

This is what is written in "Lawrence's Foot Prints"—a historical book written by Mr. Lawrence.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—Are they true, the foot prints?

Hon. Mr. DANIEL—This is the quotation:

"The last trial for a capital offence was in the old court house January 1828, Judge Chipman presiding. Patrick Burgen, a boy of 18 years, charged with entering the dwelling (in the night) of his master, J. B. Smith, manufacturer of ginger beer, corner of Union street and Drury Lane and robbing the till of one-quarter of a dollar. He was arrested the day after, tried before a jury. As the evidence of guilt was clear no other course was open to a jury than a verdict of guilty, with a recommendation for mercy, yet the judge, in sentencing the prisoner to be executed told him there was no hope for mercy. A petition was sent to the Lieutenant Governor, Sir Howard Douglas, asking the interposition of the prerogative of the Crown in behalf of the prisoner. Notwithstanding the recommendation of the jury the law was allowed to take its course, and Patrick Burgen was hanged February 21st, 1828, from the second story window of the old jail."

Lawrence takes this from manuscripts. The Early Lawyers and Old Judges of New Brunswick and their Times. With this information you can settle the Senator from Rothesay.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—The judge was drunk.

Hon. Mr. CASGRAIN—What year was that?

Hon. Mr. DANIEL—1828. With this information we can settle the hon. senator from Rothesay.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—That is the kind of justice they are handing out to the rebels in Ireland to-day. They are hanging from 12 at night until 4 in the morning. In justice to the hon. gentleman from Rothesay—

Several hon. GENTLEMEN—Order.

Hon. Mr. CLORAN—This is a matter between gentlemen. The hon. gentleman from Rothesay said that there was no record of the fact that a boy was hanged in New Brunswick for stealing a loaf. That was a broad denial of the statement made by the hon. senator from St. John. The hon. gentleman from Rothesay is absent and I am taking his place. The hon. senator from St. John made the charge that boys or men were hanged in New Brunswick for stealing bread. The hon. senator from Rothesay denied it. The hon. senator from St. John produces a document proving that the accused was guilty of burglary, which is altogether different from stealing a loaf of

bread, so that I say the hon. senator from St. John had no ground on which to stand in making that accusation against the hon. senator from Rothesay. The hon. senator from Rothesay is right, and the hon. senator from St. John is wrong.

Hon. Mr. DANIEL—I might say that the boy was hanged for stealing a horse and buggy, and the story in St. John is that the boy used the quarter to buy bread for the family so that he was hanged for stealing a loaf of bread.

DISMISSAL OF C. CHOQUETTE.

Hon. Mr. CHOQUETTE: When I spoke on the 28th April last I referred, I think, to my brother who had been dismissed from the Immigration Department in Montreal two days after my remarks in the Senate. Now I have received a letter from the Minister of the Interior in which he states:

It may be that the decision that was come to was not received by C. Choquette until 20 or 21st January—"

Two days after I spoke—

"But the investigation and the decision had been arrived at some considerable time prior to the delivery of your speech referred to."

As a matter of fact I was not aware that C. Choquette was your brother until I read your recent statement in the Senate to that effect, and I must also plead guilty to the fact that I had not read the speech delivered by yourself on 29th January, so that it was impossible that that speech could have influenced my decision."

My first intention was to give your statement a denial in the House of Commons, but I thought it would come much more appropriately from yourself in the Senate, where you had made the statement, and I feel sure your fairmindedness will induce you to make this correction."

So that my statement was correct; I spoke on the 19th, and he received notice on the 21st, I place these facts before the House because the gentlemen asked me to do so.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE BILL.

REPORTED FROM COMMITTEE.

The House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on Bill (67) An Act relating to St. Peter's Indian Reserve.

(In the Committee.)

Hon. Mr. WATSON—I should like to have an explanation of clause 2, "Patents on lands included in St. Peter's Reserve issued by His Majesty, etc." What does it mean? It does not appear to include all the lands.