Communications.

[FOR THE CHRONICLE.]

If there's a hole in a your coats
I rede ye tent it,
There's a chiel amang ye taken notes
An faith he'll prent it.

MR. EDITOR:—I have always noticed that in every political movement, some favourite watch word or sentiment is adopted, around which a party rallies as the standard of their cause. They hold it up as the moving principle with, and the grand object to which all their exertions tend. I have noticed also, that the more unworthy the motives which actuate the party, the more noble the sentiment they adopt for their motto that it may suffice for a screen for dark and wicked purposes, by assuming the outward garb of virtue and patriotism to insinuate themselves into the confidence of their fellow men, that they may execute their purposes with a surer and deadlier aim. The Irish agitator has assumed the soul stirring war cry of "*Justice to Ireland*." The agitators here, have adopted a motto no less specious plausable and generous, viz. the "*Blessings of a responsible Government*:" and the first is as much the end of the one, as the last is (in the usual acceptation of the term) the object of the other. By "Justice for Ire and" is meant, the oppression and consequential discontent of the poor, for the agitators self agrandizement, and by "responsible Government," our Representatives intend, not only the accountability to them of all public functionaries for the due and efficient managment of their respective offices, but a dependance on them for the tenure of those offices and the remuneration for the services performed. Now it is well known, that of all the component parts of Colonial constitution, the House of Assembly is the only one that has no higher tribunal to which it is responsible for its proceedings. They are elected for the term of seven years and during that time are accountable to no mortal man. Never mind how treacherously they may act,—no matter how base the motive or principle of their political conduct may be—or howsoever dangerously it may operate upon the interest, nay the liberty of the subject—during that period, they are beyond the reach of those whose servants and protectors they are, and to whom alone they are responsible (if responsible it can be called) for what, in truth, does their accountability amount to? Should they die a natural death, or "kind heaven" sooner terminate their existence; they return to their constituents, who can only inflict upon them the punishment of non-election a second time. This is the only way a representative can be called to his account! Now what would be the effect if all public bodies and officers, whether judicial or civil were to be under the direct controul and influence of the Democratic branch of the Legislature? why they would be made responsible to a body who are themselves responsible to no one. All functionaries (under one well regulated government) when they are guilty of official neglect or transgessions of any kind are not only deprived of the power of repetition but are punished for the offence committed. But the Assembly are not so amienable—they may be guilty of the most grinding tyranny—they may inflict the most serious evils upon the community at large or private individuals, and dare even encroach upon the *freedom of the person*, and cannot be challenged for the outrage. They are merely deprived of doing the like again. This is responsibility with a vengeance! "Angels and Ministers of grace defend us" from such!

The composition of the present House of Assembly is of such a character, as would prevent the idea, from being seriously entertained by any reflecting man. Were it composed of persons whose integrity, honor, virtue, and patriotism was so unimpeachable as to be like Cæsar's wife "free even from suspicion"—did it confide in the majesty of its moral power for commanding the respect of the country, rather then the strong arm of its assumed authority, one would be disposed to concede the point: but when we detect the working of private ambition, of individual resentment, of grovelling scurrility, one is naturally jealous of enhancing a power already dangerous to liberty. Have they not during the last session deprived a British subject of his freedom; and that without what the meanest and diabolical felon may claim as a right—*a hearing*—We were accustomed to boast of Magna Charter and the habeas Corpus Act; but what will Magna Charter or the habeas corpus avail him, who provokes the resentment of a member of our Assembly—it might as well be on the sheep's back again! and where is the remedy? *Echo* answers, WHERE. He must be content to polish the bars which secure him, and await retributive justice in the world to come, for assuredly he will not get it here.—"Tis well for such to cry out for the 'Blessings of a responsible government!'

We will know (at least all those who are at all conversant with New Brunswick politics) that all the iniquities of the last session can be traced to one or two leading men, and the inference must be, that the remainder are either under their controul or so ignorant as not to penetrate the film that obscures their designs: either conclusion will convince us of the danger of increasing the means of carrying those designs into execution. The House of Assembly have never been consistent in their line of policy, except in being inconsistent, and this is to be deduced from the want of principle in their leaders, the motives of some of whom it would be as well to notice, as it may tend to open the eyes of some who imagine there is not a "hole in a his coat."

