road near Samuel Raymond's to Ely Northrop's and others.—20*l.* for the road from Waddie's Mill to James White's in Kingston.—10*l.* for the road from Moses Jones' to the Widow Matthis'.—15*l.* for the road from the Widow Matthis' to Barnes', near the Little River.—10*l.* for the road from William Conners' to the River, by way of M'Vay's Saw Mill.—10*l.* for the road from the main road near Caleb Wetmore's to Nicholson Cove.—10*l.* for the road from John Wright's to the main road, near Gondola Point Church.—10*l.* for the road from Bates' Mill Pond to the main road, leading from Gondola Point Ferry.—10*l.* for the road from the Wards' Creek road, near John Fryer's to the cross road near Joseph Killin's.—20*l.* for the road from John Hallet's to the head of the Settlement on Trout Creek.—10*l.* for the road from William Price's, on the old Cumberland road, to Thomas Herriott's.—20*l.* to aid in building a Bridge across Trout Creek, on the road between the main road and Mr. Evanson's.—10*l.* for building a Bridge near George Robinson's, senior, on the road from John Barnes' towards Loch Lomond.—10*l.* for the road from John Barnes' farm to Titus'.—25*l.* for improving the Shepody road from Nethery's to M'Lauchlin's.—15*l.* to assist in building a Bridge over the Hammond river at Salmon Hole, on the road to Fletcher's settlement.—5*l.* to assist in rebuilding the Bridge near Andrew Sherwood's.—10*l.* for the road from Alexander Henderson's to the road leading from Joseph Barnes' Mill to Loch Lomond.—10*l.* for the road from the Lot granted to Alex. Henderson, across the River, to the School House, near Tweedie's on the north side.—10*l.* for the road from Thomas Saundet's to the new road, by the Bridge over Hammond River.—10*l.* for the road leading from Shepody road to James Campbell's, senior, on the south side.—15*l.* for the road from Ezekiel Foster's to Abel English's.—10*l.* for the road from Gershom Kiersted's to Alexander Kennedy's.—20*l.* for the road from Ezekiel Foster's through the English Settlement, to the Queen's County Line.—10*l.* for the road from Samuel Carson's to Charles Gailey's.—10*l.* for the Road from Gidney's Brook to Musquash, below Ellison's on the new road.—10*l.* for the road from Bellisle to the Settlement of Sprague, Henderson and others.—10*l.* for the road from John Little's to Abraham Parlee's.—10*l.* for the road from Richard Jordan's to the cross road below William Marr's.—10*l.* for the road from James Smith's Mill to Andrew Bullis.—20*l.* for the road from Gillies' to the Great road near Burnett's, Kennebackasis.—15*l.* for the road from Isaiah Kiersted's to James Gonong's, Kingston.—10*l.* for the road from John Sherwood's to Robert Marshal's.—10*l.* for the road from Noah Tabor's to David Faulkner's.—10*l.* for the road from Daniel Campbell's to John M'Monagle's.—10*l.* for the road from Henry Piers' to Peters' Mill.—10*l.* for the road from Crawford's to Chapman's Mill.—15*l.* for the road from Walker's, on the old Cumberland road to the Burying Ground, Sussex, one half of said sum for a Bridge near Nicholas Roache's.—5*l.* for the Road from Deforest's Lake to Sidney Baxter's.—10*l.* for the road from Hayward's Mill to the settlement of Thomas Stapleford and others.—10*l.* for the road from Crawford's Mill Brook to Matthew Smith's in the Irish Settlement.—10*l.* for the road from Peter King's to the Maxwell Road.—10*l.* for the road from near Eli Yeaman's to Corey's Farm, in Hampton.—15*l.* for the road from Gilbert Stockton's to William Beech's.—10*l.* for the road from James Nowlan's to Ryan's Mill.—15*l.* for the road from the Midland Settlement, Kingston, to near Seely's Kennebackasis.—10*l.* for the road from the Lower Line of Sussex to William Baxter's, Norton.—25*l.* for the road from the Widow Spences to the Patticake.—10*l.* for the road from near Gilead Secord's to the settlement of Caleb Spragg and others.—20*l.* for the road from Deforest's Lake to Tweedale's Brook, through the Salt Spring settlement.—10*l.* for the road from Beech's to Butternut Ridge.—10*l.* for the road from near Sherwood's old Mill to Colpitt's, and thence to the main Road near Hay's.—15*l.* for the road leading south westward from Benjamin White's, in Kingston.—5*l.* for the road from William Giggy's to Stephen Cronk's and others.

