

the discharge of their duties, their attention to the wants and necessities of the country, the foundation they laid and the establishments they endeavoured to make for the permanent welfare and prosperity of the province, claim a return of our warmest gratitude; and we are fully persuaded that if their example had been followed by the two succeeding Assemblies, we should not have been left to complain of the wants and difficulties that we labour under at this day. . . . Had the two succeeding Houses had any serious desire to accommodate the inhabitants of the Province with that first of objects—proper schools for the education of the rising generation—they would not have refused some *permanent* regulations to have provided for the establishment and support of the necessary schools in the several parishes in the Province. But instead of such attention to the public interests, long sessions were wasted to little purpose and at an enormous expense in idle and groundless controversies, which terminated in the loss of the public revenue for four successive years.*

The controversy referred to arose in this way: The House of Assembly in the year 1793 submitted for the approval of the Governor and Council the annual "Bill for appropriating and disposing of public monies." In this Bill they failed to make provision for several objects recommended in the estimate of the Governor and Council, and also voted money for other matters originated in the House of Assembly, granting, for example, to the Justices in each county for the purpose of aiding and assisting the education of the youth in each parish of the Province, £10 for each parish, to be expended under the direction of the General Sessions. The Council desired a conference with the Assembly, on the ground that the appropriation bill did not provide for certain measures particularly and earnestly recommended from the executive chair, and also that the Governor and Council, whilst heartily approving the object of the proposed grant for schools, considered that the appropriation of money for the education of children in the different parishes was a new thing for which special and carefully considered regulations were necessary. These the Council desired to approve, amend or reject on their merits, which they felt could not fairly be done if the withholding of their approval implied the rejection of the bill in which all the moneys voted for public services were included. As the Council disapproved of the regulations proposed by the House of Assembly, they recommended that the grant for Parish schools should come up in a separate Bill.

*The signers of this address were Rev. James Scovil, Rev. Oliver Arnold, Jona. Ketchum, David Pickett, Daniel Mischeau, Isaac Ketchum, Rufus Rulofson, Walter Bates, Isaac Perry, Elijah Baxter, John Jarvis, William Peters, Azor Hoyt, Samuel Hallett, Wm. T. Stockton, William Puddington, John Prince, Edward Scovil, Silas Raymond, Joseph Dickson, Newman Perkins, Hen. Fairweather, Wm. Frost and thirty-two others.

The controversy that ensued apparently resulted in the loss of the appropriation bill for several consecutive sessions, and in consequence public interests suffered severely. The opening up of roads of communication was delayed and educational matters were at a stand.

The strained relations existing between the Governor and Council and the majority of the Assembly may be seen in a letter now in the writer's possession. It is dated July 6th, 1797, and was written by Col. David Fanning, one of the representatives of Queens County, to the Province Treasurer, Col. Abraham DePeyster. The letter is a curiosity in its way, and an extract may here be given as both showing the altered customs of the times and the limited education of some of our earlier legislators:

"I have taken the liberty to draw an order on you for five gallons of rum. This is intended for my haying and the mending of my Mill dam. As you was good enough to serve me in the winter, I am in hopes it will be in your power without disobliging yourself, but it is out of my power to send you the cash until fall, as I don't think that I ever shall get anything for attending the general Assembly, as I believe the Diel has got full possession of a majority of the house, and he will hold his holt I will be bound."

An anonymous political tract dealing with the dispute between the Assembly and the Governor and Council at this time suggests that the Council disapproved of the action of the Assembly, on the ground that the members being, almost without exception, influential Justices of the Peace, would practically control the expenditure of the school money in the various parishes. The grant would therefore be merely a little "popularity money," to be expended by the members for their own advantage.

[NOTE.—The date of first meeting of the House of Assembly should be January 3rd, 1786, not February 3rd, as in last number of the Review.—W. O. R.]

Unethical Teaching.

One day little Philip came running home from school in high glee. "O, mamma," he said, "we have had such fun in school to-day! A woman came in with a big wheel, and she turned it fast, and asked us questions, and we all 'hollered' out something, and it was such fun!"

"What did you 'holler out,' Philip?" asked mamma. "I don't know, but I 'hollered' just what the rest did." Now Philip is a boy well endowed by nature. He is strong and healthy, and his mind is in harmony with his body, not over-sensitive, but alert to all the sights and sounds that beat against the door of consciousness. He has that eager curiosity common to all young minds in a normal condition, and when something a little out of the ordinary is