

...and with the division of Scotland into Parishes, and this took place in the reign of Alexander 1st, from 1102 to 1124, many centuries before America was discovered.

In the 5th Parliament of James 4th, (1494) it was enacted, "That all Barons and Free Holders that are of substance shall put their eldest sons and heirs to the Schools." This clearly evinces that schools existed at this early period. On the 10th December, 1616, the secret Council of James 6th framed an Act, in which it was declared necessary and expedient that in every parish of the Kingdom a school should be established and a fit person appointed to teach the same upon the expence of the parishioners, according to the quantity and quality of the Parish. This act was ratified by the Parliament in 1633, and in 1638 the Presbyteries were urged to see it carried into effect within their bounds, again confirmed in the Parliament of 1693, and re-enacted with more particular provisions in 1696. So much for the first part of your assertion, that Parochial Schools were earlier established in New England than in Scotland. The second part, that the system of education was more uniformly and completely carried into effect in the former country than in the latter, is equally void of foundation. But I proceed with your panegyric.

The attention paid by some of the Colonists to the civilization of the Indians, and their conversion to Christianity, deserves praise, though partial in its exertion, and altogether unsuccessful. Yet here, as well as in the former parts of this section, you are anxious to exalt the merits of your countrymen at the expence of the people of England, though it was within your knowledge that by far the most vigorous and effectual exertions to propagate the Gospel among the Indians were made by the Church of England Missionaries sent out for that express purpose.

Your last subject of praise, the Physical œconomy of the settlements, and their rapid increase requires no remarks, it is certainly wonderful that so great a Nation hath sprung up in so short a time from so small beginnings.

Yours, &c.

Parliament of Upper-Canada.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

SATURDAY, 26th February.

When the door was thrown open we found Mr. Nichol on his legs. He stated that the flagrant impolicy of the House upon the Militia Law last Session was such, that he could not name them as the true and faithful Representatives of their Constituents. They had, before their return home, thrown the bill out, but had brought it in immediately afterwards and passed it into a Law. Upon such proceedings, he must say that there could be no faith put in Journals, since they decide one day and expunge the next. The bill was of a most important nature, and the manner in which it was enacted and passed was foreign to the Constitution of the Country—let them look to Great Britain—where in that country could they find an instance of a person being punished by Martial Law in time of peace, except the Army and Navy, and surely they could not place the Militia of this country upon a footing with them. It ought not to extend to the Militia of this country—they were freemen, and he trusted they would always meet with the protection of this House.

Mr. Fraser was surprised how the Gentleman could complain of a breach of privilege, as he might have stopped till the close of the Session, and have exercised his Legislative abilities. Mr. Nichol insisted that they infringed upon the rights, not only of Parliament but of the public. The introduction of Martial Law in time of peace was a gross violation of the Constitution. The Journals were no records—they might be called so, but he could not rely upon them, when cut up by half a dozen of Members in their sky decisions. He trusted that the parties to that business would make atonement to the country for their conduct. Was it not an iniquitous proceeding, that a Bill lost in the House in a Parliamentary way, should appear afterwards on their Journals in an unparliamentary way.

The House went into a Committee on the Prince Regent's answer relating to the Navigation of the Saint Lawrence.

Mr. Van Koughnett in the chair. Mr. Nichol moved that an Humble Address be presented to His Excellency, thanking him for the Communication. He remarked that the Province had not the means of completing the work, because it was withheld from them. He entirely objected to jobs, and thought the Navigation could not be improved unless it were undertaken by public bodies, otherwise the sums raised would be swallowed up by favourites. They were now Bankrupts, and to be talking of improving the Navigation of the Saint Lawrence was laughable. He had no doubt if they could find ways and means of raising a supply, people here would find ways and means to spend it.

Mr. Burwell was of opinion that the Saint Lawrence would not be improved, however desirable and advantageous to the Province, on account of the large salary asked by the Engineer. —Resolution adopted.

The Committee rose and reported resolutions, and upon the motion of Mr. Burwell, Mr. MacMartin and Mr. Cotter were appointed a Committee to prepare a draft of an address to be presented to His Excellency, pursuant to the resolutions of the House of this day.

Mr. Nichol, from the Committee on the subject of claims, reported that the Draft of an Address was ready, which was received and read the first time.