Thursday, March 5.

QUIT RENTS.—[*Continued from last page.*]

Mr. End said, this was as important a question as ever the house was called upon to decide, and they ought to take it up coolly, dispassionately and singly, without reference to the Casual Revenue or any other extraneous matters. The first point for consideration was, did the house really believe that government were sincere in their intention to collect the Quit Rents, and that point being answered, the next was, should the house allow them to be collected, or should they prevent it. He (Mr. E.) thought, altho' government had so long delayed proceedings, and tho' they were accused by the hon. and learned member for York, with not doing what the law required and authorised them to do, there could be little doubt whether they were sincere or not. If an honest man put the question to himself, what would be the obvious answer? It would be, that the government had been slow in collecting them, that they had been mercifully slow. Still, a great deal actually had been collected. and what had been the effect? The hon. member for York had mentioned an instance of an old and feeble man having been brought far from his home, to attend a trial and to tell what was the opinion of Governor Carleton on that subject; and this instance shewed that great difficulty and distress, and often glaring instances of what might be called cruelty, must take place in prosecuting their collection. He (Mr. E.) thought the government sincere in their intentions; and if the Quit Rents therefore were to be collected, great dismay and confusion must be caused in the country. He would go for the commutation, because he would take away all occasion from those who wished to keep up agitation in the country; and would deprive them of arguments to work upon. He believed the people of this country were too wise and too judicious, even to be driven into those outrages and contests contemplated by some persons; but still, if people would go on, agitating and agitating, he could not tell what would be the ultimate consequences; great commotions might arise from little beginnings, and therefore the house ought to be serious in attempting to prevent such effects.—They must be quite certain that government were sincere in their intention to collect the Quit Rents; but the hon. member for York said, that because the Casual Revenue was more than was wanted for the expenses of the government, that therefore they would not collect them. But on the very contrary, the very circumstance of their already collecting more revenue than they wanted, was a proof that they would also collect these rents, altho' they might not be immediately wanted. But it was argued that landholders only paid the Quit Rents; he (Mr. E.) however, thought differently. The public generally paid them, and he thought the odium of collecting them would fall on demagogues who would prevent commuting them, while the trouble would fall on the landowners. Farmers would put this very rent on the articles of produce which they might dispose of; the whole expense attending the raising of it always regulated the price of the article, and therefore the whole would be paid eventually by the consumer. Then the question was, whether the house should consent to the collection of those rents, which would cause trouble and confusion in the country, or pay that which would cause no trouble at all. He thought that if hon. members had any regard to the peace of the country, they must do the latter. It had been argued, that this commutation would increase the public burden; but it could not do so, because it would be commuting the Quit Rents at only half their value, and therefore it would actually diminish the burden. But if the tax-gatherer was to be sent round to every man's door, what would be the consequence? It would cause trouble, confusion, litigation and expense; and hereafter the legislature would have to provide funds to defray those expenses. A good deal had been said about the old loyalists; but he would ask, were not all the settlers in this province loyalists? Were not all its inhabitants equally loyal subjects of one sovereign, living under the same laws and institutions, and subject to the same effects of circumstances? Every one who came into a new country, and settled in a wilderness, bore a part of the hardships consequent thereon, and suffered privations previously unaccustomed to; therefore all the inhabitants of this province were entitled to the same consideration as the loyalists, and the latter ought to have no exclusive privileges.—But now as to the nature of the Quit Rents: look at the proclamation of Governor Lawrence in 1759 from Halifax, when he wished to draw colonists to Nova Scotia from Massachusetts, and see what was said there about Quit Rents. The object was, to people the colony with new settlers by offering them lands on the most advantageous terms; the proposition came first from the local government, and therefore they would certainly not hold out burdens or impositions in their offers, but would use the most powerful inducements and present the most flattering prospects. [The hon. member here read extracts from the proclamation alluded to.] Here, then, was a special reservation of Quit Rent on all lands, at the rate of 1s. for every 150 acres; here we found the Governor of Nova Scotia sending proposals to the New England settlers, anxious to hold out to them every encouragement to remove to Nova Scotia, and still specifically reserving these rents. If it had been a mere nominal thing, surely he would have so stated it, but the proclamation went on most particularly to specify the reservation and the amount; therefore, even in the absence of that record which now stood on the journals of this house, whereby they had admitted the fact, this was a proof of actual revenue intended to be derived from Quit Rents. If they were intended to be mere pepper-corn rents, why did they so often differ in their terms, in the grants? Why were they not the same, in all times and in all places? But they varied very much; different sums were reserved in different grants, and surely this did not look like a mere pepper-corn rent. Therefore, all these things were a convincing proof that the demand was undoubtedly a serious and legitimate one, and the right was unquestionable. Then came the question, would they be collected? Undoubtedly they would. He (Mr. E.) was therefore for the resolution; the house could not interpose between the government and the collection in any other way; they had delayed the question too long already, they could not otherwise prevent the enforcement of the claim; the difficulty would occur, and if so, then let those bear the palm who deserved it. Let it hereafter be recollected, when the evil day should arrive, that those who talked most about patriotism and loyalty were those who opposed this measure, and suffered the burden on the people to continue.

