

must be his argument in this case. An hon. member has remarked, that pay had been offered to the Council in 1848; but this attempt to bribe that body failed. He should, however, have gone on to say, that a similar attempt had not failed in 1855, when the bribe was offered by the present House. The members of the Council, now that they are paid for their services from the public purse, ought certainly to submit themselves to the popular will. The hon. member from Queen's County (Mr. Mooney) thinks that hon. members on this side of the House wish to fill the Council with an aristocracy. This would, no doubt, be a dreadful shock to that hon. member's feelings. Nothing could give him greater offence than to see gentlemen of independent means—who are under no necessity of resorting to dishonourable measures for the accomplishment of their purposes—occupying seats in the Legislative Council. Were the members of that body placed there by the suffrages of the people, I should be satisfied. The country ought to see that they are possessed of a more independent spirit; and now that pay has been granted to them, it is the more necessary that they should be elected. In making this statement, however, I do not wish to detract from their merits as individuals; but I do not hesitate to pronounce the Council, as at present constituted, a perfectly useless body. I possess no hostile feeling towards them individually; but I confess that, looking upon them as a body, I cannot help viewing them with superlative contempt; and I think the country at large looks upon them in the same light. I have arrived at the opinions I entertain with respect to the Council, by very slow degrees, for at one time I was in favor of allowing the constitution of that body to remain, as near as possible, a copy of that of the Upper House in England. Experience, however, has since shown me that Colonial Governments generally have no disposition to take upon themselves one grain of responsibility more than they were obliged to do—that they were continually shirking the responsibility which they ought to assume—and were but too much inclined to surrender everything to party. When, therefore, I reflected upon these things, I could not but admit that a change in the Constitution of the Council was imperatively demanded.

T. KIRWAN, Rep.

Mr. LAIRD said, the question respecting the Bill before the House was no new one, as it had now been before them two sessions; and he thought the minds of hon. members were pretty well made up on the subject. As far as he was acquainted with the people of the Island, he thought a large majority of them were in favor of the principle of an elective Legislative Council. As long as the members of that body accepted pay, they ought to be elected; and since there now was Responsible Government in the Colony, the Legislative Council ought to be responsible too. He would support the motion for going into committee on the bill, even though it was late in the session.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY said, he would say a few words, which he only did because he wished to put hon. members right. He could not agree with the hon. member for Charlottetown, when he said, that the Legislative Council was like the lump on a dromedary's back, which he (Hon. Col. Secretary) did not receive as if the hon. member meant any disparagement to that body; but hon. members knew well that they sometimes passed measures through the House in the heat of debate, that would clash with one another, but which the Legislative Council were the means of correcting. The hon. member for Charlottetown (Hon. Mr. Palmer) had said that on account of the Members of the Legislative Council receiving pay, they ought to be elected and to become responsible to the people; and the hon. member, Hon. Mr. Mooney, had said that they were offered pay by the party to whom the hon. member for Charlottetown belonged. But how had it been offered? It had only been offered to certain country members, which was thus a partial measure, and as such had been rejected, the members of the Council from the country having opposed it too, he believed; yet at that time the principle of paying the Legislative Council had been acknowledged by the party to which the hon. member for Charlottetown belonged. He (Hon. Col. Secretary) repudiated the principle of making the Legislative Council elective merely because they received pay; but he had thought much on the subject, and he was of opinion that perhaps it would be necessary that there should be some means of changing that body; because members appointed to it for life might adopt different views from those of members of the House of Assembly, and thus be the means of stopping the supplies. He differed from his friend on his right (Hon. Mr. Whelan) when he said that the Legislative Council was to be a reflection of the views of the House of Assembly; but a member of the Council must be a person of some weight in the community and free from local influence. He could not agree with the hon. member for Charlottetown that the present Legislature Council were bound to vote just as the House of Assembly pleased; for the members of that body were as independent as they had been in former times. Respecting appointments to the Legislative Council, he said he felt a delicacy in naming gentlemen of his own political views; but other gentlemen would have nothing to do with it, and should they be appointed, it would be said at once that the Government wanted to buy them over. In this manner it was scarcely possible to get gentlemen there opposed to the liberal policy of the day; but he thought if there were gentlemen of different views in the Council, it might work well, if elected in a gradual way. He differed from his friend on his right, Hon. Mr. Whelan, that the House had no right to interfere with the constitution of the Legislative Council; for a change had already been effected in the constitution of that body, when the Legislative and Executive Council were constituted separate bodies. Perhaps no petitions had been before the House praying for a change in the constitution of the Council; but he thought the people had not had an opportunity of discussing the matter; and they sent hon. members to the House to concert measures, and not to wait till the people brought them before the House. Upon mature consideration he did not doubt that it would have been better to have moved that the further consideration of the subject be postponed till next session. With the leave of the House, the hon. member then withdrew his former motion, and made a motion in accordance with the opinion he had just expressed, which was agreed to without a division.