The now leader is no doubt a disappointed man, his ambition has been thwarted, and the government now feel the malignity of his revenge. The time has been, when this same man was recognized as the firm supporter of the constitution—a pillar of the Government and an uncompromising protector of the rights of the subject, he was then respectable and respected as a public man. "Sed quantum mutatne ab illo!" he was then I suppose a sinner, he must now be a Saint. He then saw through monarchcial spectacles, he now sees through democratic ones. It is an old saying among moral writers, "that a man never became depraved in an instant:" but we find there are some who can change their creed as a mountebank changes his cloths, in the twinkling of a bed post. And we can only say of his politics what Dr. Johnson said of whiggism, "that it was the negation of all principle." But what is his power and influence? is it not kown to be almost omnipotent? He can make Speakers and re-make them "*ad lib*;" and there can be no surer evidence of its extent, than the fact of his controul over one, who has heretofore been the puller of all, that person now enjoys the *Blessings of Responsibility*, for if he does not jump Jim Crow as the string pulls, he must ere long evacuate his high seat. To such a man and his adherents are the destinies of the country committed. To one who is not only in unrelenting hostility to the government, but in pursuing that revenge; so sweet to disappointed mortals, has trampled upon the rights of the people and that which is most sacred to man, the freedom of the person. To him my countrymen confide yourselves and to those who support him, and if they do not ride yon a pretty race, my prophetic spirit has for once deceived me, and I think before many a lustrum passes by, you will discover what our democrats mean by "*the Blessings of a responsible government.*" Y.

British News.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES.

To whom was referred the letters from the Lord Chancellor and Mr. Charlton.

Mr William Wynn reported from the Committee of Privileges, to whom were referred two letters to Mr. Speaker, one from the Lord Chancellor, dated January 31, 1837, and the other from Edmund Lechmere Charlton, Esq., a Member of this house, dated January 31, 1837, and to whom was also referred another letter from Mr. Charlton to Mr. Speaker, dated Feb. 3, 1837, and who were empowered to report their proceedings, together with their opinions thereupon, to the house from time to time, that they had examined the matters to them referred and had agreed to the following Report:—

"In reporting upon the question which has been referred to your Committee, they propose to follow the course which had been usually adopted upon such occasions, first stating the circumstances of the particular case and afterwards the law and usages of Parliament as it appears to apply to them.

"The warrant of Mr. Carlton's commitment to the Fleet, and the order of Court on which it was founded, were produced to the Committee and it appeared he was committed by the Lord Chancellor for writing a letter, addressed to William Brougham, Esq., one of the Masters of the High Court of Chancery, containing matters scandulous with respect to the said master, and an attempt improperly to influence his conduct in the matter pending before him, 'which the said Lord Chancellor deemed to be a contempt of the Court of Chancery.' The other not proceeding to set forth the letter in question, or to specify the part of it on which these charges were grounded, your committee therefore directed the letter that although the Lord Chancellor had the power to declare what he deemed to be a contempt of the High Court of Chancery, it was necessary that the House of Commons, as the sole and exclusive judge of its own privileges, should be informed of the particulars of the contempt, before they could decide whether the contempt was of such a character as would justify the imprisonment of a member. They also summoned Mr. Charlton before them, and afforded him an opportunity of fully stating his case.

"Upon the whole examination the letter appears to your committee to be expressed in an intemperate and improper manner. The letter however, was occasioned by information derived from the Solicitor in the cause, the correctness of which Mr. Charlton had no reason to doubt; but they are of opinion that it is offensive to the Master, and thereby to the authority of the Court under which he acted, and was an attempt improperly to influence his conduct in the matter pending before him, with a view to obtain a further hearing, to which if applied for in a proper manner, Mr. Charlton would have been entitled.

"It is found, in the course of the investigation that Mr. Parkes, the solicitor for the parties who appeared before the Master in opposition to Mr Charlton's claims, had, during the interval which had occurred between the issue of the warrant and its execution, written a letter at request of a third person, containing the following assurance—'Mr. Charlton may take my honor, and I have never yet violated it, that he is perfectly secure in coming to my house to see if we can adjust the Ludlow matters,' and that Mr. Charlton did afterwards in consequence attend a meeting at the house of Mr. Parkes without any interruption or attempt to execute the warrant by the officers who held it. Your Committee therefore felt it necessary to ascertain whether the execution of a process issued on the ground of punishing a contempt of the Court of Chancery had in any manner been allowed to be enforced or suspended at the discretion of one of the litigant parties, or to be rendered subservient to his objects. This inquiry has tended considerably to lengthen their proceedings, but the result has satisfied them that no power had ever been given by any person, or exercised by the Solicitor, for that purpose.

"Upon the law and usage of Parliament, as affecting this case, your committee beg leave to refer to the statement contained in the Report of the Committee of Privileges on the case of the Hon. William Long Wellesley, presented to the house on the 26th of July, 1831, the precedents cited in which they will not here repeat.

"The Committee are deeply impressed with the difficulty and importance of the question referred to them, in the absence of all authorities to which they can refer as clear in point and directly bearing on this particular case. It will be seen, from the early cases, that the ancient definition of Privilege of Parliament is, that it belongs to every member of the House, except in cases of treason, felony, or refering to give surety of the peace. These exceptions by the statement of the Commons, in 1641, are further extended to all indictable offences; by their Resolution in 1697 to forcible entries and detainers; and in 1763, in conformity with the principle of the declaration of 1641, and of a subsequent resolution in 1678, to printing and publishing seditious libels: to which may be added the resolution of the Lords in 1757 that privilege shall not protect Peers against process to enforce the *habeas corpus*.

