

Tight Binding

The Woodstock Journal.

Thursday, May 16, 1861.

AN OUTRAGE.—On the night of Monday last some person or persons broke into the room of Mr. Coffin, ambrotype artist, over the store of Blanchard & Co., and took away the lens of his instrument, with a number of cases, and so on. Evidently the motive was not plunder but malice, the materials in the room having been scattered around and down the outside stair. We regret to have to chronicle such a gross outrage to a stranger in our town; and we believe the feeling of the community is a desire that the offender may be discovered and receive condign punishment. A term in the penitentiary would probably be of great service to him. Mr. Coffin some time ago suffered from a similar outrage in Houlton, and there can be no doubt that the same persons were engaged in both crimes. Mr. Coffin has offered a reward of fifty dollars for the discovery of the offenders.

WEATHER, &c.—The weather for the past week has shown us a succession of fine days and rainy days, alternately. The air is very mild, but the number of wet days must interfere with agricultural operations. The River has been very high, as has the Maduxakik, and there is a probability of the former keeping at a good height far into the Summer, there being yet great quantities of snow in the woods.

RESIGNATION OF PRINCIPAL HEA.—Dr. Hea has resigned his place of Principal of the University of New Brunswick, and will, we understand, return to Nova Scotia. The Govt. will again be called upon to exercise its wisdom in the choice of a head to our Provincial University.—The country looks to it for an exercise, in its choice, of the greatest care and the soundest discretion.

THE TWENTY-FOURTH OF MAY.—The twenty fourth of May is near at hand; and we hear that the Rifle and Artillery Companies intend to honor it by firing a salute, although we cannot say positively that they will. We trust that it will be made a general holiday in this community.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.—The Water Cure and Pnenological Journals, from Fowler and Wells, have come to hand. The latter has been enlarged, and Life Illustrated incorporated with it. The Laws of Life are also at hand.

We have also received the Canadian Agriculturist for May, and the Genesee Farmer for the same month.

DROWNED.—At Big Pasque Isle some time since a young man named Wm. Starrett. His body has not yet been found. He had on an under shirt of homespun, over shirt striped red, gray homespun frock, grey homespun pants, white woolen drawers, two pairs of grey socks, and a black hat.

PROVINCIAL EXHIBITION.—We have received a copy of the Premium List of the Provincial Exhibition, to be held at Sussex Vale on the 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th of October next. We shall notice the List, and proposed Exhibition at greater length in a future issue.

DISSOLUTION AND ELECTION.—A Royal Gazette Extra of Tuesday contains a Proclamation dissolving the Assembly, and calling a new one, the writs returnable on the 28th June.

For the Journal.

MUTILATION OF THE OFFICIAL DEBATES.

MR. HOGG'S REPLY.

The New Brunswick Reporter, of which Mr. James Hogg is proprietor and editor, has an editorial article in its issue of the tenth current in reply to my letter on the mutilation of the official debates. This article is republished in another column of the Journal. I have no desire to bandy words with Mr. Hogg. It is sufficiently humiliating to have anything whatever to do with or say to a man who defends himself from an accusation of such abominable dishonesty by abusing his accuser with all the vileness and volubility learned by a long training in the school of Billingsgate. But duty, not to myself, but to the public, requires that I should with a few plain words scatter to the winds the edifice of falsehood which he has erected.

First, as to the only point started in my letter—the mutilation. Mr. Hogg makes no attempt to deny that he did, of his own mere notion, omit portions of the reports furnished him by Mr. Watts and myself. But he puts forward an excuse or reason for so doing. He states that he felt that the infliction of printing the quotations made from the evidence by Mr. McIntosh and others was more than he had a right to bear!

“More than he had a right to bear!” And what was Mr. Hogg's contract? He tendered, and his tender was accepted under the following advertisement. I italicise a few words.

“DEBATES OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.—The undersigned, appointed by Resolution of the House of Assembly a committee to make arrangements for the printing and publishing the whole Debates of the next session, will receive at the warehouses of J. & G. Lawrence until the 20th day of June next sealed tenders for the same,

and will close with the most approved on the first day of July following.