Mr. Nichol proposed, for the general dispatch of business, that the 5th rule of the House should be dispensed with. He had no motion of a dark or hidden nature—his conduct should be fair and open—and he intended to move for an account of the public expences and civil establishments, and as His Excellency was anxious to return to Quebec, he hoped no opposition would be offered. Mr. MacMartin believed the conduct of the Honourable Gentleman to be fair and open, but dispensing with the rule of the House might put it in the power of others to take advantage of it, as was the case before.

Mr. Burwell opposed the Resolution of Mr. Nichol, and was of opinion that the Rule ought not to be dispensed with.

Mr. Fraser opposed the resolution. The Resolution passed that the 5th rule of the House be dispensed with, so far as related to the Address to His Excellency the Governor with respect to Inquests.

Upon the motion of Mr. Nichol, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole to take the address into consideration.

The Committee, upon motion of Mr. Nichol, rose and reported address.

Mr. Nichol moved that the address be engrossed and read the third time this day.

Mr. Nichol, from the Committee, reported that

the Draft of an Address to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor on the subject of the Revenue was ready.—Received and read the first time. Mr. Nichol moved that the fifth rule of the House be dispensed with so far as related to the address to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, on the subject of the Revenue.—Ordered.

On the motion of Mr. Nichol, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole, to take the address into consideration.

He stated his object in moving for the accounts was to see the state of the Revenue. Lower Canada was in their debt £50,000, under an English act of Parliament.—The large demands against them should make them investigate every thing, and endeavour to get rid of their Bankruptcy, and the best way was to commence at the foundation. In order to be happy and prosperous they should live within their income, and enforce retrenchment, otherwise their constituents must curse the day they sent them to that House. He had courage to despise the sneers of courtiers, and disdain to court popularity—it was his duty and the duty of every Member of the House to see how far the burthens could be lessened—it was his wish to stop profusion in their expenditure, which was carried to a greater extent here than at present. He had a duty to perform, and proceeded on the ground of conviction, disregarding the consequences of being cherished or execrated by high or low. The Session afforded time to vote more or less, and gave them time to see why it should be voted. He moved the Committee to rise and report the Address.—The question being put as to its being read, was carried.

Mr. Nichol moved that the address to His Excellency on the Crown Revenue disposition be engrossed and read a third time this day.—Ordered.

Mr. MacMartin, from the Committee, reported that the Draft of an address was ready, on the Communication of the Prince Regent's answer. Received and read the first time, and on the motion of Mr. Nichol was ordered to be read a second time on Monday next.

SECTION LAW AMENDMENT BILL. The House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole to take this bill into consideration.

Mr. Van Koughnett observed that there was little room left for his observations, from what had been said on a former day. The object of the Bill then before the Committee, was to do away with the obnoxious part of the former. He conceived it to be unconstitutional to place it in the power of one man to arraign, try, and pass sentence upon another, by sending him out of the country. Two persons had suffered by the enactment of that law, which was subversive of the Constitution. However he was of opinion that one (Mr. Gourlay) deserved it—and he would thank the Commissioner for doing his duty in that case—but as the innocent were as likely to suffer as the guilty, and as it was foreign to the Law of England, he felt it his duty to bring in the present Bill, which was loudly called for by the country. He would have brought in a bill for its total repeal, but feared it might meet with opposition.

Mr. Nichol rose and said he was in favour of the amendment. He approved of arrest for seditious practices, which could be done without the aid of that obnoxious act. They ought even to be induced by the Governor's Speech to repeal it, as the ordinary safeguards of the Constitution were sufficient without extraordinary safeguards. Some of the Members who passed the act thought it operated against Foreigners, others entirely against His Majesty's Subjects, and none of them understood it. He (Mr. Nichol) heard he was appointed a Commissioner—he was now (not then) a Democrat, at least he was called so, but was satisfied with any rat, if he carried the measures that were beneficial to the country. Suppose a man placed in Office, negligent of his duty, ignorant, illiterate, malicious, intolerant and vindictive, spurning the presence of those that he is bound to attend, and meeting with one whom he finds troublesome—to get rid of him, he points him out to his satellite as seditious,—the satellite, though ignorant of the meaning of the word seditious, yet willing to swear, goes before an ignorant Commissioner, who is anxious to support the Government, and please the intolerant vindictive Gentleman—the Commissioner grants his warrant—the prisoner is brought up—he denies the charge of sedition, and demands liberation upon bail—till he can pay a Jury of his country prove his innocence—this is denied him—he is sent to jail—no pen or ink is allowed him—if he receives a letter, it is examined—he lies there, in what he might term a Bastile, 360 days,—he is called upon for trial—not whether he is a seditious man, but whether the ignorant Commissioner gave the order for his arrest, upon the oath of the ignorant informer, and whether he refused to obey the order of banishment.—So this extraordinary power, given to extraordinary characters, who are ignorant and mercenary, condemns the most respectable part of the King's subjects to banishment.

