NCE.

JOHN
NCE COMPANY.

ORS of the MARINE IN-
the present year, having
eeting of the Stock held-
ably to the Act of Incor-
given, that the Business
and RISKS taken upon

t and Directors.
IAS HEAVISIDE.

OTLAND
OFFICE.

re to inform the Public,
ed instructions to take
etofore; and also, to is-
d rates for all Insurance
ation of the Present Re-
eipts.
ROBERTSON,
Agent and Attorney.

SWICK
E COMPANY.
ry, is open for Business
cepted), from 11 A. M.
Instructions for Insurances
day following that on

Mail must be post paid.
JORDAN, *Secretary.*
31.

RANCE.
D, AGENT for the ATT-
ANY, of Hartford, Cir-
policies, and renewal re-
s, Farms, Stores, Mills,
port, or on the goods,
s' Stock and Utensils,
every other description
mage by Fire, on liberal
that the subject of insu-
ve from the inhabitants
n which its insurance
for five thousand dollars per
reputation to the value
much less sympathy as
y have neglected to avail
oviding against such co-

ry, $200,000, has been
e best securities; inde-
TS FUND of more than
o meet the occasional
s bears a high premium,
attend personally to the
nsurance is desired with-
in writing (post paid)
vince, describing the si-
e insured, will receive

vember, 1831.

FES.

y authorised to settle all
ate Business of KEATOR
fore indebted either by
unt, are respectfully re-
Notes of Hand and Book
n the 1st day of Novem-
e hands of an Attorney
AMES KEATOR.
of KEATOR & THORNE,
ree doors from the cor-
urf. 26th July.

a Power of Attorney
H, late Merchant of this
FORD, his Assignee, by
ollect the Debts due Mr.
indebted to him to call
day, or they will be put
& F. KINNEAR,
Attorneys.

demands against the Es-
ND D. EBARLAND, are
e, duly attested, within
; and those indebted to
ake immediate payment
HARLAND, *Admin's.*
ORD, *Administrator.*

legal demands against
DUFFUS, late of this
requested to present the
welve Months from this
to said Estate, are desi-
nt to

EW, Jun. } *Administrators.*

ands against the Estate
HEN, of this City, Teach-
the same to the subscri-
this date; and those in-
ested to make imme-

EAR, }
T, } *Executors.*
1831.

his day resigned his Pu-
D L. JARVIS, requests
be indebted to present
ayment; and those wh

ested to call and settle
diate payment or other-
ied by the Subscriber.
rain unsettled after Six
be put into the hands of

LEH M. JARVIS.

request of the Heirs, has
dministration on the Es-
, (relict of BARZILLA
deceased. Those who
Estate will render them
is date; and those who
ll please pay the same to
ttorney at Law, who is
e.
BARLOW, Adm'tr.
-8†

re-entered into Co part-
t respectfully to inform
generally, that they have
occupied by Mr. Wil-
Wharf, and commenced

ission Merchants;
ll be thankfully received.
HARLES SELLY.
LLIAM PATTON.
dian Assortment of DRY
DS, which they will dis-
April 12.

indebted to the late con-
FERTSON & Co. of this
tle with the Subscribers.
HN M'NAB, Assignee of
RLW LYMBURN, as well
BURN; and such persons
ment to any other person

V. & F. KINNEAR.
1831.

SUPPLEMENT TO
THE OBSERVER.

ST. JOHN, TUESDAY, MARCH 13, 1832.

LONDON.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—JANUARY 20.

Resistance to the progress of the English reform bill commenced at the very outset. Lord J. Russell having moved, that the house resolve itself into committee on that bill, Mr. Croker expressed astonishment at the proposition, as they had not yet before them all the papers promised by the ministers, as to the extent of various boroughs, &c. and which confirmed Lieutenant Drummond's statements, or gave rise to them.

Lord John Russell contended, that, as the only question that would be pressed at present was, to ask the committee to affirm the numbers in the first clause, namely, that so many boroughs be wholly or partially disfranchised, the naming of the boroughs (the items of the schedules) would be postponed till all the papers promised should be in the hands of members, and all had been presented, and were preparing for delivery; and, as to those papers, though they corrected many facts, and much as they might differ from some previously delivered documents, they did not affect any of the boroughs named in schedules A or B, so far as to make it doubtful, according to the principle of the bill, whether they ought to be placed there or not.

