the West Indies, if imported in a New-Brunswick vessel; and besides, the West-India Produce thus imported here was generally paid for in the produce of the country, whence the country was generally benefited. Another reason was, that the revenue would not suffer by this measure, the greater part of the rum now imported being that, subject to the long duty. The honorable member said that his remarks with regard to rum would also apply to sugar. He would recommend, that all sugar should bear a tax of 2s. 6d. per cwt.; although he must say, that if the circumstances of the country would admit of it, he would be for abolishing all duties on sugar, molasses, and coffee, which were absolutely among the necessities of life; and he hoped to see the day when they would be excluded from taxation. He differed with his honorable friend with regard to the propriety of increasing the duties on brandy and gin. He thought those articles already sufficiently taxed, and he hoped the committee would pause, before adding to those duties, as he felt confident that such a measure would only be an encouragement to the smuggler, and a consequent injury to the revenue. He recommended abolishing the duty on vinegar, which now operated as a direct tax on the exporter. No vinegar of sufficiently good quality for curing salmon could be obtained in the province, and the principal part of that imported from the United States, being used for that purpose, he thought the duty should be removed. He would have no objection to a small duty on tea, as long as the Province was paying tribute to Nova Scotia for a supply of that article; but he hoped it would not be long before the East India Company would send a tea-ship direct to St. John, when he would be for admitting the article free of duty. He was happy to find that his honorable friend saw the propriety of allowing all raw materials to come in free of duty, as he felt certain that it never could have been the intention of the late house to tax such articles as tallow, salt, cattle, hides, &c. but such had been the construction put on the revenue bill, and it had operated most oppressively. He could not think that the committee could entertain an opinion, that British manufactures should pay any duty, and, therefore, till he heard the measure seriously proposed, he should not think it necessary to reply to his honorable friend. The honorable member concluded, by stating in general terms, his opinion that commerce should be free as possible, and that he intended, when the revenue bill should be brought up, to submit some alteration in the certificates for obtaining drawbacks, and a mode, for the relief of the importer, of warehousing dutiable articles.

Messrs. S. Humbert, Cunard, Wyer, Gilbert, Chandler, Taylor, Allen, Slason, End, Scott, Brown, and others successively followed, and eloquently supported their views and opinions. As far as we have been able to collect, we understood Messrs. S. Humbert and End clearly to advocate the propriety of a distinction between non-residents and residents. Mr. Cunard was of the opposite opinion. Mr. Chandler, in a long speech, confined himself almost exclusively to the subject of imposing a small tax on British manufactures, which he considered the only resort for supporting the revenue, and therefore seriously recommended.

Messrs. Weldon, Slason, Taylor, Allen, &c. supported this measure. Messrs. Partelow and Cunard opposed it. Mr. S. Humbert assented to it with great reluctance.

Resolved, that in the opinion of this committee, it is expedient to increase the Revenue, by imposing a small additional duty on Brandy, Holland, and Geneva. Yeas—Messrs. Clinch, Hill, Dow, Brown, Gilbert, Harrison, Scott, Miles, Hayward, Slason, Taylor, Chandler, End, S. Humbert, J. Humbert, Weldon, and Allen. Nays—Messrs. Partelow, Barlow, Ward, Wyer, and Cunard.

Resolved, that in the opinion of this Committee, it is expedient to impose a small ad valorem duty on all British merchandise imported into this Province. Yeas and Nays—same as on first resolution.

Resolved, that in the opinion of this Committee, it is expedient to continue the duties on rum, and sugar imported in this Province, with the exception of the discriminating duties.

