LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

THURSDAY, April 10.

House in committee on the Elective Council Bill. Hon. Mr. Forgan in the chair.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL—In making this change in the constitution of this Council, I wish to know what it will cost the Colony, or whether any of your Honors have made a calculation of the probable cost? I also wish to know whether this House is to have any more authority over the revenue? I think this is the proper time to understand those questions, as at present the House of Assembly view money matters with a very jealous eye.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—Does his Honor mean that this House should have the power to initiate money votes?

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL—Yes; that is what I mean. I think these questions are reasonable, and may save trouble and misunderstanding with the House of Assembly in future time. What are we to gain by an elective Council if we are not to have any more control over the revenue than we have now? It will cost the country some thousands of pounds to elect this House.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—Not thousands, hundreds.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL—Yes, thousands at every election. I also wish to know if the members of this Council are to bear their own expenses when they are elected?

Hon. Mr. PALMER—I certainly see nothing improper in the questions of his Honor, and while the Bill is under consideration is the proper time to understand them. His Honor asks whether it is intended to extend or abridge the privileges of this Council, or, if I understand him aright, whether we are to have the power, when elected, of initiating money votes. Now, I do not think it is contemplated to put the Council on the same footing as the House of Assembly in that respect; the Bill will not bear that construction. It leaves us just as we are at present constituted with regard to money votes. I confess that I am not exactly prepared to say to what extent the privileges of the Legislative Councils, in the provinces where they are elected, extend; but I do not think they have the power to initiate money votes. It, of course, rests with the members of this House to say whether they will contend for that power or not. For my part, I would not feel myself justified in introducing such an amendment as his Honor contemplates, and will, therefore, give my adherence to the Bill as it is; it having passed the other branch of the Legislature with such a large majority. I shall not offer any amendment except with regard to the scrutiny; but I do not find any fault with his Honor for asking those questions. If such a power were exercised by both branches of the Legislature, I think it would be attended with a great deal of inconvenience. We will still have the power to negative any Bill. All the appropriations come up in one Bill; we have the right to exercise our judgment upon each item, and if we are dissatisfied with any of them, we would be justifiable in rejecting the whole Bill, if there were no other expedient. We would then be responsible to our constituencies, and it would rest with them to say whether we or the House of Assembly were wrong.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—It is very little use to talk about this Bill, because I believe it is the determination of the majority of this House to carry it through. But with regard to the question of his Honor, Mr. Dingwell, I think it is a matter for very grave consideration: for if the country is to be put to such an enormous expense, your Honors should weigh the subject well. However, I cannot agree with his Honor in saying that it will cost thousands of pounds; but I believe it will cost hundreds.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL—Time is money, and when I consider the time that will be spent at elections, I believe that it will cost the country thousands of pounds; but I do not say that it will cost the revenue that much.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—I quite understand his Honor now, and I fully admit that it will cost the revenue and country thousands. What benefit is to be derived from it? There are no greater privileges conceded to this House; and I believe it would embarrass any Government to give both Houses the power to initiate money votes. I hope to see the day when the Government will have the sole control over the revenue. It is so in Nova Scotia; the Government initiate all money votes. But if it is to cost the country so much, what advantage will it be? Now, I will just put a case: suppose the liberals have a majority in the House of Assembly and the conservatives in this House; and suppose the liberal majority pass the Revenue Bill, and the liberal minority in this House are unable to carry it, what is to be done; are the interests of the country to be sacrificed?

Hon. Mr. HUTCHINSON—There must be a dissolution.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—Yes; but in the meantime the country would be ruined; it would be filled with Yankee rum. And if the same majority should be returned, what would be done then? You cannot then create five new members in one night. You cannot increase this House nor dissolve it. Therefore I think your Bill will be found to be a total failure. You will find that it will be almost impossible to carry on the principles of Responsible Government. If the crown had the power to get the House out of the difficulty, it would be different; but by this Bill you deprive it of that power. Therefore I say you should pause before you pass this Bill. Then again his Honor, Mr. Dingwell, has asked the question, and his Honor the President of the Executive has, through inadvertancy I suppose, neglected to answer it, whether the members of this House are to be paid. Gentlemen will not then come from the country without being paid. Suppose the Legislature sat in Georgetown, I would not leave my home, my family and my business, and attend there for a £1000; neither, I am sure, would my hon. friend the leader of the Government do so. It is no inconvenience for members residing in Charlottetown to attend here, it is rather a pleasure; but it is too much to ask gentlemen from the country to attend here and spend their time and their money without any remuneration.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—I did not expect when I moved the House into committee that we would have a contest on the principle of the Bill; but I see His Honor the President has buckled on his armour and attacked the principle with renewed vigour. He thinks two elective bodies might come to a dead lock, and wonders how the key would be applied. Now it is quite possible that such a collision might take place, just as it has already taken place when we have a nominative Council and an elective House; but I do not apprehend that it would annihilate the constitution if it did take place. This Island would not be more liable to such a collision than the other Colonies which have adopted the principle of an elective Council. Suppose a Bill initiated by the Lower House were sent up here and we refused to pass it, then each House takes the responsibility of what it does. The House of Assembly was always responsible, this House never; then both will be responsible.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—This Bill provides that this House can neither be dissolved nor crammed.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—Very well, they are responsible to the people, and that will be brought to bear which is the only remedy for many constitutional diseases—public opinion—that must regulate the matter. If a large number of petitions come in from the country, the Legislature will have to act accordingly. I think this is quite sufficient; because any constitution is liable to interruptions; but these are evils which will work their own cure. His honor says we cannot prevent those evils by a new creation. I do not admit that even now we can do so. That power may not be conceded to a future Government, at least they cannot obtain it at any moment. If the House or Chamber of Representatives need reformation, and the power is in their own hands they will never be reformed. At the time to which your honor has alluded there was an extraordinary state of affairs, and an extraordinary remedy was required. And with respect to the question whether the members are to be paid or not when they are elected, if his honor had adverted to the debate of yesterday, he might remember that that question was asked by his Honor Mr. Walker, and in my reply I said that was one of the greatest objections to the Bill; but I said that if the country wished to have the power they must pay for it. His honor speaks of the onerous burden of gentlemen from the country sitting here without pay; his honor's sympathy has broken out very suddenly. His friends sat for years and years beside him without pay; why were they not paid then? I never heard him advocate the cause of the country members as he has done at present. The present Government has said that they will not pay them till they are elected.