"The ordinary process, for contempts against persons having privilege of Parliament or of peerage has not been that of attachment of the person, but that of sequestration of the whole property, which has been found sufficient to vindicate the authority of the Courts, even in cases of some aggravation.

"It is stated by Blackstone, that 'contempts committed even by Peers, when enormous and accompanied with violence, such as forcible rescues and the like, or when they import disobedience to the King's writs of prohibition, *habeas corpus*, and the rest are punishable by attachment;' and the same doctrine has on different occasions been expressed by other writers, and by judges of high authority.

"The only cases however in which attachment have been found by the committee to have been actually issued against privileged persons are that of the Earl of Ferrers, by the King's Bench, and that of Mr. Long Wellesley, by the court of chancery, already referred to. The former was a case of disobedience to a writ of *habeas corpus*, to which while the discussion was pending, it had been declared by the House of Lords privilege of Parliament did not extend; the other was that of the forcible, removal of a ward of the Court of Chancery, and placing her out of the jurisdiction of the Court, which obviously could only be checked by the most prompt and efficacious remedy.

"Under all the circumstance of the case your Committee, are of opinion that Mr. Charlton's claim to be discharged from imprisonment by reason of privilege of Parliament ought not to be admitted.

Feb. 16, 1837.

RUSSIA AND CIRCASSIA.

The letter of our constantinople correspondent dated Jan. 25, states that a Russian corvette had been driven by stress of weather upon the coast of Circassia, where she was immediately captured by the inhabitants. Our correspondent adds, "It is a common observation of the Circassians that they are as much masters of the land as Russia is of the sea, which the latter take good care to confirm by keeping at a respectful distance."—*Morning Chronicle.*

SPAIN.

Accounts from San Sebastian to the 16th ult. state, that General Evans would attempt the movement against the Carlists in a few days, even if unsupported by the other Generals of the Queen.—The dilatory proceedings of the latter for the last six weeks, for which no reason can be imagined, have given Don Carlos time to rally his forces, and make every preparation for the defence of his lines on the point immediately menaced namely, before San Sebastian. He has from 16,000 to 20,000 in San Sebastian.

Accounts from Bayonne to the 23d ult. state, that Cabrera, at the head of 3000 infantry and 500 horses, had entered La Mancha. Madrid was said to be on the 19th in a state of great excitement. The force of the faction was reported to be before the unprotected town of Ocanna. The movement from San Sebastian had not yet taken place on the 22d.

The following telegraphic despatch has been received by the French Government:—

"*Bayonne, Feb.* 25.—The Infante Don Sebastian, at the head of nine battalions, a squadron of cavalry, and four pieces of artillery, left Durango on the 21st, marching in the direction of St. Sebastian. Twelve battalions remained before Bilboa. General Saarsfield was at Pampelona on the 23d, with 12,000 men. He had been joined on the previous day by three battalions of the division of Alaix."

FRANCE.

One of the Paris papers not only states that the whole affair of the Pepin Coronation Conspiracy was a farce got up by the servile tools of the Ministry, but that Champion's keepers actually hanged him in prison to prevent disclosures, which must have implicated certain over-zealous officials in the employ of the Minister of Grace and Justice. The chief object of the police, or rather of their superiors is said to be the establishment of a Royal Guard for the protection of his Majesty's person. On Wednesday se'night, as the body of Champion was about to be borne from the *Morgue* to a cemetery, the sections of his society met, and were about to carry off the corpse in funeral ovation; and they were in such numbers that it was thought advisable not to move the body. The *Charte de* 1830 informs us of an effort on the part of the same people to *fete* the anniversary of Pepin's and Fieschi's death.—Every prisoner, every confession, throws light upon some further ramification of these regicide societies, against, which law and police are powerless. Several individuals have been seized on suspicion of participating in the plots of Champion and Mennier. Most of them are labouring men out of employment. The vigilance of the police is so excessive as to be almost intolerable. Taverns, coffee-houses, and lodging-houses are entered by them at all hours, and the inmates subjected to the most humiliating annoyances. There is no such thing as personal liberty now in France. The *Journal de Paris*, a new Louis Philippe journal, has recommended such arbitrary measures for adoption by the Government, that even the high-royalist *Journal des Debats*, has felt itself called upon to come forward as the champion of liberty. The *London Standard* also goes so far as to recommend the total suspension of popular rights in France, "until at least, the assassins are rooted out." This advice has already, in effect, been pretty well acted upon, but if such a principle were avowedly adopted, it would be an easy matter to calculate the duration of the life of Louis Philippe, and with it, probably, the date of the French monarchy. His Majesty has already trodden too closely in the footsteps of his predecessor Charles X; by way of a change let him act on the principles of the revolution which placed him on the throne, and we shall hear no more of assassins, or regicidal plots.—A recent law prohibits the sale or carrying of pocket pistols. From all accounts the situation of Louis Philippe is pretty much the same as that of the Syracusan tyrant of old, who represented his feelings as those of a man having a drawn sword constantly suspended over his head by a single hair.

SPLENDID PHENOMENON.