The order of the day for the second reading of the bill to define the boundaries of the streets and squares of Charlottetown having been read, Mr. Perry, who thought the bill wholly unnecessary, moved that it be read "this day three months," which was carried without any discussion. Yeas 14—Nays 11—Hon. Mr. Palmer, Longworth, Col. Secretary and Lord, and Mr. Cooper—5. So the bill was lost.

(To be concluded.)

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR.—It was my intention to have called the attention of the public to the management of the Glebe Fund, and of the Treasury in the good old times, in the same letter; but as they are quite separate affairs, perhaps it may be better to treat them as such. I shall, therefore, commence with the Glebe Fund. Any person, desirous of ascertaining the correctness of the following statement, can do so by referring to the Journals of the House of Assembly, 1847, where much more can be seen than is here submitted. Five members of the Assembly, of whom the late Mr. Rac was Chairman, report:—

"That the moneys arising from the sale of Glebe Lands were paid in at interest from 2nd November, 1836, till 2nd January, 1838, and the interest, if paid, would have amounted to £200. That from the last date, till 1st July, 1840, when the interest is marked as commencing to run, the amount of interest, which, at the ordinary rate would have accrued, is £585."

The Committee could not ascertain whether this amount was paid into the Treasury or Glebe Fund. It is evident, that during the time above specified, the Glebe Fund did not benefit by any interest which ought to have accrued. The following receipt gives evidence of the fact that a large amount of money was received on account of the Glebe Fund:—

"Received the above sum of £3,822 2s. 11d. from the Commissioners, 1st October, 1839."

T. H. HAVILAND, TREASURER.

Being three years after the sale of the lands in question; but here, again, we have a letter addressed to Mr. Rac by Mr. Desbrisay, with an account, showing payments made by the late S. Desbrisay in 1836, £500 Ts. 6d., 1837, 41,000

Is. 3d; 1838, £125 9s. 7d; which evidently shows that the former receipt in full was given three years subsequent to the first payment. Mr. Desbrisay writes: "And I have reason to think the receipts, of which the accompanying is a copy, was given when the final balance was paid into the Treasury."

I shall leave you and the public to form their own estimate of the very judicious management of the Glebe Fund. Three-thirtieths of the amount realised by the sale of Glebe and School Lands (£826 1s. 1d.) was paid into the Treasury, being the portion laid off for schools, which left a balance to the Glebe Fund (see Journals of 1847, Appendix Q.) of £2,752 9s. 9d. I understand the securities now in the possession of the Commissioners are over £3,000, and that a certain amount, after deducting the annual charges, is added yearly to the capital. This fact, I presume, could easily be ascertained on application to the Commissioners.

July 23, 1857.

INCOLA.

A MISTAKE RECTIFIED.

"Let truth and falsehood grapple. Who ever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter."—MILTON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—With respect to the public acts of public men, you, I believe, quite agree with me that it is the peculiar, the legitimate province of the newspaper press, as Shakespeare has declared it to be that of "the stage" or "playing," "to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time, his form and pressure;" but that at the same time this province should never be extended to the taking cognizance of the acts of private life, or to the withdrawing of the veil which shrouds domestic privacy.