Mr. Speaker said that the hon. and learned member for York, (Mr. L. A. Wilmot,) had anticipated almost every thing he (Mr. Speaker) had to say, and had uttered it in much better language than he could pretend to; and he (Mr. Speaker,) sincerely congratulated the Province and the County of York in particular, in having selected a gentleman so willing and so able to protect the interests of the people.—What were the arguments in favor of this resolution? The hon. mover had said, if he was anxious to increase agitation, he would go against it himself. The hon. member for York had said it would create dismay in the country; then if it would create agitation and dismay, what must be the character of the tax itself? Must it not be a tax of the most odious description, more odious than even Irish Tithes? If it was a tax which the people were willing to pay, there would be no confusion or dismay. Was that, then, an argument why the house should commute these rents, and thus shift the collection of an odious tax from the shoulders of the Government to their own? Should they perpetuate this odious tax, by commuting it, and thus paying it for ever? This would compel them, instead of the Executive Government, to send people round the country, to create agitation and dismay, by collecting these rents. What was the usual conduct of the Government of England, when a tax became odious there? They immediately listened to the general voice of the people, and set about repealing it, and that was the way a wise government should always act. Could it be considered for one moment, that this was not an odious tax? Certainly not. Then it would be wisdom in the government to abolish it for ever. The collection of any tax which the people were not willing to pay, should be justified on some principle: on what principle could the Quit Rents be justified? Were they wanted to defray the expenses of the Provincial Government? No. They were not wanted at all, nor likely to be so, for ages to come. Then why should a wise government demand such a tax? Yet it was said that the house should commute them. But, first, they ought to have information as to the intended application of the tax. They only knew at present that it would be thrown into a fund, over which they had no controul, and which was already squandered away in the most lavish and improvident manner. Should the house do such an act of gross injustice, what would be the effect of it? It was said, that it would relieve the poor; it would prevent the poor from crying out. It certainly would not relieve the poor to anything like the extent that it would relieve the rich. Rich people would perhaps be relieved to the amount of £10 per annum, while most of the poor would be benefitted only to the amount of 2s. or 3s. a year. Then who was to pay this commutation? It must come out of the general revenues of the country; and from whom were those revenues raised? Not merely from landholders; but people who held no land at all contributed to the revenue, and surely it would be very unjust to tax them to relieve the landholders. Then there was another class of people, who had purchased lands without any reservation of quit rents, and they would also have to contribute to this commutation. Therefore, it would be only creating a very unjust and invidious distinction between the people, and anything that tended to create or keep up any invidious distinction was radically wrong. Any attempt at the collection of these rents would be the most unjust and arbitrary thing he had ever heard of. What was the conduct of the British government with regard to Irish tithes? They had actually forbidden the troops from aiding or assisting in their collection, which was an evident intimation of their intention to abolish them for ever. Those tithes were not more odious than these quit rents; and no doubt the government would equally relieve this province from the quit rents, if the whole matter could be fairly brought before them. He believed they would never have been thought of by the government, if they had not been recommended to their notice at the instigation of interested persons in this province. When their collection was recommended to government in 1824, by the person then at the head of the administration in this province, they were painted in such glaring colours, that the government was induced to collect them. The effects of the measure in the country were not represented to the government, but they were urged to collect them. Here there was a self-styled aristocracy, though not a real aristocracy, because they had no claims to that distinction, who had urged the propriety of collecting these quit rents so often, that it was now become a matter of pride with them, to continue to urge it, and they could not bear to relinquish the idea. Therefore the government were not to be blamed; it was not their own doing; but those persons who had recommended the collection were enemies to the province, though, perhaps, unintentionally, and the effect of this recommendation had been highly injurious. He (Mr. Speaker,) fully agreed with the hon. and learned member for York, that if the house made a proper application to the British Parliament, there they would get redress. Any further applications to his Majesty was totally out of the question, because he believed his Majesty never heard of them, but that they were all smothered in the office at the head of Downing-street. They should therefore go to the British Parliament, and then the whole British country would know their complaints, and when they saw what an odious tax it was, no doubt they would recommend to his Majesty its extinction for ever. He (Mr. Speaker) firmly believed there had been a great deal of canvassing on the part of some distinguished gentlemen in this province, to get these quit rents commuted; because their pride was interested in it, and therefore they had discovered an extreme anxiety that this question should be so settled; because, if the government hereafter found out that the tax was so odious to the people, they would turn round and say to those persons, "How came you to advise such a measure?" The fear of that very thing, therefore, induced them to be so anxious to get them commuted.—It was not necessary for him, (Mr. Speaker,) to say anything now as to the King's right to these rents; he would leave that point to the legal gentlemen in the house. But the house were asked to give a permanent grant to increase the funds of the casual revenue. That revenue was already ample enough, yet those who managed it were insatiable. One would think they had the mouth of a despotic king, and never could be satisfied. The more they got the more they wanted. They had now an annual surplus revenue of £6000 or £7000, besides a receipt of not much less than £50,000 from the Land Company, which they had no present use for; and what reason, then, could be urged for the commutation of these rents except that their collection would cause agitation and dismay? The house would not put an end to that even by commuting them: they would only transfer the odium to themselves from those who so earnestly recommended commutation. He (Mr. Speaker,) however, agreed so fully with what had been urged by the hon. and learned member for York, that it was unnecessary for him to enlarge upon it. He would conclude by moving an amendment to the resolution, which would express his sentiments on the subject.—The hon. Speaker then read and moved, as an amendment, a long resolution, setting forth the want of sufficient information to enable the house to come to any conclusion on the matter, both as to the sum necessary for the support of the Provincial Government, as to what specific purpose the quit rents were intended to be applied to,—enquiring whether the casual revenues were not already sufficient for all the purposes of government, and whether any such diminution of those revenues were likely to arise, as to require the collection of the quit rents, and also setting forth various allegations respecting the non-necessity and the injustice of the measure, and concluding with a resolution, that it was not expedient at present to entertain any proposition for commuting or redeeming the quit rents, and that in the mean time the house should address the Imperial Parliament on the subject.