“The size is required to be imperial quarto, with three columns on each page, and in respect of paper, type, workmanship and quantity of matter in all respects similar to the Debates of 1860. The number, 4500 on a sheet of four pages, to be published three times a week from matter to be furnished daily by the reporters; to be delivered out into single sheets and in parcels of fifty each, to whomsoever the House shall direct, in some room in the Province Hall or the adjacent offices.

It is to be understood that the whole matter furnished by the Reporters shall be published, and that the whole contract shall be completed as soon after the session as possible.

“To facilitate correction of proof, as well as distribution, the printing to be done in Fredericton. (Signed.) W. END, J. W. LAWRENCE, A. H. GILMOUR. April 12, 1860.”

“IT IS TO BE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE WHOLE MATTER FURNISHED BY THE REPORTERS SHALL BE PUBLISHED.”

And yet this shameless man, making a deliberate and solemn contract, containing this express stipulation, after the House has risen, and he cannot be called to account, omits large portions of the “matter furnished him by the Reporters,” and when accused of the outrage, with an unblushing impudence which is actually startling, tells us that the matter furnished was “more than he had a right to bear!”

More is not needed; but I cannot avoid making a remark. Mr. Watts and myself engaged for a specific sum to report for the session, just as Mr. Hogg did to print. Suppose Mr. Fisher or Mr. Gray had chosen to inflict upon us a speech of six hours in length, extending from three in the afternoon to nine in the evening; according to Mr. Hogg's doctrine we would have been justified in throwing down our pens in disgust, exclaiming—“it's more than we have a right to bear!” and going to tea, leave the orator speaking to an empty reporter's gallery. Or had the session lengthened to eleven or twelve weeks, instead of nine as usual, we might, according to Mr. Hogg, have taken stage for Woodstock, at the end of the ninth week, and left the debates of the other three weeks unreported, with the justification that “it was more than we had a right to bear!”

Mr. Hogg as a proof of the correctness of his position states that a combination between a single member of the Legislature and a single reporter would render the fulfilment of any contract impossible; and he in that paragraph, and elsewhere, broadly insinuates that there was such a combination between Mr. McIntosh and myself.

A more vile and unfounded accusation never proceeded from the New Brunswick Reporter, which is saying very much indeed, as every one will acknowledge who reads that paper. What do my reports actually show? I reported fourteen and a half of the speeches made in that debate. Almost every speech contained quotations; and these speeches were made by members on both sides of the House. Mr. Tibbits was reported as having quoted largely from the evidence; in fact his speech nearly resembled Mr. McIntosh's in consisting of quotations accompanied by a running commentary. Were Mr. Tibbits and myself in a combination to ruin Mr. Hogg? Mr. Solicitor General Watters I reported as quoting largely from the evidence; fully one half his speech being quotations. Had Mr. Watters leagued with me in a conspiracy to ruin Mr. Hogg? Mr. Hamington I reported as quoting largely. Had we also formed a secret fraternity with the object of destroying the material prosperity of Mr. Hogg? But worse still, it appears from the Debates that even Mr. Watts, belonging to the same political party with Mr. Hogg, supporting the same Govt., and if I mistake not, a personal friend, also has been guilty of a conspiracy, with several members to ruin him!

So much for the mutilation and the conspiracy to ruin Mr. James Hogg. I will now advert as briefly as possible to a few of the side issues which he has raised in the article spoken of.

First as to the bad writing. I gave Mr. Hogg the same writing that I have given to other printers in almost every portion of the Province. I gave him the same writing that I gave Mr. Graham, of the Head Quarters, who had the printing of the debates in the session of 1860. More than a dozen times, during that session and since, has Mr. Graham expressed his perfect satisfaction with my manuscript, telling me that “the hands in his office grabbed it out.” The simple truth is that the compositors in Mr. Graham's office were competent; while Mr. Hogg, having, at the commencement of last session the Post Office Report to print, as a son from the Govt., which required his best hands, put our manuscript into the hands of raw boys, who probably could neither read nor spell. This was the cause of the badness of the proof which was brought Mr. Watts and myself. Three fourths of the errors were merely typographical—words misspelled, letters inverted, lower case letters in place of capitals, and so on. After bearing with this imposition upon my good nature much beyond where forbearance ceased to be a virtue, and speaking not only to the boys who brought the proof, but to Mr. Hogg himself about it, at length my patience gave way, and I wrote the letter mentioned by Mr. Hogg. I may observe also that a son of Mr. Hogg's, himself I believe an excellent compositor, in speaking to me about the badness of the proof, stated that he wished me to understand