And surely you will further agree with me that none can be more justly held accountable to this censorial power of the newspaper press, than such individuals as are characterised in the subjoined extract:—

"Drowning men, it is said, will catch at straws; and some men, when in danger of moral submersion, act in a somewhat similar manner. They catch, indeed, at a something more substantial than a straw; but, oftentimes, so unluckily that, although they touch their object, it slips from their feeble, although eager grasp; and their attempt to save themselves, by such means, only precipitates their submersion, and, by a sort of re-acton, sinks them to a greater and more hopeless depth than they would, otherwise, have reached. Such men, when arraigned at the bar of public opinion, on account of any dereliction of duty, or rather demagogic impulse, often seek to save themselves, and ward off the much dreaded verdict of condemnation, by laying hold of some one, whose public position may be, or may have been, similar to their own; and endeavoring, by an attempt, generally as unsuccessful as it is base, to prove him equally culpable with themselves. The instinct—reason it is not—which thus leads the guilty to endeavor to show that another is as guilty as themselves, is certainly fatuous or maniac; for, even granting the party whom they seek to draw into the same condemnation with themselves, to be equally deserving of it with themselves, that fact does manifest, that consideration cannot, unless they are entirely destitute of every feeling of respect and unlikeness, in any degree lessen the abatement and bitterness of their condemnation to themselves. But if it does lessen the sense of guilt and shame in their bosoms, if it does make their condemnation less stinging and grievous to them, demagogic indeed must be their nature; for who, but Satan himself and his children, seek to draw others into their own condemnation and misery?"

The mean, the paltry evasions, shifts, and subterfuges, to which J. Barrett Cooper, Esquire, (charged with having drawn money from the public treasury, for services which he neglected to perform,) has had recourse, and his base attempts to throw undeserved censure upon others, especially upon J. McNeill, Esq., the long-tried and trustworthy Clerk of the House of Assembly, "the Contingent Committee" and myself, in vain seeking thereby to purge and purify himself, have fairly, I think, brought him within the above category; and, therefore, I conclude that you will justly hold him amenable to your power as a public censor, and accord space in your paper, even although it should be to the temporary exclusion of one or two of the interesting and useful articles with which your columns are generally filled.

I am, sir, your obedient servant.

R. B. IRVING.

Honble. EDWARD WHELAN, &c. &c., &c.

CHARLOTTETOWN, 15th July, 1857.

(COPY.) SIR,—In your paper, *The Monitor*, of the 9th instant, in a letter which appeared therein, over your signature, and which, it seems, was addressed by you, on the 14th April last, to the Hon. the Speaker of the House of Assembly, I find you have, in two passages thereof, taken most unwarrantable and untruthful liberties with my character.

There is scarcely, in either of the passages alluded to, as they affect me, one scintilla of truth. Six-sevenths of what is stated in the first is positively false; and what is prominently set forth as a fact in the second, is nothing less than an unmitigated falsehood. Fortunately for me, but unfortunately for you, I have ample means, not only in my own private journal and letters, but also in public records, completely and at once, to refute all that you have falsely stated concerning me, in your letter to the Hon. the Speaker of the House of Assembly; and I now assure you, that, unless you publicly, that is through the public press, (by means of which you have, with singular effrontery, in a most unjustifiable manner, cast imputations, easily understood, upon my character, both public and private,) endeavor to afford me such satisfaction, as any man presuming to account himself a gentleman, not to say a Christian, would, if convinced of his mistake—so I am willing to write your violation of the truth for the present—feel himself constrained to afford the party aggrieved; I will not hesitate to do something like ample justice in the matter, before the public, not only to myself, but upon your consideration, I subjoin the two passages of your letter, of which, with too much reason, I complain.

If I receive not, before noon to-morrow, a written intimation from you, that you will immediately endeavour to afford me such satisfaction, as I justly demand, I shall then consider myself at perfect liberty forthwith to redress the wrong which you have done me, in the best and readiest way I can.