Mr. Brown said, that like other hon. members alluded to, he had made up his mind upon the question, although he was always open to conviction. The question required a great deal of attention, and he would handle it with calmness and moderation. It would be recollected that the late House of Assembly made several attempts to obtain the controul of the King's rights and revenues in this Province, and that after repeated applications, a Delegation for that purpose was sent to London. The British government at last so far acceded to the wishes of the house, as to offer to surrender the whole of the Revenues, including the claim for Quit Rents, for £14,000 a year. The whole of the Civil List was to be paid out of this, and the overplus laid out for useful purposes connected with the Colony. To this proposal the House agreed—It would seem however that the Government on reconsidering the subject, thought we were getting too good a bargain, for they changed the conditions and broke up the proceedings. A petition was thereupon forwarded to the King—to this petition the House had received a refusal, followed up by a demand for the Quit Rents. The King's right to these rents was generally admitted; and had been admitted, as was seen, by a former house: they were clearly reserved in the Grants—but taking all the circumstances into consideration, the reservation appeared more like a matter of form than any thing intended as a source of revenue. The collection was attempted in some of the old Colonies; and in the colony of New-York an act had been passed to facilitate their collection. This was the time when the proclamation of Governor Lawrence was issued, as alluded to by the hon. and learned member for Gloucester, not after the American revolutionary war, but after the memorable expulsion of the Acadians from Nova-Scotia, mentioned in Halliburton's History of that Province,—a transaction which no man could contemplate without pain, whereby the unoffending inhabitants were driven out, and the Province left desolute. Governor Lawrence then endeavoured by proclamation to induce settlers to come from New-England, and in this proclamation the Quit Rents were mentioned. But these and other high handed proceedings ultimately excited the Colonists to Rebellion, and terminated in the dismemberment of the Empire. Since that time we heard nothing of these rents, until they were again demanded a few years ago, and that, as had been stated by the hon. Speaker, at the suggestion of a former Governor of this Province. Now, in looking at the present demand, the house would naturally ask, is the money wanted? To this every candid man must answer—Nay. Look at the Casual Revenue this year; it was more than £20,000. Now it did seem extremely hard, that this antiquated claim should be made upon the country, when the money was not needed. But it was said that we have the same right to pay as Nova-Scotia. The hon. and learned mover of the resolution said, that they have been commuted in Nova-Scotia, and that was a strong reason why we should do the same. Now the cases were by no means similar. Nova-Scotia refused to accept the offer of Government for providing for the Civil List, and these rents were called for in that Colony as a necessary item of Revenue to help to pay the salaries. New-Brunswick was ready to pay the price demanded, and the bargain was broken by the Colonial Minister. The Casual Revenue of Nova-Scotia, Quit Rents and all, was not enough to bear the expenses of the Civil List. One half of the Casual Revenue of New-Brunswick is sufficient to pay all reasonable salaries, without the Quit Rents. In Nova-Scotia the quit rents were demanded because they were needed in consequence of that Colony refusing the offer for the civil list. In New-Brunswick the Government seemed to have departed from its own offer, and now demanded quit rents that are not needed.—Here was the reasoning of one of the Legislators of Nova Scotia.