Mr. Burwell was of opinion that the act ought to be repealed, and in that opinion he was supported by gentlemen of the first respectability, as well as the high authority of His Excellency, in his communication to the House, who said that the ordinary safeguards were sufficient for the protection of the Province. The act of the 44th of the King was more than an ordinary safeguard, and was passed 13 or 14 years after the constitution was given to the Province. He was of opinion that the act was meant to operate against British subjects, dangerous at home; from whom alone, and not from aliens, they were to expect trouble. He should therefore move that the act of the 44th of the King be repealed, as the safeguard of the Constitution was the Constitution itself, and did not require that act to support it.

Mr. MacMartin opposed the total repeal. The Governor referred only to the last Convention act—the act of the 44th of the King was one of the safeguards of the Constitution—it might place in the hands of one man too much power, but surely in this country, that power could not be abused—it was a necessary power in the case of one individual. The Magistrates knew that law, but did not know the Law of England. He thought the law of great service to the country, as seditious characters were turned out, and others were deterred from coming in.

The Speaker said that Gentlemen might gloss cases as they pleased, but he denied that any case had arisen, where there was an abuse made of the power of that act. If there were, the wisdom of the Legislature would modify it. The argument of the Honourable Gentleman, Mr. Nichol, did not meet his mind, and he saw nothing objectionable in the act, or subversive of the Constitution. The Commissioner that had the power to commit had also the power to discharge, and the Bill then brought in took that power from him, as he must hold to bail. Any person residing here and taking the oath of allegiance was without the purview of that Statute, and if safeguards were ever required, they were never more necessary than at present. He desired gentlemen to look at the state of England, and the characters that leave it, and fly here, who consider this no country to them. They must admit that more than the ordinary powers of the Law were necessary.

Mr. Nichol stated that the ordinary safeguard of the Constitution was found in the due administration of the Law by the impartial decisions of a Judge, and a fair trial by a Jury. This extraordinary safeguard was given when persons from Ireland and Scotland were flying here, but the House lost sight of that dignity which was due to themselves and to the country, by passing it. He should be as ready as any man to pass strong acts, and if there were papers sent down to this House, as was the case in England in times of sedition, to be laid before them, or a secret committee, he should support any bill that the case might warrant. He thought it unfair and inhuman to hang a man first, try him afterwards, and he obliged to wipe away the stain in this manner, which he hoped would not stick in another place. They all knew that they had another odd bill upon the Statutes, which sends a man from county to county to had a possession—it was entirely opposite to the English Law, for it was better that

49 guilty persons escape than one innocent man suffer. He was sorry to differ from the powerful authority of the learned Speaker, and he did it with great diffidence. However he should assert that laws of an extraordinary nature in England were but temporary—from year to year. The judgment of the learned gentleman might be greater than his (Mr. Nichol's) but he was happy that the Lieutenant Governor differed with the Speaker, although the Speaker's judgment was greater than the Governor's. As to the learned Speaker directing their thoughts to the situation of England, he would remark that the Government of Great Britain knew how to deal with their subjects—they had it in their power to pass laws, and punish the Radicals as they might think fit. It was the theme of this House at one time that they would be blessed with a British population—they were invited to come—but they proved to be vagabonds instead of loyalists.—We had a Goulay and a Tandy to look to.—He wondered how gentlemen could oppose the present Bill. He believed the scandalous bill it went to amend was passed to prevent Emmet, Sampson and others from coming to this country; and if so, the necessity has long ceased to exist, as these persons have a better field for the display of their democratic principles. He should be sorry if the statement of an Honourable Member was true, that there were Magistrates who did not know the Law of England, as it was disgraceful to allow such persons to remain in their situations. He trusted that they would never pass a Law till that infamous and disgraceful Bill was struck out of the Statute Book.

The Speaker asserted that he did not differ with the Lieutenant Governor, as His Excellency's address referred to the Convention Bill, and not to the act of the 44th of the King. Mr. Cotter opposed the repeal of the act, but admitted it might be necessary to modify it by amendment, he was satisfied with its necessity for had it been acted upon in time, the Convention act would not have been passed. Committee reported progress, and asked leave to sit again, on Monday next.—Report Received.

Mr. MacMartin obtained leave to bring in a bill to repeal part of and amend an act of the 55th year of the present reign, entitled an act to extend the jurisdiction of the Court of Requests.