I am now extending to you that forbearance which, I think, any gentleman would, in such a case, feel it to be his duty, (even if influenced by a principle no higher than mere self-respect,) to shew to another; but I do not say that my doing so affords me that unalloyed pleasure which one ought to derive from the performance of a good or generous act; for I cannot persuade myself that, had I been the aggressive and you the aggrieved party, in such a matter, you would have extended, towards me, any thing like either gentlemanly or Christian forbearance.

I am, sir, your obedient servant.

R. B. IRVING.

James Barrett Cooper, Esquire, &c., &c., &c.

If upon the face of this letter, and the comparison annexed, there are marks of haste and carelessness; for such marks the disgust and indignation which I cannot but feel with reference to the provocation which has caused me to write them, will easily account.

R. B. I.

FALSEHOOD THE FIRST.—"In consequence of the entire absence of Mr. Irving, from the reporter's desk during the first four or five weeks of the session, the whole labour of reporting the proceedings for that period, devolved upon myself."—*J. Barrett Cooper.*

THE TRUTH.—My absence from the reporter's desk, that is from my duty as Reporter to the House of Assembly, during the session of 1852, (for I do not forget Mr. J. B. Cooper's impudent assumption and retention of my desk,) was from Saturday evening, 21st February, after adjournment, until Saturday afternoon, 28th February; and, at no other time, during the session, was I absent from when I ought to have been in the House. Thus it appears I was absent from duty not for four or five weeks, as falsely asserted by Mr. J. B. Cooper, but for five days, afternoons or evenings only; and such absence was satisfactorily accounted for by Dr. Hobkirk's certificate, sent to the Hon. the Speaker.

[In haste, instead of following the blind, I took the "1852" of Mr. Cooper, blindly of "1853," the year really in the question, and wrote accordingly as above. For "1852," he pleased, as Mr. Cooper says, to read 1853; and, with the exception of the days of the month, the above will be "the truth in every

essential particular." As Mr. Haszard's statement directly bears upon, and clears up this, I need not occupy space here by further explanation.—Saturday, July 18, 1857. R. B. I.]

FALSEHOOD THE SECOND.—"At the same time, £50 were awarded to Mr. Irving, who only attended in the afternoon, and although a whole month of the session had elapsed before he made his appearance in the House!"—*J. Barrett Cooper.*

THE TRUTH.—The above, so far as I have underlined it, is a most barefaced, impudent and unmitigated falsehood. I regularly attended, and discharged my duty, throughout the whole of the session, with the exception of five afternoons or evenings, as above stated; and not only did I do my duty, but occasionally something more, particularly when an important summary was required; as I can easily and will, if need be, show.

Until noon to-morrow, this letter (I keep a copy) shall be strictly private. After that time it shall remain so or not, as you give me reason either to suppress it, or to make it public.

James Barrett Cooper, Esquire, &c., &c., &c.

MR. COOPER'S REPLY:

A choice specimen of impotent, although bold malignity, disgraceful disingenuity, mean subterfuge, and, in the P. S., of something still worse.

CHARLOTTETOWN, July 16, 1857.

(COPY.)

MR. R. B. IRVING; SIR,—I have to acknowledge receipt of your very "gentlemanly" and eminently "Christian" epistle of yesterday.

There are I regret to observe, several typographical errors in the letter to which you allude. The most material of these occurs in the date of the transactions, the publication of which seems to have aroused "your disgust and indignation." For "1852," you will be pleased to read, "1853." With this trifling correction, what you are now pleased to characterise as "impudent assumption"—barefaced, impudent and unmitigated falsehood," &c., &c.—will, if necessary, be proved to be, in letter, as it now is in spirit, "the truth," in every essential particular.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

J. BARRETT COOPER.

P. S.—When you next go down upon your "marrow bones" in the Methodist Chapel or elsewhere, please pray for your "erring brother."

J. B. C.

REPLY TO THE FOREGOING.

"Whose tongue so'er speaks false,
Not truly speaks; who speaks not truly, lies."