—"How do we stand now? "We know that the Government is determined to "collect the quit rents if the commutation is not made "—and for what reason? Because it has not the "means to pay the indispensible officers of the Pro-"vincial Government." This was the language of one who was eager for commuting in Nova Scotia—these were his strong reasons, and could such an appeal be made here it would no doubt be irresistible. But would any man in his senses allow himself for a moment to believe, that Nova Scotia would have granted the commutation if her Casual Revenue had been as productive as ours? Every honest Colonist was willing to allow an ample salary for every reasonable service; no man would wish to see the British peasantry taxed to pay our Provincial officers—Indeed the casual revenue was now so productive that one half the sum was more than enough for every reasonable purpose. Why then call for the quit rents? It was certainly a most unfortunate and untimely demand. And should the house now offer to commute? No, by no means. Should they lose sight of what they have so long had in view? They had said that the expence of the Land Office is too great—that the salaries of some of the officers are too high—that the College swallows up too much of the public money, and if they now offered a commutation for the quit rents, they would be making a permanent and voluntary addition to those high expenditures which they had so long complained of: and it was with some surprise, that he (Mr. B.) saw the hon. gentleman who was himself one of the Delegates, now moving this resolution. He (Mr. B.) did hope that this Province, in consideration of its ample Crown revenues, would have been exempted from this impolitic and unnecessary demand; that the loyal inhabitants of this Colony would have been spared the pain of paying, what they never expected to be called upon to pay, RENT TO THE KING!—That some consideration would have been extended to them, even "for their Fathers' sake." He (Mr. B.) being an old country man, could not speak from experience, but he had a very good idea of what were the feelings and the principles of the first settlers—*Little did the* FATHERS *of this generation expect, when prompted by feelings of loyalty alone, they left their comfortable homes and their fruitful fields, and took refuge in the wild woods of New-Brunswick, that the day was coming when the* KING *would call upon their Sons to pay Rent!*—The House had this day been told, that they wondered, in their honest simplicity, when they read their grants, what the two shillings could mean; and the men in authority told them that it was a *mere acknowledgment of sovereignty—a mere matter of form*, sometimes a pepper corn, and sometimes a few pence, and that no demand of it would ever be made,—and here it lay, dormant and dead, for nearly half a century. The Governor of the Colony and all the grandees of that time submitted cheerfully to all the privations of new settlers, and quit rents and tonnage duties were equally unknown. But that frugal generation had passed away, and luxury, and an inordinate desire for money, seemed now to prevail. The evil day, it seemed, had come upon us, and now it behoved us to act prudently. Let the House not commute—let them petition once more—let them tell a plain, candid, and unvarnished tale—let them point out the impropriety of the present proceedings. They had tried the Whigs, now let them try the Tories. They had justice and reason on their side, and might yet succeed. It was painful to contemplate the reasons, and the only reasons, that were urged for commuting. The learned mover of the resolution talked of litigation, and trouble, and inconceivable confusion, and dissatisfaction, that would prevail all over the Province should the collection of these rents be resumed; and how deeply interested the Government was in the good feeling and loyalty of the people. And would the Government, without any cause, lay this bitter infliction upon the country? Surely not. And another learned gentleman also told of troubles, and perplexities, and the agitation of demagogues, and great difficulty, and dismay. Really it would almost be a libel upon the British Government to suppose it capable of such acts of oppression. He (Mr. B.) once underwent a severe castigation in a former House, for applying the term "*infernal*" to the quit rents—he was told it was wrong, but now he began to think that the term was not so inapplicable after all;—the hon. and learned mover seemed to think so too, because he said it would cause great difficulty and dismay, and that was as much as any infernal thing would do.—[*Great laughter.*]—He should go against the resolution; he would not now commute. When hope was quite sunk in despair—when neither representations nor petitions would avail us any thing, it would be time enough to think of commutation. He would wait the event—at any rate the House should wait for instructions from their constituents, before doing any thing of that kind. He hoped the hon. mover would withdraw his resolution.

