

THE EXAMINER.

VOL. 3.

CHARLOTTETOWN, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, FRIDAY, MAY 31, 1878.

NO. 310.

THE DAILY EXAMINER

Is Published every Evening.
OFFICE:
INGS' BUILDING, CORNER OF WATER
AND GREAT GEORGE STREETS,
Charlottetown, P. E. I.

RATES OF SUBSCRIPTION:
Six Months, \$2 50
Three Months, 1 25
One Month, 0 50
One Week, 0 12

Advertising at most moderate rates.
Contracts may be made for monthly, quarterly, or half-yearly advertisements, on application.
W. L. COTTON, J. W. MITCHELL,
Manager. Office Sup't.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

TIME TABLE NO. 9.

SUMMER ARRANGEMENT!

ON AND AFTER
MONDAY, APRIL 29th, 1878.

Trains Going West.

STATIONS.	No. 1 Express.	No. 3 Mixed.	No. 5 Mixed.
Georgetown	Dp 4.00 pm	Dp 7.30 am	
Cardigan	" 4.20 "	" 7.50 "	
M. Stew't Jun	ar 5.25 "	ar 9.20 "	
Royalty Jun.	dp 5.35 "	dp 9.30 "	
Ch'town	" 6.32 "	" 10.45 "	
Ch'town	ar 6.50 "	ar 11.05 "	P. M.
Royalty Jun.	dp 6.25 am	dp 11.35 "	dp 5.25 "
N. Wiltshire	" 6.43 "	" 11.55 "	" 5.45 "
Hunter River	" 7.18 "	" 12.50 pm	" 6.42 "
Breadalbane	" 7.30 "	" 1.07 "	" 7.00 "
County Line	" 7.58 "	" 1.47 "	" 7.38 "
Kensington	" 8.05 "	" 1.57 "	" 7.48 "
Summerside	ar 8.33 "	" 2.38 "	" 8.25 "
Wellington	ar 9.00 "	ar 3.15 "	ar 9.00 "
Port Hill	dp 9.52 "	dp 4.40 "	
O'Leary	" 10.22 "	" 5.27 "	
Alberton	" 11.18 "	" 6.54 "	
Tignish	" 12.00 "	" 8.00 "	
Tignish	ar 12.40 pm	ar 8.50 "	

Trains Going East.

STATIONS.	No. 2 Express.	No. 4 Mixed.	No. 6 mixed.
Tignish	Dp 1.50 pm	Dp 6.30 am	
Alberton	" 2.30 "	ar 7.20 "	
O'Leary	" 3.13 "	dp 8.57 "	
Port Hill	" 4.10 "	" 10.22 "	
Wellington	" 4.40 "	" 11.10 "	
Summerside	ar 5.15 "	ar 12.05 pm	A. M.
Kensington	dp 5.30 "	dp 12.40 "	dp 6.30 "
County Line	" 5.55 "	" 1.17 "	" 7.07 "
Breadalbane	" 6.23 "	" 1.57 "	" 7.46 "
Hunter River	" 6.32 "	" 2.07 "	" 7.58 "
N. Wiltshire	" 7.00 "	" 2.48 "	" 8.35 "
Royalty Jun.	" 7.12 "	" 3.05 "	" 8.52 "
Ch'town	" 7.47 "	dp 4.10 "	ar 10.05 "
Ch'town	ar 8.05 "	ar 4.30 "	
Royalty Jun.	dp 8.05 am	dp 4.40 "	
Ch'town	" 8.23 "	ar 4.00 "	
Mt. Stewart	ar 9.20 "	ar 5.25 "	
Cardigan	dp 9.40 "	dp 5.45 "	
Georgetown	" 10.43 "	" 7.06 "	
Georgetown	ar 11.05 "	ar 7.35 "	

SOURIS BRANCH.

Trains Going West.