"Can he be what he is, and yet know what he is?"

"Mark how a plain tale shall put you down."

SHAKESPEARE.

TO JAMES BARRETT COOPER, ESQUIRE, &c., &c., &c.

CHARLOTTETOWN, 16th July, 1857.

SIR,—In my letter, addressed to you, yesterday, the 15th instant, I, in very plain, but truthful terms, brought before you, for reconsideration, and rectification, should you feel disposed to make it,—the falsehoods which you had published concerning me, in your own ill-conditioned paper, "The Monitor" of the 9th instant.

I at once pitied and despised you so sincerely,—pitied, especially after I had read a certain editorial of "The Protector," yesterday, in which there is dealt upon you, *en passant*, as it were, a well-deserved and most telling cut; and knowing as I did besides, something of a rather heavier and still more deserved punishment, at that time in preparation for you in another quarter,—that I had positively made up my mind to allow you (much provocation as you had given me, and much as I knew you to be in my power,) to escape almost unscathed from my hands; provided you should make a simple retraction of the mistakes concerning me into which you had fallen; attributing them to haste, want of thought, or want of records to which to refer, or, indeed, to any thing else which you might plausibly advance. But, no! no! your sordid nature could not afford even so small a measure of justice: there would have been too much honesty in it for your taste.

The rod with which, through your "Monitor" of the 9th instant, you had previously supplied me, is an instrument so very suitable for the inflicting upon you of the punishment which you so well deserve at my hands, that, wielding it alone, I could most easily, in spite of any shield or cover you could have interposed, have so applied it as to make every stroke cut you to the core.

But,—how infatuated have you been!—not satisfied with knowing that you had so armed me against yourself, you have, by your letter of to-day, in the wantonness of malignity, completely cast from you every means of retreat or protection, and delivered yourself up, bound and naked, for whatever severity of punishment I may be pleased to inflict upon you.

Years ago, when aroused by your virulent and unprovoked aspersions, I very pointedly intimated to you, as you, no doubt, will remember, my abhorrence of the man, upon whom I thought nature had bestowed the qualifications peculiarly requisite in a headman. My abhorrence of such a character is still, and I trust ever will be, as strong as it was then; and, therefore, fully deserving of extreme punishment as you are, and prostrate and defenceless as you lie before me, I cannot consent to become your executioner. But, besides, I feel that, even although you have, by bitter retaliation, more than doubled the offence, I may still very well afford to be forbearing; for as I neither have been, nor am likely to be injured by it,—the source whence it has proceeded having rendered it innocuous,—my resentment has been awakened more by the intention, of the act, than by the act itself.

By a plain and brief statement of facts, drawn from public records, I shall, therefore, simply negative what you have falsely and maliciously stated concerning me. With respect to yourself I shall now merely observe that your own hand has, in your last letter, penn'd your full condemnation. "Out of thine own mouth shall thou be judged."

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

1st SESSION, 1851.—Tuesday, 5th March. Resolved, That Mr. R. B. Irving be appointed Reporter to the House for the present Session.

[The intention was, that Mr. Irving should be appointed Reporter, not for the Session only, but "to the House;" and consequently, at the commencement of the subsequent Session, on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Coles, the mistake was rectified.]

R. B. Irving, for his services as Reporter, £50
J. B. Cooper, Assistant Clerk, £80
extra for services in 1850, 10
—£140

2d SESSION, 1852.—Tuesday, 5th March. Resolved, That Mr. R. B. Irving be appointed Reporter to the House.

R. B. Irving, Reporter, £55
Thomas Preedy, Assistant Reporter, 20
J. B. Cooper, Assistant Clerk, £80
extra, to pay Messrs. Hughes, Desbrisay & Hyndman for engraving, 20
—£155

3d SESSION, 1853.—R. B. Irving, Reporter, £50
J. B. Cooper, for Summary Reports, £20
Clerk Assistant, 80
—£150

CERTIFICATE.

CHARLOTTETOWN, 18th July, 1857.