Mr. Slason said he hoped the hon. mover would not withdraw it, because the question merely was, whether the country should pay 1s. or 6d. If they could commute the quit rents, they might come off with paying only half price, but if not, they must pay the whole. They were told that the collection of the quit rents would cause a great deal of confusion and dismay in the country, and he had no doubt of it. They had every reason now to believe the government were in earnest; they had tried every thing they could, to prevent the necessity of collecting them, and now no doubt they would collect them. He (Mr. S.) would not attempt to say, it was prudent in them to do so, because no doubt it would cause great confusion and difficulty in the country; but since they did not seem to think so, the house should endeavour to prevent those ill effects. There was surely no intention on the part of the Legislature, even if they did commute them, to attempt their collection themselves, or to burden other persons who were not now liable to pay them; they might put a kind of assessment on the lands, which would do away with all those difficulties. They would still be open to negociating with the government, they might lay the case clearly before government, and might even yet get a remission of the claim. The great difficulty in collecting the quit rents now, was, where transfers and devises of land had been made since the original grants, and the lands had been conveyed and subdivided, without any reservation of quit rents, so that it was impossible now to find who was to pay them. But if they were commuted, the house might so regulate the matter, that the lands themselves should all pay a proportionate assessment, which should be laid out on the public roads, especially the bye roads. The claim made by government, was certainly a very impolitic and a very petty one; he thought they ought never to have asked for such a paltry sum as £1200 a year, for which sum, it appeared, these rents might be commuted, but as it was demanded, and as the right could not be disputed, the house ought to commute, to save the country from the confusion and distress that would otherwise arise; and it would only be paying half price. He thought that all that could be said on the subject just came only to that, though there was a great deal of long stories said about it very unnecessarily. (*To be continued.*)