Read 1st time—and to be read the 2d time on Monday next. The address to His Excellency the Lieut. Governor, on the subject of the revenue was read the third time and passed.

On the motion of Mr. MacMartin, Messrs. Burwell and McDonell were appointed to wait on the Governor, to know when the forgoing addresses would be received.

Mr. Nichol gave notice, that he would move on Monday next, that an humble address be presented to His Excellency, praying His Excellency might be pleased to lay before the House, an account of the officers employed in the Provincial Department, and the Salaries and emoluments of each annexed to the fame, the date of their appointments, and the period when the Salaries were increased.

Mr. Cotter gave notice that he would on Monday next, move for leave to bring in a bill to regulate the Inspection of flour.

Mr. Van Koughnett gave notice, that he would on Monday next, bring in a bill to regulate the Salary of the Receiver General.

Mr. Robinson brought up the Petition of Thomas Ridout Esquire—ordered to lie on the table. On the motion of Mr. Robinson, the Petition of sundry Inhabitants of the Town of Kingston, was brought, and laid on the table. Mr. Nichol moved, that William Allan Esq. be ordered to attend on Tuesday next, at the Bar of this House, to answer such questions as may be asked him, touching the rates of postage, charged in the Province. Mr. Nichol moved for the dispatch of business, that the House do now rise and sit again on Monday at 7 o'clock, his object was to enable Gentlemen to attend on Committee in the day time, and discuss the question at night, which was opposed, and a motion was carried, that the House should rise and sit again on Monday at 10 o'clock—adjourned.

MONDAY, 28th February.

Mr. Frazer obtained leave, to bring in a bill, to repeal an act passed in the 58th year of the present reign, to prevent certain Meetings in this province—read the first time. On the motion of Mr. Frazer, it was ordered to be read a second time this day, and that the 5th rule of the House, be dispensed with so far as related to the present Bill. Mr. Nichol reminded the House, that in passing the present Bill, it only did away with one Scandalous evil, whereas the act of the 44th of the King, called the Sedition act, was such that he could not find words strong enough to express his detestation of it—partial measures would not answer to do away with grievous and ferocious evils. He approved of the present bill as far as it went, but they wanted a Sovereign balm to heal the wounds inflicted upon the Constitution—the feelings of the country, and the character of the House—No laws of the kind should exist without restrictions, it was a heinous charge against the Legislature of this Province, to empower a miscreant informer, to go to a Judge, and force a man out of the country. On the motion of Mr. Frazer, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole on the said act. Mr. Nichol again rose, and stated that he approved of the Bill as far as it went, Government had power to put down all tumultuous proceedings, all restrictions on the liberty of the subject should be limited—he could not find terms to express his abhorrence of the act of the 44th of the King, he proposed striking out the present Bill, and introducing one for the total abolition of every act contrary to the con-

stitution—he was ready as any man to arm the Executive to crush sedition, but it must be for a short period, and upon the strongest evidence that sedition did exist—He was in hopes the House could fulfil the expectations of the people, by the total repeal of the 44th and 58th of the King, and he was sure there could not be found, One Hundred persons in the Country, that would not rejoice at it.—It would be a proper subject for humiliation and thanksgiving—let them be restricted by the constitution, and tried by a jury of but not banished the Country by a miscreant informer, and a miscreant justice. There were many parliamentary instances of four or five Bills having been repealed at once, and it was never more necessary than on the present occasion.

He then moved the total repeal of both acts. Mr. Jones opposed the motion of the Honourable Gentleman. It was contrary to the usage of Parliament to connect two Bills together, which ought to be separate, and ought to be repealed by separate laws.—He was of opinion that limits should be set to such Bills in future.—The law was passed in the year 1804, when there were good causes for its existence, as it drove to the United States those rebels who in flying from Ireland, might otherwise have come to this country.—He should oppose the repeal of that law for like circumstances.—The disturbances in Great Britain induce many seditious characters to seek an asylum in this country, and he would ask Gentlemen what occasioned our present tranquility but that Bill. The discontent, caused by Goulay, a man of good abilities and strong sense, excited tumult, this law has restored tranquility and peace in the province, by driving such turbulent characters out of it. The Speaker could not accede to the proposition of the Honourable Gentleman (Mr. N.)—He never knew of two new separate matters to be incorporated together, or a clause introduced to repeal another clause.—It was contrary to the common usage of Parliament.