STATIONS.	No. 7 Mixed.	No. 9 Mixed.
Souris	Dp 3.15 p.m.	Dp 6.30 a.m.
Harmony	" 3.31 "	" 6.52 "
St. Peter's	" 4.28 "	" 8.07 "
Morell	" 1.52 "	" 8.38 "

Train Going East.

STATIONS.	No. 8 Express.	No. 10 Mixed.
M. Stewart Jun	Dp 9.30 am.	Dp 5.25 p.m.
Morell	" 10.02 "	" 6.15 "
St. Peter's	" 10.25 "	" 6.47 "
Harmony	" 11.23 "	" 8.02 "
Souris	Ar 11.40 "	Ar 8.25 "

C. J. BRYDGES, WM. McKECHNIE,
Gen. Sup. Gov. Railways. Supt. P. E. I. R.
Ch'town, April 20, 1878.

FINAL NOTICE.

I HAVE received positive instructions to take proceedings against all parties who have not yet paid their Poll Tax. All persons interested in this matter will please take notice and govern themselves accordingly.
JOHN HIGGINS,
Collector.

May 16th, 1878—pat 3i cod

DR. WILLIAM GRAY'S SPECIFIC MEDICINE.
The Great English Remedy is an unfailing cure for Seminal Weakness, Spermatorrhea, Impotency, and all diseases that follow as a consequence of Self-Abuse, as Loss of Memory, Universal Lassitude, Pain in the Back, Dimness of Vision, &c.

Before Taking, Premature Old Age, and After Taking, many other diseases that lead to Emaciation or Consumption and a Premature Grave. Price, \$1 per package, or six packages for \$5, by mail free of postage. Full particulars in our pamphlet, which we desire to send free by mail to every one. Address W.M. GRAY & CO., Windsor, Ontario, Canada.

Sold in Charlottetown by W. R. Watson, Dr. Dodd, C. D. Rankin, P. G. Frase at Apothecaries Hall, and by all Druggists anywhere.

1878.

THE Weekly Examiner

FURNISHES MORE NEWS, FOR LESS MONEY THAN ANY OTHER PAPER IN THE PROVINCE.

It Contains Twenty-eight Columns, nearly every one of which is in closely set READING MATTER.

CONSIDER OUR TERMS:

SINGLE COPIES to the 31st December, 1878—thirteen months—\$1.00 in advance.

SIX COPIES to one address, or addressed separately, as desired, \$5.50 in advance.

TEN COPIES to one address, or addressed separately, as desired, \$9.00 in advance.

FIFTEEN COPIES to one address, or addressed separately, as required, \$13.50 in advance.

TWENTY COPIES to one address, or addressed separately, as desired, \$17.00.

IN DULL TIMES

—GET THE—

CHEAPEST AND BEST

The Weekly Examiner

is acknowledged to be ahead of any other paper in the Province in the item of

LOCAL NEWS.

and is always well filled with

Political, Shipping, Commercial and General Information.

The debates of the Local Legislature will be carefully and impartially given. Special telegrams and letters from "Our Own Ottawa Correspondent" will contain everything of interest transpiring in the Dominion Parliament.

A Good Story will be made a specialty.

The Daily Examiner

Will be sent to any part of the Province, the Dominion, United States or Great Britain on receipt of

For Six Months, \$2.50

For Three Months, 1.25

For One Month,50

ADDRESS,

W. L. COTTON,

Manager Examiner Printing and Publishing Company.

Ch'town, Dec. 6, 1877.

WAGSTAFF'S HOTEL.

THE Subscriber having fitted up the Hotel formerly known as

THE RANKIN HOUSE,

in first class style, is now prepared to give comfortable accommodation to

Permanent and Transient Boarders.

Tourists and others will receive every attention at the Wagstaff's Hotel.

WM. WAGSTAFF.

May 25, 1878.

W. C. McDonald's TOBACCOES!

25 Boxes Flat Chewing,
50 Caddies "British Consols,"
"Gold Bar," "Queen's" and
"Nelson's Navy."

All the very highest grades, and CHEAP

CARVELL BROS.