EXTRACTS FROM THE JOURNALS.

Monday, March 9.

On motion of Mr. Hill,

Whereas the Legislature have made provision for the support and encouragement of primary Schools, on a scale of liberality commensurate with the financial resources of the Province: and whereas numerous Petitions are annually presented by persons not legally qualified to receive the Provincial Bounty; which Petitions unnecessarily encumber the Journals, and occupy much of the time of the House in discussion of their merits; therefore *Resolved*, That this House will not in future receive any such Petition from any School Master or Teacher of a Parish School, praying Provincial aid for services performed in that capacity.

To which Mr. Crane moved as an amendment to the second clause of the Preamble,

To strike out all after the word "presented" and insert "from persons seeking Legislative aid for teaching Schools in cases where all the requisites of the Law had not been complied with, thereby causing great delay and loss of time in discusing the merits of said Petitions, and when applications of this nature are successful, having a tendency to cause neglect in complying with the Provisions of the Act relative to Parish Schools."

And upon the question it was carried in the affirmative.

A further amendment was then moved by Mr. Crane, to strike out all after the word "*Resolved*," and insert "That no provision will in future be made for applications of the above description, unless in cases where it is made to appear to the satisfaction of the House that all the requisites of the Law had been complied with by the person so applying, or that he or she has been prevented by circumstances beyond their control."—Which was also carried in the affirmative.

The question was then taken upon the Resolution as amended, when it passed in the affirmative.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Deputation sent to England in 1833, to bring under the consideration of the Government certain matters connected with the Province, laid before the House an Account shewing the expence of the said Deputation; as also the cost of various Books purchased for the Council and Assembly.—*Ordered*, Thereupon, that the same lie on the Table.

On motion of Mr. Partelow,

That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee of the whole, on a Bill to authorize assessments upon the City and County of Saint John to pay a proportion of the Contingent Expenses of the City and County, and the balance of the County Debt.

To which it was moved as an amendment,

To strike out the word "now" and insert "this day three months."

And upon the question it was carried in the affirmative.

UNITED STATES.

From the N. Y. Courier & Enquirer, March 6.

IMPORTANT FROM WASHINGTON.—*Congress.*—The mail from Washington did not arrive yesterday till night. The proceedings in Congress, as that body approached so near to its dissolution, are of the most gratifying character. On the question of our relations with France, the House of Representatives has unanimously adopted the following resolution:

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY, That in the opinion of this House, the Treaty with France, of the Fourth of July, 1831, should be maintained, and its execution insisted upon.

The annunciation of this vote from the Chair was received with a loud and spontaneous burst of applause, which broke at once from the galleries, and was reechoed from the floor, making the walls and dome of the chamber to resound with joy while mutual congratulations passed in all directions.

This resolution is in accordance with the feelings of ninety nine of every hundred inhabitants in the United States; and is virtually saying to France—"We are "prepared to *make* you pay us the amount due our ci-"tizens *at any and every hazard*—all negotiations on "this subject is at an end, and it is for you to determine "whether our relations shall continue to be of a *pacific*, "or whether they shall assume a *belligerent* character." As Americans, we take pride in announcing to our fellow citizens this *just* and dignified, yet decided and unanimous determination of the representatives of *fifteen million of freemen!* To have adopted any medium course would have covered our country with *disgrace*, while this very obvious language of Congress, will not only admonish the nations of Europe that the United States are prompt to insist upon their rights and protect their national honor, but it will teach France to *beware* how she tampers with the faith of Treaties. If *war* should be the consequence of thus extorting justice from France, there will not be found in our country a solitary citizen, who will dare to question its justice, or oppose its being energetically carried on.

The following resolution, also moved by Mr. Adams, was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That preparation ought to be made to meet any emergency growing out of our relations with France.

Our relations with France are becoming every day more complicated. It has come to this, that each party in responding to the other, feels it necessary, for the protection of its own *honor*, to make use of expressions calculated to irritate rather than allay. At least, such has been the course of things since the receipt of the President's Message in Paris. Let this game go on a little longer, and what was begun in comparatively good nature, will be ended in blood and carnage. Three months ago our relations with France were of the most friendly character; now we are coolly talking of war, as if we were the natural enemies of each other.

And yet we are not prepared to believe and do not believe, that there will be a war. We do not believe that the two nations are infatuated. After so many years of friendship, which has proved mutually advantageous, are we, for the sake of $5,000,000, or for the sake of a few words in a Message or in a Minister's note, to gratify the whole family of despots by turning our arms against each other? We say, no. Doubtless every spring of the Holy Alliance will be set in motion to produce this result: and some of them are in motion already. Why else do Russia, Austria, and other despotic governments, seize the present moment to rake up and urge old claims against France. It is clearly to embarrass the American Indemnity Bill. And should they succeed in putting us furiously against each other, they will probably seize that opportunity to fall upon France in the rear, or upon us, as the case may be, in the hope of extinguishing one or both of these brilliant lights of freedom, so annoying to those whose element and aliment is darkness.—*New-York Journal of Commerce.*