Mr. Nichol insisted that the amendment was not contrary to the King's instructions, He wished to get rid of all extraordinary safeguards—there was no guard, but a great evil effected by that bill as no person would come here under the horrible apprehensions of being subjected to an ignominious punishment. The people of this country had their loyalty tried by a powerful enemy, and the legislature co-operated with the people—some people were pleased to say there were dissected Districts in the Province, and went so far as to name the District of Niagara—He was happy it was well known that that District was defended by its inhabitants when there was not a red coat in the country, let a loyal man find fault with any of the Executive Council, and he commits a libel, but they could not libel the public, if they say that a man in the Executive is ignorant, is arrogant, is intolerant, is malevolent he is a libeller, but let him say to the Country, "you are rebels," it is a fact he is not a libeller—This was a doctrine he (Mr. N.) wished to put down.—The act of the 44th, whilst it lay obsolete, did no harm, but when its barbarous powers were put in execution, it roused the feelings of the people of both Provinces.—It was a horrible law, not only in his opinion, but in the opinion of men of the first respectability in Lower Canada, and the best amendment would be to destroy it.—He would not attend to vague reports, it should not be listened to, evidence was the only thing that could be relied on, it was not their business to go upon Newspaper reports—England can say "Our subjects shall not go to our Provinces" and make laws to enforce it.

Mr. Burwell requested the committee to decide on the motion without further time being taken up. Mr. Jones contended, that the disturbances in Great Britain, were well authenticated, and the opinion of Gentlemen here was as good as the opinions of those below.—The law had been in operation 16 years, and he wondered the Gentleman who viewed it in such a horrible light, did not bring the matter on before.—They had no Petition complaining of its powers, nothing to warrant that its repeal would be hailed with joy and acclamation.—It was easy to obtain petitions, and he was surprised the Gentleman did not obtain any from those who saw its pernicious effects.

Mr. Nichol asked if the information from Great Britain had been as well founded as the information received from Gentlemen, and other individuals—His (Mr. N's) statement as a member ought to be attended to.—If he (Mr. J.) received a letter from Earl Bathurst, let them hear it—and it should have its full weight.—The reason Petitions were not laid before the House, was the existence of that Bill, which deterred the people from meeting.—He could name a merchant of respectability, a well informed man, who was afraid of attending a meeting for losses, and asked him (Mr. N.) "should we run the risk of being taken up by the seditious meeting Bill?" When such a gentleman had his fears, how could they expect less informed persons to meet.

Mr. Jones stated that the Gentleman alluded to, if he looked at the act, must be a blockhead.—He might be respectable, but not intelligent.

Mr. Nichol said it was cruel to take a man up for no crime, order him out of the country, and send him to Gaol for refusing to obey the order. He should be tried for sedition, but not for disobeying the order of a miscreant Magistrate. The 44th of the King was worse than the Inquisition, which tries for the fact of heresy. One half the people of the Province could not tell you the meaning of the word sedition, and this he had seen upon Gourlay's trial, when the witnesses were asked if they knew its meaning.

Bill adopted.—Committee rose and reported. Bill.—Report received. Mr. Fraser moved that the Bill be engrossed and read a third time this day.—Ordered. On the motion of Mr. Cotter, the bill for the better division of the County of Prince Edward into Townships was brought in and read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow.

Mr. Burwell moved the second reading of the Representation Bill. The House went into a Committee of the whole. Committee reported progress and asked leave to sit again. The Act to repeal an Act passed in the 58th year of His Majesty's reign, was read a third time and a Committee appointed to carry it up to the Honourable the Legislative Council. The Pension repeal and amendment Bill was read a second time, and upon the motion of Mr. MacMartin, the House resolved itself into a committee of the whole to take it into consideration. Mr. Nichol rose and stated that he looked for a remedy against an evil which had long existed, which opened a door for a number of frauds, and occasioned the Treasury to be robbed. He was sorry that the good, the serviceable, and meritorious, were suffering with the bad. Those Militiamen who were wounded by being compelled to go into actual service, who submitted to the risk of war, and defended property, were deserving of consideration; but persons serving with the Indians for the sake of plunder, and there were many of them, should have no compensation from the chest, but ought to be struck off. He was of opinion that the Provincial Artillery Drivers ought not to be saddled upon them, as they were raised by Sir George Prevost, and the burthen of compensating them ought to be borne by the Lower Province as well as by them.

Widows who married, and had children grown up, ought not to be a burthen. He hoped that there would be an express fund, held sacred for the deserving. Others receive their pay, whilst the greatest sufferers. Mr. Jones and Mr. Burwell supported the amendments adduced by Mr. Nichol. Committee rose and reported progress, and asked leave to sit again to-morrow.—Report received.