that he had nothing to do with it, but that it was the work of the raw hands in the office. As to the “specimen” of my writing which Mr. Hogg has selected I have to say this: that out of probably more than one thousand foolscap pages of manuscript with which I furnished him last session it would be very strange indeed if he could not select one page very badly written, but that I have no hesitation in saying that if this “one of a thousand” be sent to Mr. Graham's office it will be put up without difficulty and without any errors of importance and not more than half a dozen unimportant ones. Then as to Mr. End's opinion: Mr. Watts informed me that on the very day that Mr. Hogg asserted to us that this occurrence with Mr. End took place, he (Mr. Watts) met Mr. End in the street, and questioned him about it, when Mr. End most positively denied that he had told Mr. Hogg anything of the kind. I leave the matter between the M. P. P. and Mr. Hogg.

The “scrawls which could not be made out by one of themselves—as we can prove without the context” and the “Bible” and “Munchausen” affair, refer not to me but to Mr. Watts.

I left Fredericton on the third day after the session closed, without a direct personal interview with Mr. Hogg, but after all the communication with him that was necessary. The first idea of Mr. Watts and myself was to have the proofs sent to us at Woodstock by mail; but as the former after a personal interview with Mr. Hogg informed me that he objected to this, I immediately secured the services of a gentleman in Fredericton to correct the proof. As I was responsible for that portion of the work it was no business of the printer's if I had gone to China. The whole of the report of Mr. McIntosh's speech, which one would infer from Mr. H. was sent down from Woodstock, was actually in his office before I left Fredericton. It was not till after I received information of Mr. Hogg's mutilation of that speech that I directed Mr. Miller not to correct any more proof until it was published in full. The whole of the quotations in the speech, except we think, the very last one, were set up in Mr. Hogg's office, and then taken down again. On page 105 of the Debates, it will be seen that Mr. Hogg, after omitting the quotations of the Evidence from their proper place in Mr. Connell's speech, inserted them in a note. Why was this? Why is it that there are notes to supply omissions in Mr. Connell's speech and no notes for any of the rest of the speeches which Mr. Hogg chose to mutilate? In truth, the official reports of the debate upon the most important question of the session represent little else but the whims of Mr. James Hogg.

With Mr. Hogg's partiality or impartiality I have little to do, except as respects the matter before me. But as he boasts so loudly of it, he will allow me to ask him whether the republishing in his paper from the official debates of what he entitles the debate upon a certain subject, with the omission of a speech from a certain Conservative member from York, without the slightest intimation that such omission was made, or that the member spoke at all on the subject, is a very strong proof of impartiality or fair-dealing.

Mr. Hogg's abuse of me as a reporter would not be worthy of notice, were it not that he endeavors to tack it to other accusations against me with respect to the charge under which he himself labours. It is at all times disagreeable to have to speak of oneself; but I will be allowed to mention the following facts. At the close of the session of 1859 Mr. Watts and myself, at the request of several members of the Assembly, made a proposition to the House to report for the session of 1860, which was accepted. During the whole of that session—1860—not one member rose to complain of partiality; and the contract was renewed for 1861 by an unanimous vote. During the whole of the late session there was no complaint made in the House until near the close Mr. Smith rose and pointed out what he conceived to be defects; but not one other member was found to second his remarks. It does not follow that our reports were free from every error, but it does follow that as a whole they meet the undoubted and almost unanimous approval of the House. With these facts before the public, I can afford to let Mr. Hogg's remarks pass without further notice.