War or Peace.—It is seldom that we quote from the Journal of Commerce, but the following is the conclusion of a very sensible article in reply to some folly of the Evening Post:—"Before we make up our minds to a war with France, we shall have the courage to inquire whether the honor about which we are to fight, is really of the kind to be worth what it will cost We shall contemplate this happy country exuberant with prosperity, and its free and generous sons making all earth and ocean teem with their enterprise, in peace; and its cities deserted, its commerce annihilated, its merchants ruined, and its citizens slaughtered in war. We shall turn our eyes on our institutions of religion and learning, growing up on all sides, in peace, and vice and violence domineering in war. We shall look at the all-pervading supremacy of our laws, in peace, and the danger to those laws by the increase of military forces and the eclat of military favorites in war. We shall look at the prospect, such as it may be, of obtaining five millions of dollars by peace, and the certainty of its loss, with five millions more, by war. And finally, whoever may cry coward, we shall look at France, our old and faithful friend, contributing in no small degree to our happiness and honor in peace,—but with a warlike population triple our own, a well disciplined army of three hundred thousand men, and a powerful navy, ready to be let loose upon our coast in war, defended as we are with half armed fortifications, and an army nominally consisting of six thousand men. It is idiotism not to reflect on all these things before we take irretrievable steps in pursuit of that phantom,—honor."—*N. Y. Star.*

M. Serurier, late Minister of France to the United States, arrived in this city on Wednesday evening from Washington, and will embark in the Albany, packet of the 8th inst., for Havre.

The U. S. Frigate Constitution is under orders for the Mediterranean, to relieve the Delaware 74, Com. Patterson. She will stop off Havre. If the American Treaty shall have passed the French Chambers, the Frigate will proceed—if rejected, she will return with Mr. Livingston on board, to New York.

THE OBSERVER.

ST. JOHN, TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1835.

We have no later dates from Europe than those announced last week.

A New-York paper of the 11th inst. and Boston of the 12th have been furnished us.—Congress adjourned at midnight on the 3d inst. Their latest proceedings on the French question, will be found in a preceding column.

We are led to expect that our Provincial Parliament is by this time prorogued, unless any new matter has unexpectedly arisen to demand their longer attention. Many of the Members of both Houses have arrived in town, having quitted their post after witnessing the *denouement* of the unfortunate collision between the Legislative Council and Assembly, under the impression that nothing remained to be done. The die is now cast; the Legislative Council, following up, for consistency's sake, the position they had previously taken, have voluntarily run the hazard of throwing the whole country into confusion, and of incurring the well-merited odium necessarily consequent thereupon, by throwing out the *whole appropriations of the Session*, thus rendering the entire labours of the Legislature, in pecuniary matters, utterly abortive, depriving public servants of their just and well-earned stipendiary remuneration, and putting every service and every individual, dependent on legislative appropriation, to the utmost inconvenience and distress, perhaps for a whole year,—for what? Well, indeed, may every man thus wantonly shut out from the prompt and rightful recompense of his labours, indignantly ask, "*for what*," and "*why?*" We reiterate the question—"*Why?*"—And we answer:—because the *Honourable* Members of the Honourable Legislative Council, feeling themselves unable, from their *very limited* resources, from the *pitiful pittances* derived from the *trifling* and *ill-paid public offices* they have the honour to fill, (and here we speak only of those to whom these hints will apply,) to sustain the enormous expense of attending for a few weeks on their Legislative duties, in a town where several of them *actually* reside, have demanded from the Assembly *payment* of these overburdening expenses, and the Assembly have justly and indignantly refused it!—This single reason, then, this one fact of such peculiarly *public interest*, has been deemed sufficient to authorise the rejection, not only of payment of the expenses of the Members of Assembly, but absolutely of *all* the supplies and appropriations for the *whole* public service! Hear it, patriotism! Record it, justice! Admire it, disinterestedness!—The fact itself is incontrovertible; because at the very commencement of this *honourable* struggle for filthy lucre, the Upper House, when they rejected the bill for paying the expenses of the Lower, unreservedly and *delicately* put a *resolution on their Journals*, expressly stating that their sole reason for so doing was, that they *could not get paid themselves!* There was no disguise, no mincing of the matter; no delicate *hints* on the sub-