Sir R. Peel, Sir R. Vyvyan, and Sir C. Wetherell fully contended that, without all the papers, it would be to abandon their legislative functions to proceed to enpanel without an indictment, and to condemn without evidence.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted, that this might be true, if they were to proceed to name the boroughs; but, as that was not to be proposed, the opposition was without adequate cause.

Mr. Hume thought, that the house had grounds enough to go into the committee, and that if they were to wait till the opposition were satisfied, the time of commitment would never arrive.

The house eventually divided, and the numbers were—for Lord J. Russell's motion, 152; against it, 99; being a majority of 53 for going into committee of the bill.

The House having resolved into the committee, the first proposition discussed was that, in the first clause, which proposes that "fifty-six" boroughs be disfranchised; and, after a tolerably desultory but rather short debate, the committee divided on it. The numbers were—for the original motion 193; against it, 123; majority, 75. The 56, of course, are those enumerated in schedule A; so that the next step is, according to the former mode of proceeding, to settle which shall be the 56 boroughs. Sir R. Peel after the division, suggested that at least they ought not to proceed further now, as they would have to examine the schedule item by item, till members were in possession of the promised information respecting the several boroughs. The Chancellor of the Exchequer acquiesced in the suggestion, and further proceedings of the committee were postponed till Monday.

It is said, that the recent publication of the revenue accounts, and particularly that issued by the Commissioners for the Redemption of the National Debt, were intended as a sort of foundation on which ministers will propose to parliament the propriety of a tax on property. This affair has been a good deal talked of, we understand, among the members who arrived in London at the end of last week. Some say, that the scheme proposes a graduated income tax, the highest per centage being 10 or 12½ per cent. It is added, that the proposed of this tax will be contemporary with the repeal of part of the assessed taxes, and some others which press heavily on internal industry.

There had been an alarm in London, occasioned by the rumour of the appearance of the Cholera in Westminster, and that a private in the military hospital had been attacked with it. The symptoms of the case were reported to the Central Board of Health, who announced that there was no reason to believe that the case was one of Asiatic Cholera.

A petition is now lying for signature at Bristol, beseeching the Crown to extend its mercy to the criminals convicted of participating in the late riots, and is rapidly filling up.

Several parishes in Hampshire are so overburdened with poor, that in the neighbourhood of Winchester and Alresford, both men and women are to be seen in gangs, on the turnpike and cross roads, breaking stones, the former being at a shilling per day, and the women nine-pence. In the by-villages, the price is considerably less, the men being allowed only nine-pence, and the women six-pence.

Outrages had been committed in the county of Limerick. Several officers it is said had been nearly murdered.

LONDON, January 19.—The Paris papers of Tuesday, and the *Messager des Chambres*, dated yesterday, arrived this morning. There is nothing in the latter worth the slightest notice, except a report that Austria and Russia had ratified the treaty of the Conference; it was, however, a mere rumour.—The French Funds have improved; on Tuesday the Five per Cents. were at 96f. 70c., and the Three per Cents. at 66f. 55c.—*Courier.*

Holland has signified her intention not to pay the portion of the interest of the Russian debt with which the King of the Netherlands had charged himself.

We learn from private accounts, that if Austria puts off the ratification of the treaty, it will be on grounds different from those alleged by Prussia. There are also accounts from Russia which express a more favorable disposition to the treaty on the part of Russia than previous ones. Whatever may be said or done, however, by other powers, England and France are bound to ratify the treaty; and where then is the ground of apprehension that Holland will go to war?—*Globe.*

The Brussels papers of the 11th, amidst a variety of very uninteresting details, state, that General Belliard has been appointed commander of Antwerp; that King Leopold can collect an army of 50,000 men at a very short notice; that the editor of the *Messager de Gand* has been arrested for some political offence; and that a new order of knighthood is to be created in Belgium, and to be called "Leopold Order."

NEW-BRUNSWICK.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, FREDERICTON, *Wednesday, February 29.*

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

The House went into Committee of Supply, for the purpose of taking up the account of Robert Doak, Esquire, late Supervisor of the Great Road from Fredericton to Newcastle.

Mr. RANKIN moved a resolution, for a grant of a sum of £— to Robert Doak, Esq. &c. being the amount over-expended by him, such sum to be taken from the road appropriation of this year.