Hon. Mr. HUTCHINSON—His honor the Leader of the Government says that if this Council should continue as it is at present constituted, that the same course could not be pursued in case of an emergency as has been formerly adopted. Now this appears very strange to me; it seems as if one party were to have a privilege over the other. I thought from the first time this Bill was introduced that the object was to get a Council here so constructed that it could not be removed or reconstructed in case the liberal party came into power, so as to prevent them from doing anything. And I believe that the enormously high qualification that was required for candidates by the Bill of last year was for the same purpose.

Hon Mr. SIMPSON—I presume that we are out of order Mr. Chairman, in discussing the principle of the Bill now; but as the liberty of doing so has been granted to other members, I wish also to make an observation. His honor who spoke last says, that this Bill was brought in for the purpose of keeping a future Government from doing anything. Now I do not see why it should do so. On the other hand I think it will be the means of putting the other party in a better position if they should come into power, because it will be elected by the same constituencies. They will also be elected about the same time, for the Bill provides that they shall be elected as soon as it becomes law. It will therefore harmonize better with the House of Assembly. Saying that they cannot be removed is not correct, because they must go back to the country every four years. Therefore I cannot see that there is any ground for the fears which his Honor appears to entertain. When they are elected I believe they will be paid.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL—Any party that is in power should work for the public interest as well as they know how; and when I look around me and see experienced men at this Board, I say let us deal honestly and fairly—let us do for the better and not for the worse. I am not for curtailing the peoples' rights; but at the same time I cannot see that this measure will be for the service of the country; if you can convince me that it is, I will support it.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—His honor Mr. Hutchinson is evidently in very bad humour to-day. He has attributed motives to the present Government for introducing this Bill. He says it was for their own advantages and ends—for the purpose of securing the position of the members of this Board. To be consistent he should go a little further and say it is to prevent the Liberals from coming to the hustings. What advantage, I ask can it be to the Government of the day? They have a majority at present in the Council, and also in the House of Assembly. And if a majority of the same party would not be returned to the latter at the next general election, what guarantee have we that a majority in favour of the present Government would be returned to the former from the same constituencies? Does not this show the futility of his honor's arguments. There is nothing to prevent any party from gaining power, if public opinion should so order it, nor of holding that power when once gained, till its term expires. I therefore think his honor's arguments are very much out of place, they remind me of the fable of the wolf and the lamb which went to drink at the same brook.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—His honor says that it is the first time he has heard me speak about paying the members of this House. Now, I have always been of opinion that as long as they were nominated they should not be paid; but what I said was that I would not go to Georgetown if the Legislature were held there.

The first clause were then agreed to and the second read.

Hon. Dr. JOHNSON—That clause says that on the Bill being confirmed by Her Majesty, this House shall be immediately dissolved. Now I think the Lieutenant Governor should have some discretionary power, because a Despatch confirming the Bill might be received by him at a time when it would be very inconvenient to hold an election.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—Suppose a Despatch arrived when the Legislature is sitting, this House might be dissolved in the very heart of the Session.

After some dissultory debate the clause was amended by giving the Lieutenant Governor power to dissolve the House at any time after the passing of the Act not exceeding six months.

On the 7th clause, relating to the qualification of electors, being read—

Hon. Mr. WALKER moved that it be amended by striking out the words "one hundred," and inserting the word "fifty." I think, said his honor, that if it is intended that the two branches should work in harmony there should not be such a very great difference in the qualification.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL—I think it is hardly consistent with the state of the country to say that the qualification of a member for the other House is not sufficient for an elector for this.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—I must oppose that amendment, and I think their honors in, moving and supporting it, are acting very inconsistently. If they wish to show their consistency let them move to have the qualification the same as that of the electors for members of the other House. I should oppose it either way, because it is necessary, if we wish to preserve any analogy to the House of Lords, to raise the standard of the electors. What we want is the grave, sober, settled inhabitants of the Colony. We do not wish the members of this House elected by a moving, transitory population—men who are subject to a sudden ebullition of party feeling. There is enough of that element sending members to the House of Assembly. We want a selection made by people having more of the interests of the country at stake. If you take away that qualification you put this House on a par with the House of Assembly. You would then destry all analogy between the Upper Chamber and House of Lords, some principles of which we should follow. This has been pointed out in a friendly manner by his Grace the Secretary of State. He appears to know what we want better than we do ourselves. I do not adhere to that clause simply because his Grace says we should have a tolerably high qualification, but because I believe it will be for the benefit of the country; and I hope and trust that no support will be given to the proposal to reduce it. I am not standing here to deprive any class of persons of a privilege; but there is a class of persons who are not as capable of judging what is for their benefit as some others are. Many men have to submit to what is for the general benefit. For instance, how many men have to submit to a taxation for education, who have already educated their children, or who have none to educate?—but it is for the benefit of the country at large. It is, therefore, better for a question of this grave nature to be left to a class of persons who are better able to judge of what is for the good of the country. By denying the privilege to the other class we do them no harm, because we do that which is calculated eventually, if not directly, to do them a benefit. It is necessary to have laws to protect property, and those parties will participate in the blessings of those laws; they may then be content to abide by the judgment of those who are more capable of deciding. They have the privilege of voting for members of the House of Assembly. We are not contracting, but extending the privileges which they enjoy, and they should thank us for doing so. Therefore, I trust that hon. members will see the necessity of allowing the qualification to remain as it is, at £100, for I think it is very moderate. Few men in the country, as a general rule, have farms of less than 50 acres, and those whose improvements are not worth £100 must be pronounced transitory and unsettled, and we cannot rely upon them. The privilege should therefore be withheld from them till they do acquire that amount.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL—His honor, the leader of the Government accuses us of inconsistency. Last year when this Bill was introduced, there was to be no property qualification at all; I do not know how such a change could have come over the minds of hon. members. If it is the Despatch of His Grace the Duke of Newcastle that has changed their minds I must say that I do not attach a great deal of importance to the Despatches of British noblemen, dictating to our poor Colony what course to pursue with regard to our own affairs.