I must ask the forgiveness of the public for having troubled them at such length upon this matter. My first letter was nothing more than a statement of the circumstances respecting the mutilation of the Debates. Mr. Hogg having in his reply, chosen, not to exculpate or defend himself, but to vamp up a number of atrocious and unfounded charges against me in my capacity as reporter, I have thought it due the public to make this reputation. It is no pleasure to me to come in contact with Mr. Hogg. But one cannot always in the discharge of his duty avoid contact with the filth, which he despises. Self defence may oblige you to trip up the heels of a foul mouthed backguard who insults you at the street corner; but while you are bestowing upon him the castigation which he deserves you feel it to be a deed in which no honor is to be obtained, but a disagreeable necessity; and you escape as quickly as possible from the contact of the creature whose thick skin scarcely feels the blows bestowed upon it, while he pollutes your ears with a torrent of vile abuse, and bespatters you plentifully with the filth of the gutter in which he is wont to revel.

JAMES EDGAR.

Woodstock, May 13, 1861.

MR. CONNELL AND THE COUNTY COUNCIL.

To the Editor of the Woodstock Journal.

SIR: On page 69 of the Reported Debates, the By-Road Grants, and on a petition read by Mr. Allen from Thomas Murray, the Warden of the Municipality of the County of York, it is reported that Mr. Connell, in presence of the assembled wisdom of New Brunswick, did say: “That he was glad the questions had come up. The division of the special grants was the greatest difficulty which the county members met with, and it was a duty which they would gladly be relieved of, if some way could be provided by which the money could be appropriated in a way to give satisfaction, and expended where really wanted. The amounts were so small and the necessities of the country for bridges and improvements of roads so great, that much annoyance resulted from the attempt to distribute the money judiciously. In Carleton County one half the money had heretofore been given to the municipality, but what had it done with it? Why, without regard to the actual wants of different localities, the councillors had sat down and divided the money equally, and until there was some law passed to guard the distribution of the money by the municipality, he was not disposed to advocate the system of putting all the money into their hands. He and his colleague had never disagreed about the division of the money. The object of the special grants was that they should remain as a reserve fund to be used where the requirements of particular localities, otherwise neglected, seemed to demand.”

Now, if the division of the special grants is a difficulty of such magnitude for the County Representatives, why do they not try the experiment of giving it to the Council to divide for one year if no more, and get rid of the great difficulty they so much complain of? But no; they never made the offer, nor even intimated the subject to the Council, as I am aware of. It is my opinion Mr. Connell would rather keep that business under his own control, for the benefit of his own business, and electioneering baits, his complaints of the great difficulty notwithstanding.

Following his speech a little further down, he says “that in Carleton County one half of the money had heretofore been given to the Municipality; but what had they done with it? Why, without regard to the actual wants of the different localities, the Councillors had sat down and divided the money equally.” Now, Mr. Editor, such language appears to me to be a gross attack, and a blow aimed at the Council without good grounds,—uttered as it was in the House of Assembly, in presence of its members, and before the public; then entered on the printed debates, and sent broadcast over the Province. He has thereby placed the Council of this County in a very nice position in the eyes of the public. Instead of rising to speak at that time, if he had just his postage stamp die in his mouth, kept his seat, and held his peace, he would certainly have shown better sense, and more wisdom, and would to-day have been in a better position in this County. He must have lost sight of the fact that it is the same people elect the Councillors that elect him.

If the Councillors are such an ignorant, lazy, heedless, and regardless set of fellows as Mr. Connell's makes them, so must the people be that elect them. Therefore that speech does not speak very well for his constituents.

I admit that the division of the money by the Council has not always been by unanimous vote, but if my memory serves me right, the only objections to an equal division was made by the members of one parish only. And I further make bold to say that since the money has come through the hands of the Municipal Council of this County, and distributed by them, it has done far more good, and been expended with full better satisfaction than when it was divided and distributed by the County Members. And a very good reason can be shown why it is so. The Councillors—two in each parish—live in most cases in the immediate localities where the money is expended, and have a knowledge of where it is most needed, they can see if it is expended judiciously by the Commissioners; for this reason the Commissioners are far more particular under the present system, than they were when the County members divided the money, then they were under no restraining eye—now they are. He also says in his speech “that until there is a law passed to guard the Councillors, he is not disposed to advocate the system of putting all the money in their hands”—now this says as much as that the judgment and sense of 18 men chosen two from each Parish is not equal to his the Hon. C. Connell's as he appears to think he is fully capable, and honest enough to manage this business of distributing the money without a law to guard him.