The debate which followed this resolution was the most evident and strong we have ever heard within the walls of the House of Assembly; personal invective and rancour being unbridled; and we find ourselves in a very unpleasant dilemma, in the discharge of our duty. One hon. Member, (usually emphatic and explicit) while indulging in strong invective against an absent public officer, took occasion to aim a powerful shot at the Reporter's box, asserting that "*that Reporter never published any thing that he* (the hon. member) *said*" in the House. We believe, however, that that hon. member's name and *says* is so well to be very frequently found in the printed reports of this session; and we can conscientiously affirm, that we have never intentionally omitted reporting any thing said by that hon. member, opposite and important to the subject under debate; but we freely confess, that to report *all* the sayings of that hon. member, or even to *correct* them at all times, baffles our ingenuity, and is beyond the abilities of one unassisted by a reporter. But that hon. member also apparently seemed that all the strong, unpalliated personal allusions and invectives which occurred in this debate, whether relative to present or absent parties, should appear in our reports. We are however, imperatively impelled, by the dictates of our own judgment and feelings, to refrain from such a course. It is, we humbly conceive, the business of a Reporter to commit to paper the debates, not the personal conflicts or reflections of hon. members. Where such conflicts occur, in a minor degree, and when there is no press of other matter, it may sometimes be excusable and even useful to report them. But when the invectives have become so extensive and unpalliated as they have been to day, and more especially when such very strong attacks are made by an *individual* member on a party not present, and not charged with any misdemeanour, we cannot conceive it our duty to give publicity to such matters. The hon. member alluded to has since in private expressed his opposition, that the Reporter was a "*man of peace.*" We plead guilty to that charge, and confess that it is our earnest endeavor, "*as much as in us lies, to live in peace with all men.*" In older countries, where the population is so dense, that it may almost be said, no man cares for his neighbour, and where interests are so inexplicably involved and tangled, that the dropping of one link in the complicated chain has scarcely any perceptible influence; it may be the case, that a Reporter is wholly independent of the opinions of those whose names may chance to come into his papers, and the sphere of their influence may never come in contact with that of his prosperity; but in so young and thinly populated a country as this, a kind of family compact pervades all society, and the smaller the community, the more indelible are the effects of that sacred bond. Others, therefore, an individual be, by some adventitious circumstances, raised above the power of that influence, the actions of those around him must have a considerable effect on his own welfare; and he must therefore, in some degree, have regard to those general relations which are the bonds of society. In the present case, not happening to be so independent in *fortune* as the hon. member alluded to, and not having the sanction or protection of the honorable house, we cannot decide it our duty to give publicity to all the causticity and keen insinuations of hon. members, whether intended to apply solely among themselves, or to those beyond the walls; lest by so doing we should unnecessarily embroil ourselves in the community, and render our labours a public nuisance rather than a general good. There have ever been motives for suppressing such parts of the observations in debate; these *solely* actuate us on this occasion: but having been, by the peculiar occurrences of this day, compelled to make this public vindication, we hope we shall at least be allowed the credit of candour and prudence, and the liberty of unostentatiously pursuing our avocations, without a repetition of unfounded insinuations. [The following report is a concise epitome of the excessively extensive discussion on this question, freed from the objectionable matters above alluded to, and confined to the opinions of hon. members on the subject matter of debate.—The discussion lasted about 4 hours; and we feel much exhausted by the attention it required.]

Mr. CUNARD said that he understood Mr. Rankin had some further important information to give in this case, and he therefore asked him to bring it forward.

Mr. RANKIN said he had no wish to withhold the information. He was perfectly willing to bring it forward.—We could scarcely hear any thing the hon. member said, but we understood him to state that since the last discussion on this subject, he had seen several persons from Northumberland, who had travelled the road in question, and who had pronounced the works to be quite satisfactorily executed. The hon. member also read a letter from the Honorable R. Simonds, Province Treasurer, stating that in September, 1820, he had travelled over the road, in company with — Peters, Esquire, that it was dark when they passed over the part disputed about, that they went over it without impediment, and that in conversation on the subject, he (Mr. Simonds) remembered having remarked what an excellent line of road it was.—The hon. Treasurer also, in his letter, stated that when he resided in that part of the country, he always heard Mr. Doak spoken of as a man of excellent character.—The hon. member also said that he had another letter, written by the late Lieut. Governor of the Province, in favour of Mr. Doak, (which, however, the committee seemed to think, it was not necessary to read;) and he stated his conviction, from general testimony, that Mr. Doak was a man of strict integrity, skill and ability, and he, (Mr. R.) knew no man who bore a better character for uprightness. The hon. member also strenuously contended that there had been no collusion between Mr. D. and his son-in-law. He thought Mr. D. might very well ask of the House a much larger sum than he really claimed, which was his balance of £119 13 4; as much more than that sum would not compensate him for the sleepless nights, the restless days, and all the anxiety and mental distress he had endured in this business. Even if it were a claim for nine times that amount, he (Mr. R.) would stand up in his place, and advocate Mr. Doak's cause.—After some few further observations, the hon. member said he should move for the sum of £119 13 4.