Hon. Mr. HUTCHINSON—I intended to move that the qualification should be the same as that for electors for the other House, but I am willing to fall back and support the amendment of his honor, Mr. Walker. I have listened to the arguments of his honor the leader of the Government, and they appear to me like saying to a man, you may come into the kitchen, but not into the parlour, to say that he may vote for members of the House of Assembly, but not for the Council. I hope the men who are prevented from voting for members of this House will not vote for supporters of the Government in the other; for I maintain that the inhabitants of this Island should not be put on a par with the inhabitants of Britain, where the population is so dense. Almost every man, when he comes here, looks out for a piece of land, and settles down upon it, and why should such an individual be prohibited from voting, though he may not have £100 worth of property. His honor the leader of the Government did not say a word last year against the qualification being the same as that for the other House and I was pleased to see that he did not; but it appears that some unaccountable change has come over his mind. I suppose the Despatch of his Grace the Duke of Newcastle who knows very little about us has produced the change; but it is very likely that those very words have been put into his mouth from this side of the Atlantic.

Hon. Mr. WALKER—A poor man's labour is his capital, and I certainly think that £50 is high enough.

Hon. Mr. GARDINER—I do not know why we should reduce the qualification, for I think it is too low at £100; I wish we could have it higher. If this House is to be elected it should be chosen by men having a stake in the country. I do not think that any person having the good of the country at heart would say that £100 is too high.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY—If we are to have a qualification for the electors, it should be a respectable one. I am of opinion that both the electors and the candidates should have a property qualification, and last year I contended that that for the candidates should be £1000; but it was reduced by the House of Assembly.

Hon. Dr. JOHNSON—Some of the arguments of hon. members are on the assumption that we were disfranchising a certain class of persons, but this is not the case. We are endeavouring to reconstruct the Constitution of this House and should endeavour to have it established on the very best foundation. Last year I took the liberty to move that the electors should be 30 years of age; that was not disfranchising any class; it was enfranchising all above that age. This House should be elected by a fixed population, having a fixed stake in the country, and having the welfare of the country at heart. I agree with his honor, Mr. Gardiner, that it is two low. £100 sterling would be more acceptable. It would then have a similar effect to the amendment which I proposed last year. But to say that it should be the same as that for the other House is altogether unreasonable.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—His honor, Mr. Hutchinson, says that I was willing last year to have the qualification the same as that of the electors for members of the House of Assembly, and I have been accused of inconsistency because I go for that clause now, which requires the electors to have a qualification. Now, I can inform hon. members, for their gratification, that when this measure was first introduced into the House of Assembly, I contended strongly for a qualification of both the electors and the elected; but I had to give way to the opinions of the more numerous; and why did I do so? Simply because I did not wish to lose the Bill. That was not inconsistency; and the same feeling induces me now to vote as I intend to do—to maintain my consistency by carrying this Bill. If I thought the Duke of Newcastle, or any other Colonial Minister, would assent to it, I would still go for having a qualification in the candidate, but I yield for the purpose of carrying my object, for it is better to have the Bill as it is than not have it at all. As to the remark of his honor, Mr. Hutchinson, about the class of persons to whom we do not grant the privilege of voting for members of this House not voting, as he has expressed a hope, for the supporters of the Government when the time comes; if they do not I suppose it will not be his honor's fault, for I dare say his honor will be found leading up as many of that class as he can find to vote against the Government. All I can say is that I wish him joy of his company. It is not likely that I will be in the contention. I am sorry that we should occupy so much of the time of this House, going over what was fully discussed here yesterday; but hon. members do not appear to be satisfied with an answer. I was reading not long ago of a parrot which had been taught to speak a number of words. It was placed near where a bricklayer was building a house, and some wag learned it to say, "more mortar." The hod carrier would no sooner go down with his hod than he would hear the cry from the top of the wall, "more mortar," and supposing it to be the bricklayer would immediately return with his hod full of mortar. At length the bricklayer began to complain and asked the man what he meant by bringing him so much mortar. The hod-carrier, to his surprise, then discovered that it was the parrot that was calling for it. There appears to be just as little use in answering the questions of hon. members, for there would only be a repetition of the cry of "more mortar."

Hon. the PRESIDENT—This discussion is not on the principle of the Bill, but on the details, and I think your honors should weigh this clause well. In the Despatch of the Secretary of State, a copy of which I hold in my hand, his Grace says, with regard to the electors, "I would require a tolerably high qualification." Now, what does his Grace mean by this? He means that the electors should be of that class of persons who have a stake in the country, so that we might have an aristocratic Upper Chamber which would really represent the landed interests of the Colony. Well then if we take the despatch as our guide, we should take the whole of it, and I do not think that £100 currency will be considered "a tolerably high qualification." If this body were to be elected by the same electors, you might as well have but one chamber. Therefore I cannot agree with the amendment proposed by his Honor Mr. Walker, for I would rather increase the qualification than diminish it; and if a motion is made to that effect I will support it.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON—When this Bill was passed last year there was no qualification required for candidates, and I was satisfied; but as his Grace the Secretary of State requires a tolerably high qualification, all I am afraid of is that it is not high enough to secure its passing, because I know that the people wish to have a voice in the formation of this House. I would therefore be willing to raise the qualification higher in order to secure the passing of the Bill.