At the request of Mr. Irving, Reporter to the House of Assembly, that met, in their first session, on Tuesday, 5th March, 1850, and were dissolved by Proclamation July, 1853, I hereby certify that, on reference to *Haszard's Gazette*, 1853, I find that he (Mr. Irving) regularly supplied that paper with the Debates of the House, from the very commencement of the session of 1853, Tuesday, 10th February, to its close on Saturday, 16th April; except for a period of five days, during which he was confined to his home by sickness, and attended by Doctor Hobkirk; and that such was the case, I can positively assert, for he (Mr. I.) and his family, at that time, occupied a part of my own residence.

Mr. J. Irving's first Report, that session, appeared in *Haszard's Gazette*, Tuesday, 10th February, the very day on which the session commenced; and his last report of a debate, (that on the sale of wrecked vessels, &c., Tuesday, 5th April, only eleven days before the close of the session,) was published in *Haszard's Gazette*, Wednesday, 6th July, 1853. His report of the close of the session, Saturday, 10th April, was published in that paper, Wednesday, 20th April. Mr. Irving also supplied the papers, as I find by reference to *Haszard's Gazette*, with all the most important summaries of that session.

Mr. Irving began to attend his name to his reports, Friday, 25th February; his reason for so doing being, I believe, that he might, thereby, be able to point out his own work beyond question. From that date, all that was published in *Haszard's Gazette*, 1853, of the proceedings of the House of Assembly, whether of summary or debate, was reported and supplied by Mr. Irving.

Mr. J. B. Cooper, I am well aware supplied, or was engaged to supply, the papers with Summaries, during that Session; but I do not find that a single Debate, reported by him, was published in *Haszard's Gazette*.

I find by an editorial remark in that paper, Wednesday, 19th February, 1853, that Mr. Irving had furnished the proceedings of the House up to Friday, 14th February, and, therefore, it is quite clear that anything at all in the shape of Debate, that may have been supplied by Mr. J. B. Cooper, must have been between that date and Friday, 25th February, during Mr. Irving's illness; but all between these dates is little but Summary.

Respecting the Debates in the House of Assembly, in the session of 1853, I find this observation, in an editorial of *Haszard's Gazette*, 28th May: "Of the debates which took place in the House of Assembly, in the last session, we have already published more than we believe have ever before been given by the Island Press, of any other session." These Debates were reported and supplied by Mr. Irving.

The foregoing certificate was drawn up, to be signed by my son, Mr. George T. Haszard; but, as he happens to be absent from home, on a visit in the country, just at the time when his signature is required for the publication of the said certificate, I have at the request of Mr. Irving, carefully compared the facts set forth in the certificate, with *Haszard's Gazette* for 1853, beginning with the number of Thursday, 10th February, and ending with the number of Monday, 6th July, 1853; and I find that the evidence afforded, by the paper, fully corroborates or establishes the statements contained in the certificate; and any who may question these facts, I beg leave to refer for their satisfaction, to the same record which I have consulted.

Charlottetown, July 20, 1857. JAMES D. HASZARD.

When, by the aid of the foregoing statement, the claims of Mr. Cooper are placed in nearly their true light, does it at all appear surprising that notwithstanding all Mr. Cooper's "facts laid before the Contingent Committee, at the close of the Session of 1852, (of which the Hon. Robert Mooney was Chairman)," that "the result was a grant of £20, for furnishing a summary of the proceedings of the House of Assembly to the Newspapers," whilst, "at the same time, £50 were awarded to Mr. Irving, who only attended in the afternoon, and although a whole month of the Session had not elapsed,"—no, nor even a second of time,—before he made his appearance in the House?"

Why, yes, it does appear surprising, I must confess, that to Mr. Cooper for his supererogatory work, and which, according to his own shewing, (vide the letter in *The Monitor* of the 9th inst.) the printers "suppressed for want of room, as was" justly "alleged," they giving the preference to Mr. Irving's "more lengthy reports." (Very contradictory, this! Mr. Cooper.) Yes, it is surprising that the Contingent Committee should vote him £20 for supererogatory and rejected reports; but I suppose the Committee did so on this principle,—the less his deservings, the greater their generosity.