Shower of Falling Stars in Russia, on the night between the 12th and 13th of November, 1832.—The following extract of a letter from Monsieur le Comte de Suchteln to Mons. Feodorou, was communicated to the "Royal Academy of Sciences" at Paris, in which mention is made of numerous meteors which were seen in the neighbourhood of Orenburg, in the night between the 12th and 13th November, 1832. "In the night between the 12th and 13th November, 1832, between three and four in the morning, the weather being calm and serene, and the thermometer being at 55S of Fahr. the heavens appeared to be bespangled by a great number of meteors, which described a great arch in the direction of from north-east to south-west. They burst like rockets, into innumerable small stars, without producing the slightest noise, and left in the sky (what was long of disappearing) a luminous band, having all the various colours of the rainbow. The light of the moon, which was then in her last quarter, obscured this appearance. It sometimes seemed as if the heavens were cleft asunder, and in the opening there appeared long brilliant bands of a white colour. At other times flashes of lightning rapidly traversed the vault of heaven, eclipsing the light of the stars, and causing these long luminous bands of varied colours to appear. These phenomena continued to succeed each other without occasioning the slightest perceptible noise. They were in their greatest splendour between five and six o'clock in the morning, and continued without interruption till sunrise. They were observed principally by the sentinels, and by the officers, when going their rounds; also by the ecclesiastics, and by the subordinates, and by many other persons. Monsieur Milordou, the principle priest of the cathedral, stated in the account which he gave of this occurrence that the interior of the cathedral was sometimes suddenly illuminated by the light of this brilliant phenomenon. Monsieur Ischitow, Lieutenant-colonel of the 3d battalion of the line of Orenburg, also confirmed these statements in his report, which as an additional ground of confidence, contained the accounts of the sentinels in the several positions in which they had been posted. During the same night, and almost at the same hour, a not less remarkable appearance was witnessed at Hitzkaja-Saschtschita, about seventy-five miles to the south of Orenburg. Two columns of a white colour rose from the horizon equidistant from the moon, which at the time had not risen far; about the middle of their height they appeared brilliant and much curved. Several horizontal bands sprung from this point, the most brilliant of which extended towards the moon, in which they appeared to unite, so that in this way they appeared to form a great H. In the town of Ufa, the seat of the government of the same name, situated 330 miles to the north of Orenburg, a phenomenon similar to that which was observed at Hitzkaja-Saschtschita, was perceived, but according to the accounts which have been given, it was not quite so brilliant."—*Edin. New Philo. Jour. July*, 1836.

The Meteoric Phenomenon of Saturday night, February 18.—On Saturday night one of the most splendid specimens of the Aurora Borealis was observed in the western hemisphere, and excited considerable attention. The light was so extremely brilliant that many of the men at the London establishments brought out the engines, and started in the direction of the supposed conflagration. Towards eleven o'clock the lurid appearance gradually died away, and at half past eleven it was no longer visible.—*Morning Herald.*

A great fire broke out in the Royal palace at Naples on the 9th ult., in which the furniture, jewellery, &c., in the apartments of the Queen Dowager, and other property worth 4,000,000 francs, were destroyed.

It appears by a Parliamentary paper, just published, that the total amount of the colonial expenditure (military, civil, and naval) of Great Britain, for the year 1834-5, was £2,431,990 17s. 8d.

I've been buying a splended piano-forte for my wife, said a gay bridegroom. "A *Broadwood* of course," observed a lady. "Oh, dear, no ma'am: it was a rosewood."

A sea volcano was lately observed to pour out lava from the waves of the Shetland Isles.

The *Brussels Observer* states that an English gentleman has provided his horse, which has the misfortune to be short-sighted, with a very elegant pair of spectacles.

Mr. Ward, M. P. for St. Albans, has consented to stand for Sheffield at the next election in the room of Mr. Buckingham.

A quarrel, which threatens to be followed by serious consequences, has taken place between Tahir Pasha and Mr. Warrington, the British Consul General at Tripoli. Some British vessels of war have been sent from Malta with orders to bring the imperious Pasha to his senses.

Accounts from Hayti mention that two piratical sloops belonging to the Island, one of them commanded by a negro, and the other by a very light mulatto, and both filled with blacks, were cruising on the coast, and had captured several American vessels, and murdered their crews.

Since the 54th Regiment went to India they have lost 34 officers, 1,200 men, 51 European women, and 135 children, all from disease, except about 76 who were killed in the field.

A market boat was upset off Youghall, on Saturday the 18th ult. and sixteen persons perished.

A rope upwards of 4,000 yards long, seven inches in circumference, and 12 tons weight, costing about £400, and intended for the use of the London and Bermingham Railway Company, was finished at Sunderland last week.

A farmer in Aberdeenshire has made a wooden leg for a cow, which is so excellent a substitute for the one he was obliged to amputate, that, but for a slight limp, a stranger would not be aware the animal stood on any other than its own legs.