Hon. Mr. GARDINER moved that the qualification be £150.

Hon. Dr. JOHNSON on rising to second the motion said—I am of opinion that the interference of the Secretary of State is very proper, because by this Bill the crown is delegating its power to the people; and therefore Her Majesty, or rather the Colonial Minister, who is in this respect the guardian of the prerogatives of the Crown, should exercise the right of making any suggestions which he may think proper, and I further think that he is entitled to the thanks of this House for doing so.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—Though I admit that there is a good deal of force in the arguments for raising the qualification, yet, as the matter has been strongly argued in the House of Assembly, and as it has been fixed by the Government at £100, I think it would be very little use for us to try to raise it.

The question was then put on Hon Mr. Walker's motion and the House divided:

CONTENTS—Hons. Messrs. Walker, Hutchinson and Dingwell—3.

NON-CONTENTS—Hon. the President, Hons Messrs. Palmer, Johnson, Anderson, Gardiner, Haszard, Ramsay, Simpson and McLaren—9.

So the motion was lost.

The question was then put on Hon. Mr. Gardiner's motion, and the House again divided:

CONTENTS—Hon. the President, Hons. Messrs. Gardiner, Johnson, Anderson and Ramsay—5.

NON-CONTENTS—Hons. Messrs. Palmer, Haszard, MacLaren, Simpson, Hutchinson, Walker and Dingwell—7.

So it passed in the negative. House resumed and progress reported. Adjourned for one hour.

THURSDAY AFTERNOON, April 10.

House again in committee on the Elective Council Bill.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY moved that a clause be inserted to prohibit any member from being elected from any other county than that in which he resides.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—I would support that measure, but I do not think it would be good policy at the present time. It appears to be the feeling at present to allow the electors to select their member from any district so long as he has been in the Colony for a given time. I scarcely think it would find support at the present time in the House of Assembly; and though I would like to see the Bill embrace the views of all parties, yet I cannot support his Honor's amendment, as I fear it would obstruct the Bill.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY—I am sorry that his honor Mr. Palmer cannot agree with this resolution. I submitted a similar resolution last year and there was a majority of this House in favor of it. I am still of the same opinion. I think we have a right to judge for ourselves about our local affairs; and if you canvas Prince County at the present time I am confident that you will find 99 out of a 100 who will go for the measure.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON—From his honor's own admission there can be no need for the measure at least in Prince County, for if the people are so much in favor of the measure they will certainly return a man from their own county.

Hon. Dr. JOHNSON—Members will not be sent to this House to represent any district or party, but the whole Island; and if the electors think there is a man in their own district who will suit them, they will certainly select him without restricting them by law; if not they should be at liberty to choose a man from another district.

Hon. Mr. HUTCHINSON—Last year his honor, Mr. Ramsay, proposed a similar resolution, and I seconded it. I am still of the same opinion; for if candidates have liberty to go to all parts of the Island certain individuals from Charlottetown will get themselves returned in spite of fate. I think the members should represent the counties in which they reside.

Hon. Mr. HASZARD—I do not see that we can do any harm by leaving the choice to the electors themselves. Some of the very best representatives reside beyond the bounds of the district which they represent.

Hon. Mr. GARDINER—I shall support his honor Mr. Ramsay's amendment. I have seen candidates from Charlottetown coming to the country with their kegs of rum, and collecting crowds round them—extorting promises from them—and in this way they would choose the representative of the district. I would confine them to the counties, for I do not think they have any right to go beyond them.

The question was then put on the amendment, and the committee divided:

CONTENTS—Hons. Messrs. Ramsay, Hutchinson and Gardiner—3.

NON-CONTENTS—Hon. the President, Hons. Messrs. Palmer, Johnson, Anderson, Haszard, MacLaren, Simpson, Dingwell and Walker—9.

So it passed in the negative.

The clause relating to members vacating their seats on accepting office was then read.

Hon. Dr. JOHNSON—They have to go back to be re-elected. That principle is adopted in England. and I suppose it is found to have some beneficial effect; but I cannot see the propriety of adopting such a course here. The people who select a man as their representative must have confidence in him, and I cannot see that accepting office disqualifies him in the least. And if he do go back he only goes to a small district, whereas he is an officer for the whole Island. I therefore object to that clause. I think the principle should be abrogated.

Hon. Mr. HUTCHINSON—If there is any good in any part of the Bill it is that part; and I am surprised that his honor Dr. Johnson, who is an Englishman, should depart from those great principles which have been established in England. When the bait of an office is held out to a man, is he the same man that he was before? He should then go back to the people, and it is for them to say whether they have the same confidence in him, and if they have they can elect him again; if they have not they can say no, we will not elect you. That is a privilege granted by the British constitution and I hope it will never be surrendered.