Ch'town, May 10, 1878—3w law

P. E. I. Starch Manufacturing Co.

CAPITAL . . \$25,000,
In Shares of \$25.00 each.

THIS COMPANY has been incorporated by Act of Parliament during the present session, and one-third of the Shares have been taken up by the leading men of Charlottetown. Farmers holding Stock in this Company will have the benefit of the preference in the large purchase of produce which the working of the Company entails.

Applications for Shares to be made to Messrs. Hyndman Bros., until the Directors and Officers of the Company are appointed.
April 16, 1878.

PAINTING!

THE Subscriber takes this opportunity of thanking the Public for the liberal patronage he has received during the five years he has been in business, and solicits a continuance of the same.

He is now prepared to execute, in a very superior manner, House, Sign, and Carriage Painting, Paper Hanging, &c. Special attention is given by him to WHITENING, COLORING and the DECORATING OF CEILINGS, WALLS, etc.

On hand and made to order—
EVERY DESCRIPTION OF CARRIAGES.

Carriage Repairing promptly attended to.

PRICES TO SUIT THE TIMES.

P. H. TRAINOR,
82 Kent St., opp. Rocklin House.
April 2—3m cod

JAMES HOBBS,

CABINET MAKER.

Cor. Kent and Prince Streets,
Charlottetown.

THE SUBSCRIBER, in returning thanks to his customers and the public generally for past favors, would take this method to solicit a further continuance of their patronage. I am better prepared than ever to execute any orders that may be entrusted to me.

The latest styles of all kinds of Household, Office, Church and School Furniture, made from well-selected and seasoned stock, at short notice.

Special attention paid to Cutting, Making and Laying Carpets.

Repairing neatly done, at short notice. I would also invite the attention of Trustees of City and Country Schools to A DESK, one of the Cheapest and Best ever offered here for School purposes. Please call and inspect it at my Show Room.

JAMES HOBBS.

Corner Kent and Prince Streets,
Ch'town, Feb. 23, 1878. } 3m 2aw

St. Lawrence Marine Ins. Co.

OF P. E. ISLAND.

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL . . \$120,000.00.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS:

ARCHIBALD KENNEDY, Esq., President; JOHN F. ROBERTSON, Esq.; ARTEMAS LORD, Esq.; G. D. LONGWORTH, Esq.; W. E. DAWSON, Esq.; THOMAS MORRIS, Esq.; P. W. HYNDMAN, Esq.

Risks taken daily at their Office, Exchange Building.

FRED. W. HYNDMAN,
Secretary.

March 25—1y law

BLANK - BILL HEADS,

BLANK STATEMENTS,

—AND—

BUSINESS CARDS,

Furnished promptly and cheaply, to order, at the

EXAMINER OFFICE,

INGS' BUILDING,
Corner Great George and Water Streets.

Senator Haviland's Speech on the Quebec Outrage.

SENATOR PERRY CORRECTED.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—At this late hour of the evening, I do not intend to detain the House, but I could not sit in my seat and listen to the misrepresentation of history made by the hon. Senator from Alma, relative to the dismissal from power of Lord Palmerston in 1850. The way I read history is: he was not dismissed by the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown, but by the Crown at the request and on the recommendation of the Premier of the day.

Hon. Mr. PENNY—Why did the Premier make the recommendation?