COMMITTEE ON THE ROAD REPORT.—Resolved, that in the opinion of this Committee, the Report of the Select Committee appointed to take into consideration what sum was necessary for the improvement of the Roads throughout this Province, be sustained, and that the same be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Mr. BROWN'S SPEECH IN THE COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS: It was long a favorite doctrine with me, that we had four particular and distinct interests in this Province, which it was the duty of the Legislature to protect. These were Commerce, Agriculture, Lumbering, and the Fisheries. The state of these four considered required the particular attention of the Legislature, and I believe that the Revenue and appropriation laws required to be framed with particular reference to the state of each of them. Thus if Agriculture happened to be less profitable than lumbering, I took it to be sound policy to fetter and discourage the lumberer, with duties and taxes upon the necessities of life, and such articles as were indispensable to the carrying on of his business, in order that his profits might be lessened, that it might not be in his power to give such high wages, and that greater attention might therefore be paid to the cultivation of the soil. In the appropriation of the Revenue, I considered it necessary to grant such bounties as would tend to keep up a balance among these four different interests as nearly as possible. My scheme of a bounty on rum, and the application of the principles upon which the Legislators of this Province have hitherto acted. The tendency of this policy, it has been argued, is to make the country independent by cultivating its own resources, by furnishing its own supplies, and therefore retaining within itself all the profits of its own industry. This I confess seems all very plausible, but I doubt after all, whether it will stand the test of strict examination. The grand object appears to be to keep the money in the country; we think if we can only keep our money in the hands of our farmers, it is all well, and so we legislate with the view to keep foreign produce out of the home market. I would now inquire what would be the consequence if this policy were altogether abandoned. The Province, it is thought, would then be ruined; every man would then be left perfectly free to employ himself, and what capital he might possess, in that way which in his own estimation would be most advantageous: the business of the country would then flow in its natural channel, unfettered and free. Money would indeed go out of the country, and it finds its way out now, but it would be replaced by a greater quantity of necessary articles than could by its means be raised or obtained within the country, and these again put into productive operation, would bring an increased quantity of that kind of produce into the market, for which a greater sum of money would be obtained. It certainly is bad policy to endeavor to furnish within ourselves what we can purchase from our neighbors with less labour. If we are to alter the course of our trade, we must be able to purchase our own industry to purchase a necessary article from a foreigner cheaper than we can possibly furnish it ourselves, it is not the very worst policy to hinder us from doing so? For instance, if for carrying on the lumbering, we should be bound, as is now intended, to raise our own oxen, and to furnish our own supplies.—A certain portion of our capital must then be drawn from our lumbering pursuits, and applied to the

raising of cattle, &c. Now it is evident that if the application of capital, in any other way would be productive of the means of purchasing a greater quantity of supplies from foreigners, that by as much more as the produce of such capital would have purchased, the country is so much the loser. country, when we seek by legislation to force the inhabitants to produce articles as they wish, with the proceeds of other labour, can buy far cheaper. It is the maxim of every prudent master of a family, never to attempt to make at home, what will cost him more to make than to buy. Whenever a man finds that he can employ himself in such a way, that the proceeds of his labour will purchase a necessary article cheaper than he can make or raise such article, he will purchase it. What is prudence in the conduct of a private family, is prudence in the conduct of a province or kingdom. And surely we do not employ ourselves in the most advantageous way, when we direct our labour to the raising of an article which we can buy with the proceeds of less labour. It has been stated by an author of some celebrity, that taxes upon the necessities of life have the same effect upon the circumstances of the people, as a poor soil and a bad climate. Provisions and other things are thereby rendered dearer in the same manner as if it required extraordinary labour and expense to raise them, such taxes he says when carried to a certain extent, are a curse equal to the barrenness of earth, and the inclemency of the heavens. If by means of these exorbitant duties a part of the capital and industry of the country is directed to the production of such articles of consumption, all the extraordinary protection will hardly at last command a remunerating price, does not this prove to a demonstration the destructive tendency of this system. Perhaps it will be said that the flourishing state of four revenue is this I flatly deny. We have had extraordinary protections, and extraordinary privileges, and our revenue has increased, not by means of these regulations, but in spite of them. We have been praying, and begging, and of late almost threatening, His Majesty's Government upon this subject, and well we may; for under the operation of the present system, should this protection be in any degree withdrawn, the destruction of our lumbering interests, and our commerce, crumpled and burdened as they now are) would inevitably follow. I believe therefore that our best policy is to lay taxes principally with a view to raise a revenue. We should therefore be careful not to burden the necessities of life, nor cramp the industry of the country. Let us furnish the operatives with every encouragement, assuring ourselves that the true wealth of the country arises from the free and unrestrained employment of its inhabitants.

Monday, February 28.

TAVERN BILL.

[This bill having before been under discussion, we omit the lengthy debate that ensued on Mr. Simonds proposing that the minimum of the penalty to be imposed on tavern-keepers or retailers selling liquor on the Sabbath-day, should be £5.—The Members generally having expressed their sentiments on the baneful effects of tipping on Sundays, and after considerable discussion on the question, the clause in favor of travellers was erased from the bill, and the maximum fixed at £5, and the minimum at 20s.