Now for "Mr. J. B. Cooper's impudent assumption and retention of my desk," and I shall speedily have done with him. Before the opening of the session, 1853, it had been arranged, I believe, and so Mr. J. B. Cooper himself says, that he (Mr. Cooper) should report the proceedings of the forenoon sittings, and also regularly supply the press with daily summaries; and, for that service, it was, I believe, generally understood that he should receive the sum of £20, the same amount as was voted to Mr. Preedy, for his services, as Assistant Reporter, in the session of 1852.

Availing himself of the opportunity which this arrangement gave him, as he fancied, at the time of my sickness, to supplant me, retain his own appointment of Assistant Clerk, and draw the full allowances for the services both of Reporter and Assistant Clerk—calculating he could engage some needy individual to do his work in the Clerk's room, for £10 or £15—he, with the most pertinacious impudence, retained possession of my desk, (of which, with propriety enough, he had taken and kept possession during my sickness), until the close of the session. On my return to my duty in the House, I found Mr. Cooper seated at my desk—at that time there was only one desk for reporting at in the House.) After having waited for some time to see whether or not he would manifest any inclination or intention of vacating it, seeing, as he did, that I was again in the House, and ready to resume my post as Reporter, I went up to him and quietly said, "Mr. Cooper, is it your intention to occupy this desk for the remainder of the session?" To this interrogatory, with the cool impudence of the weasel who had taken possession of the rabbit's burrow, and refused to resign it to its rightful owner, Mr. Cooper replied, "I believe so." I rejoined no more than "very well!" and taking a seat on one of the strangers' benches, by the side of Mr. W. MacGill and Mr. Mitchell, I prepared to pay such attention to the proceedings of the evening, as would enable me to report them from memory; for I very well knew, from previous trials of my ability, that I could do so. The Speaker almost immediately after took the Chair: some important business was transacted, and one or two short, but interesting debates ensued. Although occasionally exchanging a few words with Mr. Mitchell and Mr. MacGill, I charged my memory with the whole; and, at home, before I went to bed that night, I wrote down a full report thereof, which was, I believe, published in all the papers. Will it, in any degree, refresh Mr. Cooper's memory to be reminded of his sending for the key of my desk, by an officer of the House, at the time I was sick?

The next day another desk was provided, at which, quietly allowing Mr. Cooper to retain the one which he had usurped, I regularly discharged my duties in the House for the remainder of the session.

To Mr. Cooper's postscript scoffing, I make no reply but this: How much soever I may have erred and sinned in life, I have never treated any becoming outward manifestations of devotion with disrespect; much less have I ever spoken of them in terms of mockery and contempt.

[Out of respect to others, I here suppress a passage, which, although penned solely for the benefit of Mr. Cooper, might, if published, give offence to some to whom none was, or, in fact, could be intended by me.]

R. B. IRVING.

(COMMUNICATED.)

The "Benevolent Irish Society Pic Nic" came off on last Monday, and did infinite credit to those entrusted with its management. Shortly after the time appointed, the Officers of the Society and the Managing Committee met at the beautiful banner of the Society, walked in procession to her precious cargo, and was already received the greater part of her precious cargo, and was already decorated with flags, banners, &c. All on board (who we should say numbered over 300 persons, exclusive of a large number who preferred going by land,) and the "Ora," steamed beautifully up the river to Apple Tree Wharf, where they were welcomed by a display of bunting and three hearty cheers from the persons who had congregated there from an early hour in the morning. The party immediately landed and proceeded in regular order with flags flying, and music playing, to the residence of Francis McQuaid, Esq., through whose kindness all the other necessities requisite to constitute a Pic Nic were brought to the scene of action. Mr. McQuaid had a considerable portion of his beautiful Farm arranged and decorated for the use of the party, and as they arrived doors and gates flew open, and the hospitable owner gazed with delight on the crowds as they took possession of his premises. After a few moments the whole party retired beneath the shade, which a large grove of