Hon. Dr. JOHNSON—I am an Englishman, and an old Englishman too, and I believe that Englishmen at the present day would not approve of that clause. You have no business to elect a man as a representative in whom you have not confidence. His honor says that when the bait of an office is held out to a man that he is changed; but you must have time to know whether he is changed or not. I do not see why you should loose confidence in a man because he accepts an office.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—I must congratulate the majority for inserting that clause. When the present majority came into power they would not allow any member to hold an office; but before another session passes I rather think you will find public officers holding seats in the House of Assembly; and therefore I think some new light must have dawned on the minds of the present majority. I think they find that it is almost impossible to carry on Responsible Government without the heads of departments on the floor of the House. I must say I am surprised at the position assumed by his honor Dr. Johnson, for it is a principle admitted in England. For instance, suppose his honor were elected to a seat in the House and were afterwards appointed Vaccinator General, he would have to go back to his constituency to see if they approved of the appointment. Therefore I consider that the clause is just and necessary, and I will support it. I also expected to see his honor Mr. Simpson on his legs, judging from the tenor of his remarks yesterday; but perhaps he has also seen some new light.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—A similar clause still remains in the constitution of the House of Assembly; and it has been thought proper to assimilate the constitutions of the two Houses. It might so happen that a man might accept a paltry office, which might just come within the meaning of the term "profit or emolument," for the purpose of doing a favor to the Government of the day. His honor the President says he did not think the present Government would insert such a clause.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—No; I said I thought some new light must have dawned on their minds.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—Then his honor should not speak by insinuations, but in plain terms as I do. We will then undertsand him better, and I will not rise up to disclaim the insinuation. You might have a set of men in the next House of Assembly who would wish to have some of the heads of departments in the House; and suppose they should desire to introduce one into the Council, what would be said then? The cry would be—oh, how nicely they have managed it! And I do not hesitate to say that it is not improbable that we may see some of the heads of departments on the floor of the House at no very distant day. If the present Opposition are in power we will have the House crammed with them. It was so before, so much so as to cause his Grace the Secretary of State to write a despatch to the Lieutenant Governor reprimanding him for not informing him of the circumstances; but at the same time perhaps it would be better to have one or two Public officers on the floor of the House. At the time that the present party came into power, it certainly was the feeling in the country to have them all excluded. Many of their own party were of that opinion; and some of the supporters of the present Government think we have gone too far in excluding them all. At a future time candidates might be called upon to pledge themselves to admit 2 or 3 officers on the floor of the House, but no more. And I do not hesitate to say that it would not take a great deal to persuade me to consent to have that number in the House; for perhaps the party at present in power did carry the matter a little too far. But if such an alteration do take place, I hope we will not go back to the extreme measure. I think then it is right to have such a clause as that in the Bill; for there might be a Government in power which would cram this House with public officers. Eleven out of the thirteen might hold office, therefore I think it is better to look forward and make some provision to prevent such a state of affairs. Though I do admit that there is some force in the arguments of hon. members, yet, nevertheless, I will not object to that clause for I think it is necessary.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—If his honor had heard my observations from the first I do not think he would have occupied so much of the time of the House, for I stated distinctly that I congratulated the House of Assembly for introducing this clause.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL—I am thankful for the explanation of his honor Mr. Palmer, for I certainly did apprehend that a change had come over the present Government; but his honor's explanation is so satisfactory that I am willing to leave the clause as it is.

The clause was then agreed to.

House resumed, and progress reported.

MISCELLANEOUS.

A DUEL ON THE TIGHT ROPE.

The taste for rope-dancing which the celebrated madame Violante brought into fashion in the early part of the last century flourished nowhere so much and so long as in Dublin, where the agile lady established herself, and opened at heatre, the attractions of which for a time surperseded every other place of public amusement. Madame Violante was the Blondin of her day, but more of an artist, and less of an acrobat. She treated the public to scenic effects they had never witnessed before; she trained some notable actresses—among whom was Peg Woffington—and carried rope-dancing to so high a pitch, that the *beau monde* of Dublin talked of, and attended to, nothing else for some years. Long after the day of her management had gone by, and her theatre passed into other hands and uses (it is said to have become a Methodist Chapel), the relish for this species of performance was strong enough in the public mind to produce a kind of civil war regarding the merits of two rival rope-dancers, who had established themselves and their ropes at opposite ends of the city. One astonished the natives of the then fashionable Liberties, the other amazed the dwellers of the New Town, who had not then extended to Merrion Square. They had arrived in Dublin on the same day, set up their rival camps, and sent forth their manifestoes next morning; and henceforth there was nothing but contention at dinner-table and tea party, in tavern, coffee-house, and billiard-room, concerning the moral, social, and acrobatic worth of Signor Sarfuico and Monsieur Perote.

As their names and titles indicate, the one was an Italian and the other a Frenchman. Sarfuico was young, muscular, and tall for a gentleman whose business had to be conducted on the tight-rope. Perote's age could not be ascertained; his adversaries asserted that the blackness of his thin hair was owing to dye; he was small, slender, and wind-dried, professed to have been brought up on the rope, and considered it the grandest and most elevating of human pursuits. Signor Sartuico was grave, silent, and even dignified. On the hemp he danced the latest minuet, carried a hamper of glass on his back, and balanced his sword on his chin with a taciturn stateliness sufficient for a cardinal in full canonicals. His Gallic antagonist talked with immense volubility throughout his performance, generally in his own praise and that of his science, as he pleased to call it; related his experiences, delivered his opinions on men and manners, and exchanged repartees with his Dublin audience. Signor Sarfucio assured the public that he was the last scion of a noble Florentine family. Monsieur Perote boasted his descent from a line of rope-dancers, and took special pride in one of his ancestors who performed before Henri Quatre. Each gentleman professed to know nothing of the other, but their mutual hatred was said to exceed that of ordinary rivals; through their respective satellites a whisper oozed out that they had travelled and danced together for years on the continent—that their quarrels had latterly been such as to call for police interference—and that they had separated with vows of vengeance on each other; some intention of that kind was supposed to influence the Frenchman's movements in particular, for wherever the Italian went, there he followed him, and set up his opposing camp.