Mr. Simonds next advocated the necessity of giving Magistrates a discretionary power to charge as high as £20 for licenses, where necessary, as in the City of St. John, Fredericton, Saint Andrews, &c. This proposition also called forth much argument, without coming to any definitive arrangement on the subject.]

Considerable discussion then took place, as to the minimum quantity of spirit which a retailer should be allowed to sell.—Mr. Speaker, Messrs. Simonds, Chandler, and S. Humbert, were for restricting it to one quart. Messrs. Wyer, Slason, Cunard, and Clinch, for one pint.—Mr. Partelow proposed, to settle the dispute, that it should be three half-pints, which would just fill a nominal quart bottle.—The motion for one pint was carried.—The price of a retailer's licence was fixed at a maximum of £7 10, and a minimum of 40s.

On the question as to the Mayor of St. John having the exclusive power of granting and charging for licenses in that City—

Mr. Partelow wished to obtain further information before pressing this section, as he wished that care should be taken that the rights of the citizens are not infringed.

Mr. Simonds defended the section, but would not press it at present, if Mr. Partelow had any serious objections.

Mr. Partelow thought the proposed maximum in this case too high. He thought if power was given the Mayor to impose it, he would do so.—His Worship was known to be a great friend to Temperance; and perhaps this power would only enable him the more forcibly to advance the great cause he is so attached to. He [Mr. P.] thought the Common Council should have this power.

Mr. S. Humbert concurred in thinking the sum too high, and that the power should not be given to an individual.

Mr. Cunard thought, that if the City of St. John possesses certain privileges under a charter, the House ought to be extremely cautious how it infringed those rights. He thought time was necessary for the consideration of the question, and that it should therefore, for the present, be postponed.

Mr. S. Humbert wished for the alteration of the charter when a fit opportunity should occur, as there are many things in it hard to be borne.

Mr. Partelow observed, that such a thing could only be done, upon application to the Legislature by the Mayor and Corporation of the City.

Mr. Simonds was not aware that the City members objected to his section of the bill.—As to the charter, he considered it as part of the law of the land, which might therefore be altered by the Legislature. But he admitted it might not be proper to do so, except on such application from the Mayor and Corporation.

Mr. Partelow said his great objection now was, to the maximum of £20 being left in the sole discretion of the Mayor.

Mr. Barlow mentioned, that some time before he came up from St. John, he had heard that Mr. Simonds contemplated the consolidation of all the laws respecting the regulation of taverns and retailers shops, and he [Mr. B.] approved of the measure. He was not aware that the City members objected to his section of the bill.—As to the charter, he considered it as part of the law of the land, which might therefore be altered by the Legislature. But he admitted it might not be proper to do so, except on such application from the Mayor and Corporation.

Mr. Partelow said his great objection now was, to the maximum of £20 being left in the sole discretion of the Mayor.

Mr. Partelow wished for the alteration of the charter when a fit opportunity should occur, as there are many things in it hard to be borne. Mr. Partelow observed, that such a thing could only be done, upon application to the Legislature by the Mayor and Corporation of the City. Mr. Simonds was not aware that the City members objected to his section of the bill.—As to the charter, he considered it as part of the law of the land, which might therefore be altered by the Legislature. But he admitted it might not be proper to do so, except on such application from the Mayor and Corporation. Mr. Partelow said his great objection now was, to the maximum of £20 being left in the sole discretion of the Mayor. Mr. Barlow mentioned, that some time before he came up from St. John, he had heard that Mr. Simonds contemplated the consolidation of all the laws respecting the regulation of taverns and retailers shops, and he [Mr. B.] approved of the measure. He was not aware that the City members objected to his section of the bill.—As to the charter, he considered it as part of the law of the land, which might therefore be altered by the Legislature. But he admitted it might not be proper to do so, except on such application from the Mayor and Corporation. Mr. Partelow said his great objection now was, to the maximum of £20 being left in the sole discretion of the Mayor.

Monday, February 28.

TAVERN BILL.

