

that I, Zachariah Chipman, of Saint Stephens, in consideration of forty dollars and fifty cents, do me paid by Edward Jack, of Saint Andrews, do hereby assign, transfer and set over unto the said Edward Jack, as well the written order of survey as the said twenty-seven acres therein described and mentioned.

ST. STEPHENS, 1st April, 1863.

(Signed) Z. CHIPMAN."

"Know all men, by these presents, that I, Edward Jack, of Saint Andrews, in consideration of eighty-one dollars, to me paid by Alexander Gibson, of Le-preaux, do hereby assign, transfer and set over unto the said Alexander Gibson, as well the accompanying order of survey for twenty-seven acres of land, as the land therein described or mentioned as "any other lot of twenty-seven acres that he may select."

ST. ANDREWS, 14th April, 1863.

(Signed) EDWARD JACK."

CROWN LAND OFFICE, }  
Feb. 17th, 1864.

Honorable Surveyor General:

Dear Sir.—The deficiency of twenty-seven acres in the grant to Zachariah Chipman, south of the Simonds Grant, assigned to Edward Jack in 1863, who, on the 14th April, 1863, conveyed his right to said deficiency to me, as will appear by annexed quit claim. I now beg to select that quantity in the following situation, viz: at the southern end of the Upper Nashwaak Lake, and request that an order of survey will issue in my favor, and at my expense, to lay out the same.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
(Signed) ALEXANDER GIBSON.

"Alexander Gibson requests an order of survey for twenty-seven acres of land, deficiency in the grant to Z. Chipman."

"Let an order issue to Deputy Whitehead, as requested by Mr. Gibson."

February 18, 1864. (No. 2801)

(Signed) J. McM."

The hon. member for Albert, in his usual mild and apparently sincere "suaviter in modo" style, thought proper to make this a specific charge, which, no doubt, he thought would influence hon. members, and the Surveyor General charged the hon. gentleman with want of candor and fair play, because he could, and should, have explained all the circumstances connected with the transaction; but that hon. member, for some reason best known to himself, has not thought proper to do so, which the Surveyor General pronounced unfair and unmannerly.

Mr. McClellan, who was absent when the Surveyor General was speaking, on the following day, attempted to explain, but stated that he justified the course taken by the Government. The Hon. Attorney General replied, "Then why allude to it at all?"

The Surveyor General then justified the Government in not filling up the office of Auditor General, and quoted Act of Assembly of 1855:

"Section 3. It shall be the duty of the Auditor General, or other officer appoint-

ed to examine and report on Public Accounts, to have all the Public Accounts audited and corrected."

The Government has appointed a proper person to audit the accounts, and it has been well done, and given general satisfaction. His hon. colleague, Mr. Gilbert, had alluded to the amendment of the Legislative Council in answer to the speech, passed in that body some days since, and has called it a vote of want of confidence. He (Mr. Botsford) called it only an amendment adopting the Quebec Scheme, and the Quebec Scheme alone. Parliamentary usage forbade him from alluding to the discussion on that question, nor could he make any comments on the way it was carried through that honorable body. He would assume that the hon. member, Mr. Fisher, was in this position after he had moved his amendment.

Suppose the House was reduced to thirteen members; that the mover of the Address in answer to the Speech was absent; that the seconder was sick and confined to his bed; that another member had been unavoidably called away, and that Mr. Fisher had pressed his Amendment through the House, and carried it by a majority of five for the purpose of affirming the Quebec Scheme. Why, with all the charges made against him for intrigue, he, Mr. Botsford, did not believe Mr. Fisher would be guilty of such an undignified, unparliamentary act.

He had seen it reported in the public newspapers that the majority claimed for Confederation on that occasion consisted of three of the Quebec delegates and six of their strong partisans, and this, no doubt, will be duly forwarded to the British Government as an evidence of a change of opinion of the people of this Province.

His hon. colleague had alluded to the reinstatement of Mr. Inches in the Crown Land Department, notwithstanding he did that gentleman every justice as to his qualifications and attainments, still he must have had some motive in bringing it up in this debate.

He (Mr. Botsford) would show the House what induced the Government to reinstate Mr. Inches. He was recommended by twenty-six members in the year 1863, and by twenty-five members of the present House last year; and he felt convinced that his reinstatement would give general satisfaction to the public.

He would not pass on to the charge the hon. member, Mr. Fisher, made with reference to his temporary absence from the Crown Land Office. He told his colleagues in the Government, on accepting the office of Surveyor General, that he would not become a permanent resident at Fredericton, and if accepting office involves the principle of permanent residence at Head Quarters, and a necessity of being compelled to remove one's establishment to it, and this House should confirm the doctrine; it will limit the appointment to persons living in Fredericton, and the surrounding and adjoining Counties; and he challenged the hon. gentleman to point out a single instance where the interest of the public has suffered in consequence of his temporary absence, to use the ordinary expression of that hon. gentleman, "to the bosom of his family."

He then alluded to the card of the hon. member for York, at last election, where he proclaims that he has left the impress of his mind on the political institutions of the country, and that he looked down on the members of the Government as political pignies, and claimed that he himself would occupy a large and conspicuous place in the history of the Province. Why, he was the one individual who was turned out of the Government by his colleagues for improperly acquiring public lands. And how did this same hon. gentleman, who accuses the present Government of being mean, low fellows, act after this disgrace? Like a spaniel, he was seen to lick the hand that struck him, and proved indeed the most obsequious servant of the men who treated him as unworthy of being a member of their Government.

Another charge made by Mr. Fisher is, the appointment of Chief Justice Ritchie, which, he stated was for political purposes. This he (Mr. Botsford) denied. Judge Ritchie was appointed to that responsible situation because of his talents and standing as a Jurist, and the Government are prepared to justify it; but, if Mr. Fisher thinks that Mr. Justice Ritchie's appointment detracts from the talents and standing of Mr. Justice Wilmot, he (Mr. Botsford) could not help it; but when he charges the Government with dragging in politics, and justifies Judge Wilmot's voting at elections, and taking part in political squabbles, he wholly dissented from such unsound doctrine.

There might have been some slight palliation for the offence of Judge Wilmot addressing a Grand Jury on the Quebec Scheme in the County of Sunbury when the excitement ran high, and the country was convulsed from one end to the other; but when that excitement had subsided, and the people had pronounced their verdict against the scheme, and it was virtually dead, what do we find? When a vacancy took place in the representation of the County of York, by the promotion of Mr. Justice Allen to the Bench, after a lapse of many months, when the Judge had ample time for reflection. The hon. member (Mr. Fisher) was a candidate at the election in opposition to Mr. Pickard, who was recognized as the Government candidate, and at the hustings proclaimed that Confederation was not the question at issue, that Fenianism and hostility to the present Government was his avowed platform.

He (Mr. Botsford) held that when Judge Wilmot so far forgot his position as a Judge, and entered into that political contest, and ostentatiously voted for Charles Fisher, he prostituted the ermine with which he was clothed; that was his opinion, he might be wrong. Suppose a riot took place in the presence of the Judge, between the several partisans, and an indictment was preferred against anti-Confederates engaged therein, and Mr. Justice Wilmot was the presiding Judge, could he possibly divest himself of the strong political bias, which, to a certain extent, would operate on his mind at the trial? Probably he might, but he could not convince parties holding opposite views that even-handed justice would be dispensed. Why, the other day the House was discussing a Bill authorizing a Judge to try a cause where his interest was only the seventh part of a cent. It