Mr. S. HUMBERT thought Mr. Doak stood before the House in a very fair way. He had done his duty; was a man of unimpeachable character, and ought to be compensated. The hon. member then (as far as we could hear, for he spoke at sometimes a very low tone, and at others with vehement rapidity,) stated that the Province Treasurer had lately mentioned to him the circumstances of his journey with Mr. Peters over the road in question, and that he had then remarked how well it was done, far beyond his expectations; and that the hon. Treasurer had also remarked that Mr. Doak was a man of well-established character. The hon. member proceeded to make some comments on the inestimable value of character, and of the impropriety of tampering with any man's reputation, and expressed his conviction that Mr. Doak was fully entitled to the allowance he prayed.

Mr. PARTELOW said he was really sick and tired of the subject, and he would not have arisen, had it not been attempted to establish a claim for the whole amount of the balance. It was expressly understood, when this matter was referred to the Committee of Supply, that no further sum could be sanctioned, than the balance of £37 : 2 : 2, as established in 1829; but after the extraordinary steps that had been taken, he (Mr. P.) felt it to be his duty to object even to that.

Mr. SCOTT at considerable length argued against the resolution, and contended that the road money had been misapplied by Mr. Doak, and that he was entitled to no allowance whatever.

Mr. CUNARD said that he would not go over all the history of the transaction, but that if fifty witnesses came forward in favor of Mr. Doak, it would not protect the Province from this current of imposition. Every individual in Miramichi had spoken in strong terms in commendation of his (Mr. C.'s) statement. The hon. member then at some length indulged in strictures on the conduct of the Province Treasurer, both with reference to the letter read by Mr. Rankin, and to the certificate given by that officer to Mr. Marter, ride surveyor, of St. John, and asserted that he had admitted to him (Mr. C.) that the money had been wasted by Mr. Doak on the road in question. The hon. member contended, that not one person from Miramichi had said the road was good, and that his own prior statements had been fully explained; and expressed his determination, as a duty he owed the country, to resist imposition, to oppose the resolution to the extent of £1, or even 1d.

Mr. CHANDLER denounced the warmth shown by hon. members in debating on this subject, but expressed his conviction that they were conscientiously actuated. He had no doubt that they were actuated by the best motives; but they appeared more to assume the character of advocates than judges. The hon. member proceeded to support similar views with Mr. Partelow, to the extent of £37 : 2 : 2; and observed, as to the Province Treasurer, that he thought that gentleman should not be spoken of disrespectfully, without some very good cause. He (Mr. C.) thought there should have been some certificate in this case; but the hon. Treasurer, having a due regard to his own character, could not make any such certificate; but had merely written a letter. The hon. member then observed, that the testimony was evidently that of a person not hostile to Mr. Doak. If the Treasurer had said to his fellow traveller, "how well the road is made," that must have been said after actual observation, and there would then have been a certificate of the fact. But the Treasurer had ridden over the road in the dark, and had merely observed what a good *line of road* it was. He could not, therefore, answer as to whether the road was well made. He thought the Treasurer deserved credit for the cautious manner in which he had stated his observations. The hon. member then contended that the Committee could not grant this large balance, in the face of all the resolutions and understandings of the House; and thought the hon. mover was not justifiable, or treating the Committee well in moving it.

Mr. S. HUMBERT said a few words in reply.