A lady informs the London public, through the columns of the Morning Chronicle, that ashe husband is gone to sea, and she expects to find herself rather *dull* during his absence, she would be glad to receive a *gentleman* to lodge with her. We doubt not that the fair lady's somewhat equivocal looking notice was penned in perfect simplicity of heart, and "evil be to him who evil thinks."

There is no other news from England of the least interest—not even the proceedings of Parliament—if we except the trial before the Court of Kings Bench of Lord de Roos vs. Cumming, was concluded on the 13th with a verdict in favour of the defendant. The case excited an unusual degree of interest, the facts of which are briefly these:—Some few months since, Lord de Roos, who was a frequenter of one of the gambling houses in London, called the Traveller's Club, was detected in cheating at cards, and compelled not only to leave the Club, but the country also. He repaired to the Continent, where he remained but a very short time, when he returned to London. As soon as he made his re-appearance there some newspaper publications were made by several individuals (including Mr. Cumming) which drew replies from Lord de Roos. The result was that the latter wished to submit the whole matter to a Court of Honour, but Mr. Cumming insisted upon having the case brought before a Court of Justice, and to this end publicly made the direct charge of cheating. Lord de Roos was then left no alternative and accordingly brought a suit. The result was, after a close investigation, which occupied several days, a verdict for the defendant—or, in other words, a verdict of guilty against Lord de Roos, who is the premier baron of England, the patent bearing the date of 1264. He is the son of Lord Henry Fitzgerald and is in his 47th year, Mr. Cumming is the son of an opulent commercial gentleman, doing business in St. Petersburg. He is said to have recently lost £30,000 sterling at the gaming table.

THE CHRONICLE.

SAINT JOHN, APRIL 14, 1837.

By the ship *Forth* which arrived here on Sunday last, Liverpool papers to the 13th ult. have been received. The affairs of Canada were occupying the attention of the British parliament, and on the 6th March, Lord John Russell moved Ten Resolutions in the House of Commons, chiefly founded on the Report of the Canada Commissioners. It appears quite clear from the 9th resolution, that the Commissioners had called the particular attention of His Majesty's government to the Act 1 Wm. 4, respecting the Casual and Territorial Revenues of these Provinces. Knowing that the sole right of those Revenues were vested in the Parliament, and *not in the King or the Colonial Minister*, the resolution prays that the King *may be authorized by the Parliament* to dispose of those Revenues: the very ground we have maintained in our arguments against the Civil List Bill, that neither the King nor his Colonial Minister had power to give or sanction it. We shall reserve our remarks in this particular for a future number. The following is the 9th Resolution mentioned above:

"That it is expedient that His Majesty be authorized to place at the disposal of the Legislature of the said province the net proceeds of His Majesty's hereditary, territorial, and casual revenue arising within the same, in case the said Legislature shall see fit to grant to His Majesty a civil list for defraying the necessary charges of the administration of justice, and for the maintenance and unavoidable expenses of certain of the principle officers of the civil government of the said province."

The Schooner Frances arrived yesterday morning from Boston with papers to the 10th inst. We regret to observe, that numerous and extensive commercial failures have taken place at New York; the number announced is ninety three, viz:—

5	Foreign Exchange Brokers,	$15,000,000
39	Dry Good Jobbers,	15,000,000
16	Commission and Clothing Store,	7,000,000
28	Real Estate Speculators'	20,000,000
8	Stock Brokers,	1,000,000
6	Miscellaneous,	2,500,000
93	Making a total of	$60,500,000

REPORT FROM THE DEPUTATION, CONTINUED.

In the answer which Lord Glenelg is commanded by His Majesty, to return to the Address of the Assembly, being number 2, in his despatch of 31st August 1836, he says "the Assembly complain that "they have not been able to obtain detailed accounts "of the receipts and expenditure of the Casual and "Territorial Revenue, and have thus been prevented from making these suggestions respecting the "management of that fund which by Lord Ripon's "despatch of the 24 Jan. 1833, they were invited to "offer. It would appear by the observation annexed by you to the Address, that you dissent in "some degree from the correctness of this statement." We have now to ascertain which is founded in truth—the complaint of the Assembly, or the contradiction of the Lieut. Governor: and for this purpose, let us refer to the Assembly Journals, commencing with the reign of His present Majesty.

It will be recollected that in the accession of Wm. 4, in 1830, he surrendered to the Imperial Parliament, *all his revenues in his foreign possessions*, in return for the Civil List of the Kingdom: accordingly on March 3, 1831, Mr. Partelow introduced some resolutions which were passed by the Assembly in which that fact is recited, and concluding with an address to the President (Hon. W. Black) requesting a detailed account of the Casual Revenue, from 1st Jan. 1824 to 1st Jan. 1831. To their address Mr. Black replied "that *consistently with such "instructions as have been hitherto received*, he could "not now comply with the prayer of it, but that he "would transmit it for the consideration of His Majesty's ministers, and their orders thereupon."—On March 16, Mr. Partelow moved that "the subjects be brought under the consideration of His "Majesty's government by an address from the "House": the address was brought up by the committee on the 31st, but a squabble having arisen among the members, the Assembly was prorogued without its having been agreed to.