They were both excellent in, or rather on, their peculiar lines. As ropes were walked or danced in those days, Dublin had not seen their equals, and they divided the town between them. Dowagers fought their battles over their cards; young men quarrelled in coffee-houses, and met next morning in the Phœnix Park about them; family controversies arose—social circles split and fell away—people altered their wills—old friends passed each other without speaking—and engagements were broken off, on account of Signor Sarfuico and Monsieur Perote. They got mixed up with politics, as what in Dublin did not? The *popular or Irish party* were the chief supporters of Perote; he bowed to the carmen, and wanted justice for Ireland. The high Tories and friends of government, on the other hand, lent their strength to Sarfuico; he was a reduced gentleman, and no doubt of sound principles. The Irish party being the most numerous, gave Perote a considerable majority, and what was still more in the Frenchman's favor, the ladies threw their weight into the scale. In spite of the better looks and higher pretensions of his rival, Monsieur Perote's abundant compliments and general devotion to the fair sex carried the day; the ladies, young and old, espoused his cause as ladies only can; and in their influence, great as it is, and has been in all times and places, had a power on the banks of the Liffey in those days sufficient to swamp any opposition. Monsieur Perote's fame and cash-box went up at a rate which threatened extinction to his rival, till the Italian's ingenuity found out a mode of making things more than even. Sarfuico raised his rope. The elevation was full twenty feet above anything Perote had ever attempted. The bare advertisement drew a considerable house on the first evening of exhibition, and when it went abroad how he had carried the sack, balanced the sword, and drank a glass of wine to the health of the *lord-lieutenant*, Perote's popularity fell to freezing-point. In vain his most astonishing feats were put in requisition: he stood on one leg to no purpose, danced the minuet *De la Cour* with no effect; notwithstanding his bows, the carmen ran to see and shout for his daring antagonist; and though his compliments rose if possible to a higher key, the ladies deserted him and his rope.

At this epoch, it became public by their joint advertisement that Sarfuico and Perote had made friends. Why and how, their most confidential advisers could not declare, but it was generally believed that, as became his position, Perote had made the first overtures, and Sartuico, remembering former days, and not unwilling to rule over his enemy, agreed to let bygones be bygones, and receive him into his service. They were henceforth to act together, and the surmises, speculations, and reports that went through Dublin, when that announcement was issued, was unexampled. Would the Italian bring down his rope? Would the Frenchman elevate his? Would the stage admit of two ropes? Would there be anything more than the old tricks? Heavy bets were taken on those important questions, and a full hour before its doors were opened, a crowd that might have filled a building twice the size, had collected in front of Sarfuico's theatre. *The getting in* and getting places was a considerable business; and when no more seats could be found for the ladies, and no more standing-room for the gentlemen, the curtain rose. Then what a surprise for the eager faces—what a disappointment of shrewd conjectures—what a losing of heavy bets appeared, for there was Sarfuico's rope alone, at its highest elevation, and there were the rivals both upon it. The Italian looked more than usually grave and grand; *the Frenchman determined and unflinching*, as if his courage had been screwed up for some desperate purpose. The one bowed solemnly to the boxes, the other to the whole house, but it was carelessly done, and Perote's hand was not even laid on his heart when he turned to the ladies.

As soon as the house recovered from its amazement, it made the roof ring and the rope tremble, not to speak of those who stood on it, with thunders *of applause. Sarfuico's theatre, it must be premised,* had been an ancient windmill of more than common height, which allowed room for his present elevation, and there he and his former rival stood some forty feet above the stage. Most people expected the Frenchman to fall, but he did not. The Italian had evidently no notion of the like; he received the ovation as his due; and the little dark man who acted as his crier—by the way, he called him Manifestato—came forward and announced that the ladies and *gentlemen* were that evening to witness a performance never before exhibited on any stage; it was called the dance of friendship, invented by Monsieur Perote, and immensely improved by Signor Sarfuico.

The two on the rope immediately began to put themselves in dancing position; they were both in the full dress of the period, with lace ruffles, bag wigs, and swords. The eyes of the whole house were fixed on them. Signor Sarfuico was still grand, but in beginning the dance of friendship, he seemed to have some difficulty with his feet. Perote had perceived this, and made some remark, which no body else could hear; but it aroused the Italian's anger. He raised his hand as if to strike him; the same instant, Perote's rapier was drawn, and before the audience could comprehend that they had actually quarrelled, Sarfuico's hanger was out also, and they thrusting at each other on the tight rope. A pin might have been heard falling in the crowded house, where everybody sat still in his place gazing up at the two fighting in the air. How they kept their footing, the genius of mischief only knows. The concentrated hatred and malice of their faces were fearful to see up there in the flickering lamplight. Pass after pass, lunge after lunge, they made at each other with the rapidity of lightning. Both were good swordsmen, but Perote was the best of the two; he warded off the Italian's thrusts with his small rapier, and positively seemed more certain of his footing than before the quarrel began; till Sarfuico, making one desperate lunge, received a back-stroke which threw him off his balance, and at the same moment attempting to grapple with his enemy. Down he went, and down went Perote. A cry of horror rose from the spectators; but some power had interfered in their behalf, for there was the Italian hanging to the rope by his feet, and the Frenchman holding on to it with both his hands. "*Look, ladies and gentlemen,*" he cried with a face of triumph sufficient for having saved Christendom; "behold how I have perilled my life, and, still more, my fame, to unmask deceit, and vindicate science! Look at the straps attached to his shoe-soles, and passed over the rope; there is how he made himself safe, and dared to surpass me, whose life was spent on the rope, whose great-great-grandfather performed before Henri Quatre. I guessed it—I knew it, through the inspiration of my science, and I die happy since the villain is unmasked."