I have not space nor time to go fully into this subject now, but I beg to join issue on this point: with the Hon. King Charles the 1st, and shall take the matter up some time not far in the future—a few more words and I am done for the present. “He says that he was glad the question had come up”—why glad, I ask. I think the reason is apparent, and that his feelings toward the Council are hostile, was it not so he would not have been glad of an opportunity of attacking them; his indifference toward their petitions for two or three years past is sufficient proof of his feelings.

Yours, &c.

A COUNCILLOR.

1861,

THE OFFICIAL DEBATE

[From the Reporter May 10]

The last number of the Woodstock Journal contains a letter signed James Edgar, and another written by the same gentleman, a singular instance of the small portion which is required in order to give to a long string of misrepresentation reader will therefore excuse us if in so we are compelled to “begin at the beginning” the differences which have arisen between the Reporters of the late Debates,—Mr. particular—and ourselves as their Public. At the commencement of publishing these debates last winter, we found the manuscript Edgar so carelessly written, we will not say bad, but that it became next to impossible to proceed with them at one half the ordinary rate of type-setting, and the despatch so near the particular occasion. The proofs of the first instance furnished him were corrected far from clean, and thereupon he wrote would not in future feel it his duty to correct typographical errors. The question was, as to what was and what was not a typographical error under such extraordinary circumstances, and we showed samples of the matter to Wm. End, Esq., M. P. P. one of the published committee, who at once stated that it was not fit for a printing office. We did not make a formal protest, and being unable to make further trouble, we submitted the whole session to the drudgery of corresponding rather to guess at the corrections which could not be made out themselves—as we can prove—without test!

At the close of the session Mr. Edgar was away without seeing or making any arrangement with us, in reference to the yet unwritten of the debates; but a gentleman here Mr. Miller, Esq., informed us that he had seen his agent, and from him sometimes times through the Post Office, after many delays, we received the remainder of the transcripts.

It was then that Mr. Edgar commencing us—along with his own written long extracts from the evidence taken in Crown Land Committee, and already from the Royal Gazette Office—as those had been read in the House of Assembly, this was for a time submitted, as these might be supposed necessary to give to respective speaker's opinions; but length Mr. Edgar sent us “an extract” of Mr. McIntosh, which would make columns of the printed Debates, (we printed one more than a column long—same speech) we felt that the infliction more than we had a right to bear, and to publish it as whole, although we stated Mr. Edgar's agent that we were willing to cut extracts from the extract as he, thought reasonable and proper under the circumstances. Had we proceeded with all that we would have been compelled to purchase the whole book referred to, as almost every page had previously been quoted as part of speeches, by the respective members. Mr. Miller declined to comply with, for shortly on the other side. The latter informed us that Mr. Edgar had prohibited reading the proofs, and consequent wards devolved upon us to issue to the our ability—correct versions of the speech description of writing already alluded to indeed so bad was the scratch, purpose made so, by Mr. Edgar, that when we to the Hon. Mr. Allan, in order to have blanks filled, which Mr. Edgar had supplied by ourselves, he, Mr. Allan, declined to read the connections!

Of the opinion entertained by the Reporter in reference to their own importance, and that a publisher must render himself their will, we may just add, that one of the most recently stated, that as a matter of principle adherence to our contract, we were to publish the whole of the Bible, or the Acts of Baron Munchausen, if they chose them, as read by a member, as a speech in the House of Assembly! We will readily perceive that under such an arrangement would be madness for any one to such work, when a simple combination of a single Member of the Legislature and a Reporter—mark, we do not say this, we between Messrs. McIntosh and Edgar under the fulfilment of any contract is possible.

As it is, we have published the late Debates to an extent which they have never before in this province; giving the whole as reported, and also a great number of extracts with all the necessary references to the Report and evidence alluded to. We have done without the slightest indignity feeling, as will readily be seen by a perusal of those extracts and references as near in the speeches of the respective Reporters as may be seen at our office, and ourselves to acknowledge that individual not less sincere than civil, if there be a business man who can read it.

Here then we find Mr. Edgar furnished the first place with manuscripts which he has not the sable personage said to be a prompter could read; in the meantime Mr. Fredericton without a personal interview undulating us with matter which, if