Mr. SIMONDS was fully convinced there was nothing whatever to impeach the character of Mr. Doak in the slightest degree. He stood as fair for honor and integrity as any man; tho' he certainly had been injudicious in his management. The hon. member from Northumberland (Mr. Cunard) had not allowed himself to understand the letter of the Province Treasurer. He had made many very unnecessary observations on that hon. gentleman's conduct, but he (Mr. S.) was perfectly satisfied it was not in the power of that hon. member to prejudice the character of that officer. Any such attempt would be totally unavailing. Any thing that hon. member could say on that subject would not have the slightest weight, and he (Mr. S.) would therefore pass over the observations. The hon. member then contended that Mr. Doak's character stood unimpeached, tho' he had been rather injudicious; and he (Mr. S.) would ask, where was the Supervisor who had not been so? Many Supervisor's accounts had come before the House fully as injudicious. The hon. member he stated that there was a great deal of party spirit evident throughout the whole of this business; that many accounts, more objectionable, had been passed by the House, and that Mr. Doak was entitled to his full balance.

Mr. ALLEN expressed his desire to do justice in this case, and his conviction of the integrity of Mr. Doak's general character, and concurred in Mr. Chandler's interpretation of the Treasurer's letter. The hon. member declared his opinion, that the resolution could not be sustainable for more than £37 : 2 : 2.

Mr. SIMONDS replied.

Mr. KINNEAR went over some of the circumstances of the case, and concluded that the whole question was, whether the sum of £37 : 2 : 2 or £119 : 13 : 4 was sustainable; and requested further information on that head from the chairman of the Committee of Public and Private Accounts.

Mr. PARTELOW, in reply, entered into the details of the case, and contended that the balance claimed was wholly made up of sums which the House had before solemnly resolved were inadmissable charges; and that the question simply was, whether the Committee should revise and overthrow the whole former proceedings of the House on this case; and grant money for building a bridge, which the Supervisor had never been instructed to build, and on which he had misapplied the money.

Mr. CHANDLER said, the whole line of road was already paid for; the £27 2s. 2d. was, in fact, part of the money expended on the bridge; but as that balance had been struck in 1829, the house had felt disposed to allow that balance.

After some few words from Messrs. SIMONDS and PARTELOW,

Mr. END rose, and after some remarks in reply to personal allusions before made use of by another hon. member, entered into a detail of facts, to prove that the road in question was bad; that the contractors had executed the work badly and thus misapplied the money; that Mr. Doak was deceived by them, and not the deceiver; that he was an excellent bridge maker, but a very bad road maker, and therefore properly dismissed; that he had been spoiled by the praises of Sir Howard Douglas; that he had erected the bridge in question at the suggestion and instigation of Judge Bliss, and not for his own convenience; and that his faults were more of the head than the heart.—The hon. member stated his opinion, that Mr. Doak was an honest and disinterested man, and that there was a vast deal of election feeling and party spirit in this business. He was not for allowing the sum of £119 : 13 : 4, but thought £37 : 2 : 2 too little. He thought the house ought at all events to divide with him the loss on this bridge, and to give him £50 on that account.

Mr. WYER thought Mr. Doak had a fair and just claim for the whole balance.

Mr. WELDON supported Mr. End's proposition.

Mr. HARRISON said, that from all he had heard, he was convinced that Mr. Doak had as fair and just a claim as ever came before the house. He did not know the man; but it seemed he had been induced to build the bridge by Judge Bliss, and had sufficient reasons for his claim. He [Mr. H.] thought, that if every Supervisor of Roads were called on for the purpose, many of them would be put to it to furnish such fair accounts as Mr. Doak's.

Mr. SPEAKER briefly reviewed the case, and expressed his determination to oppose the resolution. He had seen or heard no thing to induce him to alter his opinion of the impropriety of Mr. Doak's conduct; and if any thing was wanted to confirm him more strongly in that opinion, it was offered by the Treasurer's letter, and by his knowledge of that officer's general serious character. The hon. Speaker concluded with some few remarks in reply to other hon. members; and expressed his opinion that by passing the resolution the house would be contradicting themselves.

Mr. BROWN opposed the resolution.

Mr. TAYLOR thought Mr. Doak had acted from no improper motives, and supported the views of Mr. End and Mr. Weldon, as to the amount of the grant.

Mr. RANKIN withdrew his resolution, in favour of one moved by Mr. Weldon, for a sum of £ to Robert Doak, Esq. &c. &c. in full of all claims, to be paid out of the road appropriations.

Mr. HAYWARD expressed his opinion that Mr. Doak's character was re-established, and that he was entitled to his whole balance.

The question was taken on Mr. Weldon's motion, which was adopted.

Mr. CHANDLER moved that the blank be filled up with the sum of £37 : 2 : 2, which was negatived.

Mr. GILBERT thought Mr. Doak had stood