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—We all know what the cause of that dismissal was. As the old phrase says: "There cannot be two Kings in Brentford." Lord Palmerston received deputations upon foreign questions without consulting the Premier or any other member of the Ministry—in fact he was a despot in the Cabinet—and in consequence of his acts at that time, Lord John Russell recommended Her Majesty to dismiss him. I will not give my own words for it, but I will quote from Molesworth's History of England—not the historian's version of it, but the statement made by Lord John Russell in Parliament, in reply to a question from Sir B. Hill:—

"The first important transaction in which Lord Palmerston took a part, since the end of the last session of Parliament, was his reception of a deputation of delegates from certain metropolitan parishes, respecting the treatment of the Hungarian refugees by the Turkish Government. On this occasion I thought that my noble friend exhibited some want of due caution, but I gave him the credit of supposing that this was through an oversight. The next occasion to which I think it necessary to refer relates to the events which took place on the 2nd of December in France. The instructions conveyed to our ambassador by the Queen's Government were to abstain from all interference in the internal affairs of that country. Being informed of an alleged conversation between Lord Palmerston and the French Ambassador, repugnant to their instructions, I wrote to that noble Lord, but my inquiries for nine days met with a disdainful silence, Lord Palmerston having in the meanwhile, without the knowledge of his colleagues, written a despatch containing instructions to Lord Normanby, in which, however, he evaded the question whether he had approved the act of the President. I consider the noble Lord's course of proceeding in this matter to be putting himself in the place of the Crown, and passing by the Crown, while he gave the usual approbation of England to the acts of the President of the Republic of France, in direct opposition to the policy which the Government had hitherto pursued. Under these circumstances, I had no alternative but to declare that while I was Prime Minister, Lord Palmerston could not hold the seals of office, and I have assumed the sole and entire responsibility of advising the Crown to require the resignation of my noble friend."

Therefore it was not by the exercise of the prerogative he was dismissed, but on the recommendation of the Prime Minister because he had taken upon himself the powers and authority of the Government, and carried out his own views in direct opposition to the policy of the Administration, of which he was a member. He was dismissed at the request of Lord John Russell, and the Premier took the responsibility of it. Therefore, the precedent cited by my hon. friend from Alma is scattered to the winds. As to the case of Lord Metcalfe, there was very little known about responsible government in those days. It was merely the commencement of the experiment of responsible Government. I must confess I am surprised when I look around this House to find the

of pure and undefiled Liberalism are the Conservatives and the champions of old Toryism and despotism are the Liberals.
Hon. Gentlemen—Hear, hear.
Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—They say history repeats itself, and it certainly does. We know in the days of George III., when the Almighty in His wisdom thought fit to smite the King and to take from him his reason, when the Regency Bill was before Parliament, it was the Conservative party that checked and limited the power of the Prince Regent, and it was Fox and his party who desired to make him a despot. It was at the feet of a greater Gamaliel than my hon. friend from Alma—the late Joseph Howe—that I learned the principles of responsible government. His definition of it is a government for the benefit of the people, as expressed through a majority of their representatives in Parliament assembled. I am surprised that we should find among the so-called Liberal Party such champions for despotism and irresponsible power—who would avenge a Lieutenant-Governor

over the Province which he governs. I do not care for the point raised in another place, as to whether a Lieutenant-Governor's power is greater or less than that of the Governor General, whose commission comes direct from England. I am willing to put them on the same footing, and I contend that, taking that view of it, hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to give greater power to Lieutenant-Governors than the Queen herself dare exercise. I do not want to go into learned quotations, because I know the House is weary of them. We have had them from the hon. Senator from Halifax, until we could not understand the applicability of them to the question before the House; because sometimes his quotations were the very reverse of the opinions expressed by himself. There is one case which I will quote, and it is the

only one I remember since 1830, where either the Governor or the King has ever exercised the prerogative of dismissing a ministry which had the majority in Parliament,—that was the