Monsieur Perote did not die happy or otherwise on that occasion. Before his parting speech was done, the spectators had recovered their senses sufficiently to give the alarm, and rush to the rescue with ladders, fire escapes, and feather-beds to be fallen upon. He was got safely down; so with Sarfuico, though it proved a more difficult business, and the doctors never could understand why he did not die of apoplexy. From that evening, however, his glory had departed—a fact of which the last scion of the noble Florentine family was so sensible, that he departed also without sound of trumpet, and to the great regret of several tradesmen. His now successful rival made a longer stay and a good deal of noise about the unmasking; but the whole scene cured the Dublin world of fashion of its fancy for such peformances. One knows not what Blondin may effect, but the like have never been popular among the playgoers of the royal city since they happened to witness a Duel on the Tight-rope.

BRITISH COLUMBIA AND ITS GOLD.—There is no longer any doubt that a new gold-field of surpassing fertility, and very easily worked, has been opened in British Columbia. This immense territory, stretching northward from Vancouver's Island over six or seven degrees of latitude, and bounded here, if bounded at all, only by other portions, hitherto unoccupied, of British North America, has scarcely received the attention it deserves. Most inviting accounts of its climate and agricultural resources have reached us from time to time, yet the stream of colonization has never set strongly in that direction, and the extraordinary price of labour has continued to attest the dearth of able-bodied emigrants. It is probable that last year's operations at the diggings on Fraser River will prove the turning point in the fortunes of the colony. Gold is the universal magnet, and it is not by average receipts, but by the earnings of the most adventurous and successful, that the attractiveness of a new country is to be estimated. The valleys between Fraser River and the Rocky Mountains, and especially that district scarcely to be identified on the map, but described by our correspondent under the name of Cariboo, promises to draw the surplus roving population from California more rapidly than Otago has diverted that from Australia. Already we hear of villages growing "like magic," of roads, or rather bridle-paths and "trails," being cut through the forests; of complicated machinery for gold-washing being erected in nameless localities some 500 miles north-east of Victoria and New Westminster; and of butchers' shops, blacksmiths' forges, bakeries, taverns, and gambling-houses rising up on all sides. "In all Cariboo" there were but "five white women and three physicians" in June, but the former class must afterwards have greatly increased, and if the latter did not multiply, it seems to have been due to the wonderful healthiness of the miners. Altogether, considering that this mountainous tract, though marked on some maps as "Gold Regions," was all but uninhabited till a year or two ago, we can hardly be surprised that the rumours which have reached us of its fabulous wealth have hitherto found little credit. Even in Victoria they were scarcely believed till the successive arrival of settler after settler, laden with golden spoils, convinced the most sceptical that a new El Dorado had been discovered.—*London Times, Edl. Feb. 7.*

Provisions had to be carried on the backs of Indians, who were paid $20 a day for "packing." Labouring men, who had no mining claims of their own, were hired to work those of the miners at $7 and $8, and found. Provisions were relatively high in price. Flour was at 38c. (1s. 7d.) per lb.; bacon, 75c.; beans, 40c.; tea, $1 50c.; sugar and coffee, 75c. per lb. Single meals at the *restaurants*, consisting of beans and bacon and a cup of bad coffee, cost $2 (8s. 4d.) A correspondent of one of the newspapers in Victoria, writing from Cariboo at this time, quotes the prices of what, in the grandiose style of these parts, he calls "miners' luxuries," as follows:—A tin pan (worth 3d.) sold for $8 (£1 12s. 9d.); picks and shovels, $6 each; ditto, with handles, *i.e.*, shovels, $7 50c. each (£1 4s. 6d. and £1 10s. 6d.) Washing was charged for at $6 a dozen pieces (£1 4s. 6d.) The latter is the only item of "luxury" I see in the "Price Current," and I cannot believe that the laundryman was much patronized. It was added that "business of every description was lively." At such prices a man would need to earn his £5 to £20 a day to enable him to keep "business lively." These wages and prices show the large gains of the miners.—*Do. Corresp. Victoria, Vancouver Island, Nov. 29.*

A WORD ON THE OTHER SIDE—THE POVERTY AND THE BENIFICENCE OF ENGLAND.—In despite of all prejudice, well or ill founded, towards the English nation, it must be conceded, that the benificence is as marked as the poverty of their people, and is a full offset to it, in the eye of impartial judgment. And well does the Liverpool *Courier* remark, that "the statistics of pauperism *constitute a gloomy, but an invaluable literature*—a study by no means pleasant, and yet one which it is impossible to dispense with.

At the close of 1861 the whole number of paupers in England and Wales approximated 900,000. The entire population was less than 20,000,000—nearly one in every 20 persons being paupers. In the manufacturing districts only, the number in December last was 217,851. But looking to the vast wealth of the nation, and its habitual *benevolence*, the Queen in her recent speech to Parliament pronounced the general condition of the country to be "sound and satisfactory." Far otherwise would it be, but for these relieving considerations. Wealth has increased in each successive year in Great Britain disproportionately to pauperism, and increase of charity has kept pace with the increase of wealth, which bespeaks a noble tribute to both the industry and innate goodness of enlightened humanity. We take a priceless pleasure in contemplating it in the light of satistical proofs which bear this undeniable testimony.

The English papers record the fact, that a few weeks since, when the families of 200 poor miners were deprived of support by the terrible catastrophe at Hartley, it was announced that $85,000—or £17,000, were necessary to place the suffering survivors beyond a condition of want, double that sum was suberibed, to fill the emergency, before the coroner's jury had returned their verdict upon the unfortunate dead. The Lord Mayor had to announce, that no more contributions were needed! How beautifully sublime is this record of Christian benevolence! Such a people may be instinctively proud of their condition and power, for they are undeniably great in the impulses of thought in the right direction.