The House went into a Committee on the assessment bill, Mr. Cameron in the chair. Mr. Nichol rose and said as there were some Gentlemen there who were not in the House when the Bill first came on, it required some explanation at present. His object was that Crown and Clergy Lands should be assessed in like manner as other lands. In England Palaces were taxed, as would appear, by act of Parliament, and every person having large landed property ought to pay. Clergy and Crown lands were increased in value by the improvements that were made around them, and these poor persons by whom the Clergy and Crown lands were raised in value were obliged to contribute, while others were exempt. There was nothing opposed the improvement of the country more than those lands, and every man free from prejudice must say they ought not to be exempt from taxation. It was asked who was to pay the tax laid on them—he (Mr. N.) would answer, the land itself, in the same manner as the lands of absentees, by the act now in operation. Cist and Saw Mills were free where the owner did not reside, and even Stores. The whole of the great property belonging to Mr. St. George, of this town, in charge of agents in all parts of the country was not rateable; the bill now introduced, if passed, would tax the whole—the Clergy and Crown Lands, and lands for the endowment of Schools—the Bank, and all bodies corporate. Such is the practice in other countries, and is not liable to objection. A Gentleman (Mr. Fraser) had said on a former day, that it was ungrateful to tax Crown property. He (Mr. N.) would say it was unfaithful in them not to tax it—and it should be done out of respect to our Sovereign, whose inviolable directions were that nothing harsh or oppressive should be enacted against his subjects, and whose anxiety for their good was well known. He then read extracts from acts of Parliament, to shew that Crown Lands were taxed at home.

The Speaker denied that Crown lands were taxed for Parochial or County rates, nor was it the rule in the old country—the Crown property was not liable to taxation. He objected to tax lands for the use of Schools—it was their duty to foster and promote education. When the lands were leased, the assessment goes to possession. He differed with the Honorable mover on those exemptions that he mentioned. The bill provided for all property in possession of the owner, as well as other property not in his possession—the person in whose possession was the property, must attend the fact, though it might be improper to cut the Bill up without a fair trial, particularly as the assessors were then taking rates, and putting it into operation.

Mr. Jones stated that if Crown and Clergy reserves were taxed, it would prevent leases being hereafter taken. A land tax in England is for the support of the nation at large—here there is no tax but assessments, and they had no right to tax Crown and Clergy reserves to support Parochial establishments, or lands for Schools and Universities. This was the first he had heard of the Bill—he would oppose it in every stage.

Mr. Nichol stated that Parochial rates were proper, and should be levied upon all lands—particularly those of large land holders, who stop the improvement of the country. He insisted that fixed property, personal property, goods and chattels, need not be given in—his servant at his house need not return them. Indian lands were taxed by the last Bill, as all lands in fee were rateable.—(Mr. Jones asked across the table if he knew what fee meant?)—He (Mr. N.) knew what it was, but did not receive as many as the learned gentleman.—Another Honorable Member had remarked the last time the bill was under discussion, that there was nothing to be had from the Indians but Tomahawks and Scalping Knives—the contrary was the case—they had money in the funds in England, and they held their lands in tail, which is fee—they knew their property had increased in value, and when asked to dispose of it to Government, they answer, "our property is become more valuable, and you must pay as much as individuals, otherwise you shall not have it."—He only wished them to be subject to Parochial rates, as by those rates raised from the poor emigrants, their property was improved. If the Honorable Gentleman (Mr. Jones) had been here attending his duty at the beginning of the session, he would have heard of the bill before to-day—He would have heard the notice of its being intended to be brought in, and the postponement of its reading.

Mr. Fraser said it would be time enough to tax the Crown and Clergy reserves, when they could support the Government, the Army, the Navy, the civil establishment, and pay for the Indian presents. He differed very materially with the Honorable Gentleman on the taxation of lands for Education, which should be nourished above all other establishments. The proposed tax upon Indians was repugnant to common sense, and might lead to an Indian war. Before they are taxed, let them be represented in this House. He was anxious to know how far the tax was to reach—Was it to extend to the Pacific Ocean, to the regions of the North West, or to Hudson's Bay? If so, it would make a large representation.—(Loud laughing.)

Mr. Jones acknowledged he was reprehensible for being one week away—but more excusable than others who were a year absent. The Indians had not a fee simple—no promise was ever made.—(Mr. Nichol stated