1832. Jan. 25, Sir Arch. Campbell sends down the following answer from Lord Goderich to Mr. President Black's despatch inclosing the address of the Assembly, to himself in which he says with reference to the accounts "*it is not in my power to authorize you to comply with their request.*" Feb. 4, Mr. Simonds moves an address to the Governor "for an account of the Casual Revenue from 1st Jan'y. 1830 to 31st Dec. 1831": His Excellency on the 7th, referring to Lord Goderich's despatch, "declines to comply with the request." On 21st Mr Simonds again moves for "an account of the receipts and expenditure in 1831, *with a view to determine the propriety of making a proposition to His Majesty's Government to pay the Civil List.*" To this, on the 22d, the Governor assents, and the accounts are sent down on the 24th: On the 29th, Mr. Simonds moves for a Committee to prepare an address to the Crown, to propose a surrender of the Crown Revenues to the House "on their making proper provision for the Civil List." The address was passed March 8, and contains the following remarkable passage, "the House of Assembly *having "received such information from the Lieutenant Governor of the Province as His Excellency was authorized to give*, upon the subject of your Majesty's "Casual Revenue,—submit this their proposition." Here then we find that as yet there has been *no ground* for the complaint of the Assembly, but that sufficient information had been afforded them on which to found a proposition, and that they had received all that the Governor was authorized to give.

1833. Feb. 20, Mr. Partelow moves that as the expected answer to the foregoing address may not arrive in time, an address be presented to the Governor for a detailed account from 1st Jan. 1829 to 1st Jan. 1833: the answer however arrives and is sent down on the 25th: it is dated Jan. 3, 1833, and after declining the proposition, contains the following passage. "His Majesty regrets that there should "have appeared to the Assembly any want of due "economy in the management of the Crown Revenues, and will give his best endeavours to have "them so administered as to conduce to the benefit "of the Province. He will be happy to receive "from the House any suggestions which may tend "to that object, and in order that they may be enabled to point out any improvements which they "may think desirable, he will direct the accounts "relating to the receipt and expenditure of the Revenue, to be laid before them." Upon the strength of this despatch Mr. Kinnear moves Feb. 28 "an address to the Governor for *accounts* from Aug. 1824 to 31st Dec. 1832. It is here worthy of remark that the House have never yet asked twice for the same accounts, the period to be embraced is every time different—from 1st Jan. 1824 to 1831—1st Jan. 1830 to 1832—1st Jan. 1831 to 1832—1st Jan. 1829 to 1833—now from Aug. 1824 to 1st Jan. 1833, so that it would appear that any accounts, and for any period, would answer their purpose just as well, one as the other. The Lieut. Governor seeing this and also that Lord Goderich specified no particular period, felt himself at liberty to use his own discretion, and on March 1 replies that "he does not feel himself authorized to furnish accounts embracing a period elapsed before his own assumption of the Government: and that having furnished a detail'd account for 1831, he will order a similar one for 1832, being of opinion that he is then acting most fully in obedience to the tenor of Lord Goderich's despatch." This account was sent down on the 7th. The first notice taken of these accounts was on the next day, when the House in committee of the whole passed eight resolutions; of which the following is extracted from the 4th, "*The refusal of "the Lieutenant Governor to furnish the Assembly "with particular accounts to the extent prayed for, have "given just reason to believe that great abuses exist in "the Land Department.*" After having passed this resolution so unnecessarily, unfounded and offensive, on the 11th Mr. W. Taylor moves that "the accounts be referred to a Select committee": the next day Mr. Partelow brings in the Report which forms No. 8 of the appendix; and says that "from the way in which this account is made up, it is impossible for your Committee to ascertain *whether it be a correct one or not*, as it is unaccompanied by any detail of receipts—with the exception of obtaining information as to the way in which the large amount drawn has been applied in 1832, the House will be in as much obscurity as ever." On the 16th these accounts and the report on them were ordered to be printed; and the address to be sent home by Messrs. Simonds & Chandler, who composed the first deputation was passed. In that document they say with reference to the Casual Revenue accounts that since the receipt of Lord Goderich's despatch the Governor "has not conceived "himself authorized to give them information to the "extent prayed for, by which they are not enabled "to point out such improvements in the management of these Revenues as the despatch fully contemplated." This closes the proceedings of that year, the Governor and the House differing in opinion as to the extent to which the accounts were ordered by Lord Goderich; the Governor thinking that enough would enable them "to see the way in which the amounts drawn were applied," and this the report admits they were enabled to do:—the House thinking that a detail of receipts should have been furnished, that they might see "*whether the accounts were correct or not*"—thereby claiming a right to audit the King's accounts, a duty which belongs to the Auditor General, and which the King had not in any way committed to the Assembly, or called upon them to express an opinion upon.