[This bill having before been under discussion, we omit the lengthy debate that ensued on Mr. Simonds proposing that the minimum of the penalty to be imposed on tavern-keepers or retailers selling liquor on the Sabbath-day, should be £5.—The Members generally having expressed their sentiments on the baneful effects of tipping on Sundays, and after considerable discussion on the question, the clause in favor of travellers was erased from the bill, and the maximum fixed at £5, and the minimum at 20s.

Mr. Simonds next advocated the necessity of giving Magistrates a discretionary power to charge as high as £20 for licenses, where necessary, as in the City of St. John, Fredericton, Saint Andrews, &c. This proposition also called forth much argument, without coming to any definitive arrangement on the subject.]

Considerable discussion then took place, as to the minimum quantity of spirit which a retailer should be allowed to sell.—Mr. Speaker, Messrs. Simonds, Chandler, and S. Humbert, were for restricting it to one quart. Messrs. Wyer, Slason, Cunard, and Clinch, for one pint.—Mr. Partelow proposed, to settle the dispute, that it should be three half-pints, which would just fill a nominal quart bottle.—The motion for one pint was carried.—The price of a retailer's licence was fixed at a maximum of £7 10, and a minimum of 40s.

On the question as to the Mayor of St. John having the exclusive power of granting and charging for licenses in that City—

Mr. Partelow wished to obtain further information before pressing this section, as he wished that care should be taken that the rights of the citizens are not infringed.

Mr. Simonds defended the section, but would not press it at present, if Mr. Partelow had any serious objections.

Mr. Partelow thought the proposed maximum in this case too high. He thought if power was given the Mayor to impose it, he would do so.—His Worship was known to be a great friend to Temperance; and perhaps this power would only enable him the more forcibly to advance the great cause he is so attached to. He [Mr. P.] thought the Common Council should have this power.

Mr. S. Humbert concurred in thinking the sum too high, and that the power should not be given to an individual.

Mr. Cunard thought, that if the City of St. John possesses certain privileges under a charter, the House ought to be extremely cautious how it infringed those rights. He thought time was necessary for the consideration of the question, and that it should therefore, for the present, be postponed.

Mr. S. Humbert wished for the alteration of the charter when a fit opportunity should occur, as there are many things in it hard to be borne.

Mr. Partelow observed, that such a thing could only be done, upon application to the Legislature by the Mayor and Corporation of the City.

Mr. Simonds was not aware that the City members objected to his section of the bill.—As to the charter, he considered it as part of the law of the land, which might therefore be altered by the Legislature. But he admitted it might not be proper to do so, except on such application from the Mayor and Corporation.

Mr. Partelow said his great objection now was, to the maximum of £20 being left in the sole discretion of the Mayor.

Mr. Barlow mentioned, that some time before he came up from St. John, he had heard that Mr. Simonds contemplated the consolidation of all the laws respecting the regulation of taverns and retailers shops, and he [Mr. B.] approved of the measure. He was not aware that the City members objected to his section of the bill.—As to the charter, he considered it as part of the law of the land, which might therefore be altered by the Legislature. But he admitted it might not be proper to do so, except on such application from the Mayor and Corporation.

Mr. Partelow said his great objection now was, to the maximum of £20 being left in the sole discretion of the Mayor.

Mr. Barlow mentioned, that some time before he came up from St. John, he had heard that Mr. Simonds contemplated the consolidation of all the laws respecting the regulation of taverns and retailers shops, and he [Mr. B.] approved of the measure. He was not aware that the City members objected to his section of the bill.—As to the charter, he considered it as part of the law of the land, which might therefore be altered by the Legislature. But he admitted it might not be proper to do so, except on such application from the Mayor and Corporation.

Mr. Partelow said his great objection now was, to the maximum of £20 being left in the sole discretion of the Mayor.

Mr. Barlow mentioned, that some time before he came up from St. John, he had heard that Mr. Simonds contemplated the consolidation of all the laws respecting the regulation of taverns and retailers shops, and he [Mr. B.] approved of the measure. He was not aware that the City members objected to his section of the bill.—As to the charter, he considered it as part of the law of the land, which might therefore be altered by the Legislature. But he admitted it might not be proper to do so, except on such application from the Mayor and Corporation.

Mr. Partelow said his great objection now was, to the maximum of £20 being left in the sole discretion of the Mayor.