CELEBRATED DISMISSAL

of the Melbourne Ministry in 1834 by King William IV. We know that is a precedent which is never likely to be followed again; we know at that time King William IV. had strong views—old Tory views. After the passage of the Reform Bill, and the Ministry had been in power four years, he altered his mind very much, although he was the people's William at one time. The occasion selected by the King for dismissing the Melbourne Ministry was, when Lord Althorp, who was Chancellor of the Exchequer, was raised to the House of Lords, by the death of his father, and Lord Melbourne waited on the King and stated the changes he intended to make in the Ministry, in consequence of the vacancy of the Chancellorship of the Exchequer. His Majesty told him that he was of opinion that the business of the country could not be carried on by such a Ministry as it was now proposed to constitute, and that he had made up his mind to call in the Duke of Wellington. In that case, as in the present one at Quebec, there were advisers behind the throne; but the King took upon himself the responsibility of dismissing that Ministry. We know, according to ordinary constitutional rules, the Government of Wellington and Peel, who were then called to office, technically speaking, were responsible for that dismissal; but how is that matter treated by history? Where is the responsibility put? These are the comments of Molesworth:—

"Such was the outcome of this attempt to force a Conservative Ministry on the country. The results were, the needless turmoil and expense of a hotly-contested election; a vast expenditure of money; a great loss of time wasted in party strife, which should have been devoted to public business; a diminution of the Liberal majority, and a proportionate increase of the Conservative Opposition; a consequent weakening of the Melbourne Administration, compelling it to seek strength and stability in a closer alliance with O'Connell and his followers. And now the question arises, who was really responsible for these mischievous results? On the principle that the King can do no wrong, the blame must be thrown first, on the Duke of Wellington, who consented to fill Lord Melbourne's place provisionally, and next, on Sir Robert Peel, who accepted it definitely, and accepted with it the responsibility of Lord Melbourne's dismissal, as he himself honorably and frankly acknowledged. But history must not be arrested in its decisions by constitutional fictions. It judges Sovereigns as well as their Ministers; and, in this instance, it must condemn William the Fourth as having made an unwarrantable use of his prerogative, in order to transfer the Government of the country to the party that he personally preferred."

THAT IS EXACTLY THE CASE I contend that has arisen in the Province of Quebec. Mr. Letellier has dismissed his Ministry. It is like the old fable of "The Wolf and the Lamb." He wanted an excuse to get rid of his Ministry in order that he might have M. Joly and the party with whom all his sympathies were, around him at his Council Board. The case of King William, whom Molesworth condemns, was mildness itself in comparison with the high-handed act of Mr. Letellier in dismissing his Ministers, because King William IV. did give a reason, to the effect that they would be too weak without Lord Althorp as Chancellor of the Exchequer, and there was no man in the Ministerial party to take his place and perform the duties and functions of that important office as efficiently as he had done. Here was a reason given, but I look upon the act of Mr. Letellier as the

DEEPEST STAB that constitutional Government has ever received. He dismissed a Ministry which had an overwhelming majority in the House of Assembly, and almost unanimous support of the Legislative Council. Where can we find a parallel for such a case? With regard to the precedent in the Cape of Good Hope, there were Imperial interests to be protected, and as an Imperial officer, Sir Bartle Frere occupied a two-fold capacity, he was the representative of the Sovereign, to guard imperial interests, and he was also the Governor of the Colony. Let us see what the case of Mr. Letellier is in this message that has been laid before us by His Excellency the Governor-General. You will see that, from the first to the last, he forgot the position which he occupied. Evidently, he was thinking of days gone by when he was a Minister in this House, and thought he continued to be a Minister, instead of occupying the position of Lieutenant-Governor of a Province. Instead of remaining passive and receiving the suggestions of his Ministers, he forced his own views upon them. I have not a shadow of a doubt as regards the vote I ought to give on this question. I have come to a conclusion on reading Mr. Letellier's defence, as he terms it, without looking at Mr. DeBoucherville's rejoinder at all. It is one of the most

FERILE DOCUMENTS

in the shape of a state paper that I have ever heard of. It is a list of trifling complaints. One of his reasons is, that a Bill was passed with a blank, another that there was a grammatical error in some measure; and it is on such pretenses as these that he justifies his arbitrary conduct of dismissing a Ministry having the confidence of an overwhelming majority in both branches of the Legislature. It seems to me, from the very hour that he became the repre-

presentative of the people, that he became the repre-