1834. This year the Deputation make their Report. In the paper dated 8th Aug. 1833 submitted by them to the House, Lord Stanley says, "recent instructions to the Governor to furnish the House "of Assembly with detailed accounts, annually, of "the receipts and expenditure of the Casual Revenue will have removed the principle cause of complaint on this point." In Lord Stanley's despatch laid before the house 12th Feb. there is no allusion to accounts. Feb. 13, Mr. Partelow moves an address for the Casual Revenue Accounts for 1833: they were sent down on the 21st, and referred to at Committee. On 1st March Mr. Partelow presents the report of the committee. On the 7th Mr. Partelow moves an address for the *Particular items in detail*, of certain items stated in gross; the Governor replies on the 11th, stating that "it had been his "wish and endeavour to render the information required from him complete and satisfactory, and "regrets to find numerous and voluminous accounts "are now sought for, some of which are of a nature, "which he feels himself compelled to decline furnishing: he will however take upon himself the "responsibility of directing all such of the accounts "to be prepared (as he can with any degree of propriety furnish) with the understanding that it is "not to be considered as a precedent for future proceeding." The accounts were sent down on the 13th, and are to be found in the appendix. On the 19th an address to the King on the surrender of the Casual Revenue was agreed to. Now if the Assembly had not been satisfied with the accounts furnished to them, here would have been a very convenient opportunity for making a complaint: *but the address does not contain one syllable of complaint*, the presumption therefore is THAT THEY WERE SATISFIED, and had no complaint to make. Up to this period then there is no ground for the "complaint of the "Assembly that they had not been able to obtain detailed accounts of the Casual Revenue," and the Governor might well "dissent from the correctness "of the assertion."

1835, Jan. 28th. Mr. Weldon moves an address for the Casual Revenue accounts for 1834: the accounts were sent down Feb. 17. On the 19th a despatch from Lord Aberdeen is sent down declining any further proposals "respecting the cession "of the Territorial Revenue;" but *no mention of any kind is made of Casual Revenue accounts.* March 7th. Mr. Partelow gives notice, and on the 9th brings forward some resolutions, which contain no allusion to the accounts. On the 14th an address to the King founded on these resolutions was agreed to, *but not one word of complaint does that address contain about accounts having been withheld.* We are therefore justified in saying that even up to this period the complaint is unfounded.

1836, Jan. 25th. Mr. L. A. Wilmot moves an address for the Casual Revenue accounts for 1835: the Governor replies that "he does not feel himself authorized to comply with their request to the full "extent—some of the particulars asked for being under the consideration of His Majesty's government, and others not under his controul; but he "will direct to be laid before the House a statement "of the receipts and expenditure of the Casual Revenue for the past year." These accounts having been sent down they were referred to a committee. Feb. 25th, Mr. Partelow from the committee reports "that the information sought for has not been given. "Instead of statements and accounts *in detail*, they "are furnished *in gross*, affording information of "comparatively small importance. Your committee are of opinion, that the House should have detailed accounts to enable them to make any suggestions to His Majesty's government that might "be considered necessary, and *recommend that His "Excellency be again* addressed on the subject." No other address was however presented, but March 7th, Mr. Partelow moves sundry resolutions which passed the House. 2. "that agreeably to "Lord Goderich's despatch in 1833, the House "should from time to time make suggestions to His "Majesty's Government relating to the Crown "Lands and Revenues:" 3. "that to enable the "House to do this the most full, particular and explicit information should be laid before it regarding the receipts and expenditure of the said revenues:" 4. "that by the despatch of 7th August, "1833, of Mr. Secretary Stanley it appears "that "recent instructions had been given to the Governor to furnish the House with detailed accounts:" 5. "that it is deeply to be regretted that His Excellency has not felt himself authorized to direct such "accounts in detail, thereby rendering it impossible "to make such suggestions to His Majesty's Government regarding the Crown revenues, as might "have been deemed expedient and necessary."

Now it will be recollected that those resolutions formed the "*sailing orders*" of the deputies, Messrs. Crane and Wilmot and the fact that this deputation had been determined on, was the reason why the recommendation of the committee that "the Governor should be again addressed for accounts," was not acted upon. They were afraid that *too much* would be furnished and so the grievance be removed. Still the accounts, such as they are, are quite as full, and convey as much information as those of 1831, 1832, and 1834 with which the House had either expressed themselves satisfied, or with respect to which they had made no complaint. The only authority to which they appeal for demanding accounts at all is Lord Goderich's despatch of 1833, but in that the extent of the demand is limited to such particulars as will enable them "to point out improvements in the management of the Crown revenues:" not one word is said, there or elsewhere, about their being erected into a board of Audit.