Mr. Barlow mentioned, that some time before he came up from St. John, he had heard that Mr. Simonds contemplated the consolidation of all the laws respecting the regulation of taverns and retailers shops, and he [Mr. B.] approved of the measure. He was not aware that the City members objected to his section of the bill.—As to the charter, he considered it as part of the law of the land, which might therefore be altered by the Legislature. But he admitted it might not be proper to do so, except on such application from the Mayor and Corporation.

Mr. Partelow said his great objection now was, to the maximum of £20 being left in the sole discretion of the Mayor.

Mr. Barlow mentioned, that some time before he came up from St. John, he had heard that Mr. Simonds contemplated the consolidation of all the laws respecting the regulation of taverns and retailers shops, and he [Mr. B.] approved of the measure. He was not aware that the City members objected to his section of the bill.—As to the charter, he considered it as part of the law of the land, which might therefore be altered by the Legislature. But he admitted it might not be proper to do so, except on such application from the Mayor and Corporation.

Mr. Partelow said his great objection now was, to the maximum of £20 being left in the sole discretion of the Mayor.

Mr. Partelow wished for the alteration of the charter when a fit opportunity should occur, as there are many things in it hard to be borne. Mr. Partelow observed, that such a thing could only be done, upon application to the Legislature by the Mayor and Corporation of the City. Mr. Simonds was not aware that the City members objected to his section of the bill.—As to the charter, he considered it as part of the law of the land, which might therefore be altered by the Legislature. But he admitted it might not be proper to do so, except on such application from the Mayor and Corporation. Mr. Partelow said his great objection now was, to the maximum of £20 being left in the sole discretion of the Mayor. Mr. Barlow mentioned, that some time before he came up from St. John, he had heard that Mr. Simonds contemplated the consolidation of all the laws respecting the regulation of taverns and retailers shops, and he [Mr. B.] approved of the measure. He was not aware that the City members objected to his section of the bill.—As to the charter, he considered it as part of the law of the land, which might therefore be altered by the Legislature. But he admitted it might not be proper to do so, except on such application from the Mayor and Corporation. Mr. Partelow said his great objection now was, to the maximum of £20 being left in the sole discretion of the Mayor.

Monday, February 28.

TAVERN BILL.

[This bill having before been under discussion, we omit the lengthy debate that ensued on Mr. Simonds proposing that the minimum of the penalty to be imposed on tavern-keepers or retailers selling liquor on the Sabbath-day, should be £5.—The Members generally having expressed their sentiments on the baneful effects of tipping on Sundays, and after considerable discussion on the question, the clause in favor of travellers was erased from the bill, and the maximum fixed at £5, and the minimum at 20s.

Mr. Simonds next advocated the necessity of giving Magistrates a discretionary power to charge as high as £20 for licenses, where necessary, as in the City of St. John, Fredericton, Saint Andrews, &c. This proposition also called forth much argument, without coming to any definitive arrangement on the subject.]

Considerable discussion then took place, as to the minimum quantity of spirit which a retailer should be allowed to sell.—Mr. Speaker, Messrs. Simonds, Chandler, and S. Humbert, were for restricting it to one quart. Messrs. Wyer, Slason, Cunard, and Clinch, for one pint.—Mr. Partelow proposed, to settle the dispute, that it should be three half-pints, which would just fill a nominal quart bottle.—The motion for one pint was carried.—The price of a retailer's licence was fixed at a maximum of £7 10, and a minimum of 40s.

On the question as to the Mayor of St. John having the exclusive power of granting and charging for licenses in that City—

Mr. Partelow wished to obtain further information before pressing this section, as he wished that care should be taken that the rights of the citizens are not infringed.

Mr. Simonds defended the section, but would not press it at present, if Mr. Partelow had any serious objections.

Mr. Partelow thought the proposed maximum in this case too high. He thought if power was given the Mayor to impose it, he would do so.—His Worship was known to be a great friend to Temperance; and perhaps this power would only enable him the more forcibly to advance the great cause he is so attached to. He [Mr. P.] thought the Common Council should have this power.

Mr. S. Humbert concurred in thinking the sum too high, and that the power should not be given to an individual.

Mr. Cunard thought, that if the City of St. John possesses certain privileges under a charter, the House ought to be extremely cautious how it infringed those rights. He thought time was necessary for the consideration of the question, and that it should therefore, for the present, be postponed.