Let us now look at what passed between the delegates and Lord Glenelg on this subject. 1st interview, "We proceeded to observe on the mystery "and concealment with which the Crown revenues "had been managed, for that although His Majesty's Government had given frequent directions "that full and detailed accounts should be laid before the Assembly, they had never been furnished "in a satisfactory shape, and in such a manner as to "enable them to make those suggestions which they "had been invited to offer, and that such withholding and concealment had been the cause of very "great and increasing discontent in the Province. "Lord Glenelg expressed surprise that accounts "had not been given to the Assembly in as full and "detailed a manner as possible, as the instructions "had been very plain on the subject." We have now to bring forward a precious piece of garbling. It is a misdemeanour indictable at law to garble speeches—to garble reports is perhaps no offence at all! The following is in the above passage in the MS.—"We then stated another cause of complaint "was the withholding the accounts—*some accounts "had been furnished at different periods* (why did "they not tell the truth, and say, *every year*) and "during one session all that were asked for with the "exception of two or three, but the want of these "and previous information sought for, had prevented them from making suggestions;"—"Lord Glenelg expressed surprise that the accounts had been withheld." Compare, now, this report of what Lord Glenelg said with the printed one, and reflect upon the passage of their own speech which is omitted: however let that pass for the present. If accounts had been improperly withheld why did they not complain to his His Majesty's government. They sent addresses in 1831, '32, '34, and '35 but neither of them contains a word on the subject: Messrs. Simonds and Chandler it would appear made some complaint, but what no body knows, for they made no report: Lord Stanley, however, treated the subject, as if he did not consider what they had said as of much importance.

They made Lord Glenelg say in the printed report, that "his predecessors instruction had been very plain on the subject"—now it is plain that Lord G. could not have said this, because it is not only false in fact, but it is not to be found in the MS. Lord Aberdeen never wrote a line on the subject of accounts, nor did Mr. Spring Rice; nor did Lord Stanley: and all that Lord Goderich ordered was just so much, and no more, as would enable the House to make suggestions, and what they got under this order in 1834, and '35, was satisfactory to them.

In the 3d. interview, this subject is again slightly alluded to, and from what passed at the 7th it will appear, that enough had been furnished to enable them to make the suggestions contemplated by Lord Goderich. They mention the allowance of £1000 currency, for the "indoor establishment," of the Land office and that notwithstanding this allowance charges had often been inserted, to a considerable amount, for "incidental expences, stationary, fuel, postage, &c." and upon this suggest that the *gross* proceeds of the revenue should be surrendered, "that the House might bring to bear an efficient controul upon the Land department." They had also enough to suggest, that the allowance to the Presbyterian Minister at Saint John should be withdrawn. In fact they had had every thing that Lord Goderich intended they should have, and every thing that they could themselves ask for, except the auditing the accounts, and the production of the vouchers. In the report, 7th interview "they proposed that the word *vouchers* should be inserted in "the instructions—His Lordship replied that the "instructions would require all necessary vouchers "—but he had no objection to make the amendment." At the 11th interview "they asked if the "addition had been made as to the vouchers; he "replied that the despatch had been sent off, but he "would authorize us to say, that it was the intention "of government, that the necessary vouchers should "be furnished." It seems very extraordinary, that, if all this had actually passed between the deputation and Lord Glenelg, the *vouchers* should have been so completely lost sight of by both of them, when the instructions were prepared. In the letter which they wrote to Lord Glenelg dated 28th Sept. in which, "in compliance with his request they specify in what manner the accounts will be required to be made up," and which was sent down to the House by the Governor, not one word is there to found respecting *vouchers*: neither has there been any instructions received on which the House can found a demand for the production of Vouchers. Accordingly no vouchers were sent to them; of course the House make great complaints about it; but all the transactions of the late session will more properly come under consideration when we review the report of the deputation now in England. All we have now to say, is, that every thing the Assembly was authorized to demand, was promptly furnished, and in the very shape in which it was asked for; and that, with respect to the refusal of the Commissioner to send in the vouchers demanded by the House, a very satisfactory reason can be assigned for it. A few years ago a Mr. Scully, one of the Deputy Surveyor's brought an action against Mr. Baillie for payment for certain duties performed by him, under his direction, and under an engagement with him as Commissioner and Surveyor General. The Attorney General who was counsel for Mr. Baillie, raised an objection, that Mr. Baillie, being an officer of the Crown, and having as such made the contract, was not liable in his private capacity. The Chief Justice over-ruled the objection, and laid it down, that Mr. Baillie is responsible in his *private capacity*, for all contracts which he may make, in the execution of the duties of his office. This being the law of the case, it becomes undeniably clear, that all those vouchers demanded by the House are Mr. Baillie's *private papers*, and necessary to protect him against demands which may be brought against him on account of engagements made by him in execution of the duties of his office, and that until he is indemnified against any consequences which may or can ensue, from his giving up those papers, no power on earth can deprive him of them.

At a Meeting of the Stockholders of the Annapolis County Steam Boat Company, held at Annapolis on the 16th of January last, the following persons were elected as Directors for the ensuing year:

Francis W. Pickman, and Lawrence Hall, Esquires, Annapolis.

Thomas Barlow, I. L. Bedell, John Wishart, Barnabas Tilton, and Edward J. Budd, Esquires Saint John.

And at a subsequent meeting held by the Directors, at Saint John, Thomas