So we read that, "*in Manchester again*, where the apprehensions of pauperism at this period would naturally be greatest, a deputation of gentlemen waited on the Board of Guardians and asked whether a donatioh of £10,000 or £20,000 in aid of the rates would be useful or acceptable. The guardians replied in the negative, and said that they had means and machinery in abundance for meeting all contingencies. The amount of property available both by legal assessment and *voluntary taxation for charitable purposes* is incalculably great. It has been plainly declared, both in Lancashire and in London, that there was money ready for every call, if the genuineness of the call could be ascertained, and the machinery of distribution effectively organized."

May we not, on this side of the Atlantic, study to advantage these evidences of man's humanity to man, practically illustrated, as well as to be constantly brooding in a spirit of accusation over "man's inhumanity to man," without practically exciting for it any positive relief?

How justly says the Poet—

The world is not exactly what I thought it,
But pretty nearly so; and after all,
'Tis not so bad as good men make it out,
Nor such a hopeless wretch.

—*Portland Advertiser.*

INSTINCT OF A CAT.—An old woman who died a few years ago in Ireland, had a nephew, a lawyer, to whom she left by will all she possessed. She happened to have a favourite cat, who never left her, and even remained by the corpse after her death. After the will was read in the adjoining room, on opening the door, the cat sprang at the lawyer, seized him by the throat, and was with great difficulty prevented from strangling him. The man died about fifteen months after the scene, and on his death bed confessed that he had murdered his aunt to get possession of her money.

The operation of the Reciprocity Treaty is becoming more distasteful to the Americans every day. It has been stated in Congress that it entails a loss of $2,000,000 a year on the States. The Canadians are in effect made citizens of the States by the treaty, without being required to bear any of the burdens of citizenship. The Americans appear to be incredulous when told that the treaty cannot be terminated by a six months' notice, when the fact is patent to the world that its duration extends to ten years, from Sept. 11, 1854, and after that one year's notice of abrogation. In view of this a member of Congress has announced his purpos to apply to the President to terminate the treaty.

Lady Franklin had at latest dates arrived at Honolulu, on her way to China and Japan. This is her second visit to the Sandwich Islands. This lady has a perfect mania for travelling, and is now journeying around the world with her neice.

WHAT IS A "HORSE POWER?"—The power of a horse is understood to be that which will elevate a weight of 33,000 lbs. the height of one foot in a minute of time, equal to about ninety pounds at the rate of four miles an hour.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR—The chairman of the late Montague Meeting, in the 'Islander' of the 11th inst., has treated us to another attempt to refute a statement in a former communication to the 'Examiner,' made upon reliable information, that Mr. McAulay sent from Charlottetown to Mr. McDonald to be furnished with material, &c. As Mr. McDonald appears to be willing to submit to "matter of fact" in this case, he shall have it.

The knowledge which any one person can have from the use of his own senses, in many things, is very limited; he must, therefore, often depend for his knowledge on what others say to him; and when the thing spoken of is known only to the party speaking, the other must rely upon what he says. If the statements of one person to another cannot be relied upon, the affairs of life would be embarrassed, and confidence in each other would be destroyed. The matter of speaking the truth concerns all persons, so all persons agree in holding those who do not speak the truth in contempt. Mr. McDonald knows that sisters and nephews sometimes blurt out the secrets of brother and uncle, and when these say, "McAulay sent to James to send him an account of the meeting," why should they not be believed. From this matter of fact it is hoped Mr. McDonald will perceive the "thought does no discredit to Mr. Rowe's sagacity or intelligence," and affords no sufficient reason for Rowe to "quit the desk and attend to his rum shop." In this last expression there is a sprinkling of ingratitude. It is not commendable in any person to contemn those who have afforded accommodation in an article suited to their taste, however light the liability. Some poet has written:

"He that's ungrateful has an only fault;
All other crimes may pass for virtues in him."

When I took up my pen it was in defence of civil liberty; and John Bull like, put my name to it. My assailants appear to overlook the subject matter, and shoot their envenomed arrows at the individual, and seem to vie with each other as to which can descend the lowest in personal abuse, thus developing the inherent and prominent features of the mind, proving to a nicety that persons who can, by physical force rob others of their civil rights, cannot adopt moral suasion in defence.

Unfortunately, with reference to Revd. George Sutherland, my information was incorrect as to name. An acknowledgment of this fact is in the hands of the printer, and probably will appear before this meets the public eye.

Respectfully,
MANOAH ROWE.

Montague Bridge, April 15, 1862.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR—The tenantry are anxious to know what their Representatives have done for their settlement, and how the Award has been disposed of; and it is but right that they should be informed as soon as you can make it convenient. But as it will be some time before the debates can be published, permit me, through the EXAMINER, to give them the following brief statement of the case:

It should be borne in mind that the Commissioners formed the Court of Enquiry so often spoken of and asked for. The Commissioners were authorised to enquire into everything relating to the rights of land owners and tenants, and finding that the lands were forfeited, and the landowners holding over by indulgence from former Ministers, they *could only report the fact*. But they had no authority to escheat this land, or give an award against the Crown. The landowners holding over by indulgence from former Ministers gives them a claim for compensation; and it belongs to the Imperial Government to enquire into those claims, and repair the errors of former Ministers. Therefore, as the Commissioners could not dispute the right of the Crown to grant indulgence, they had to allow that title, and could only award as between proprietor and tenant. But they did not expect their award to become law, as will appear on referring to the conclusion of their Report, as follows: "Should the general principles propounded in this Report be accepted in the spirit which animates the Commissioners, and be followed by practical legislation, the British Government will have nobly atoned for any errors in its past policy, and the Colony will start forward with renewed energy, dating a new era from 1861."

The Duke of Newcastle has made no objections to the general principles propounded in the Report, but he has objected to the main principles of the Award, viz: the Loan and the Arbitration; and when our Government applied to the Duke for a copy of the Appendix (that is, the evidences), he said they had only one copy, which was required for the deliberation of the Government; therefore there was no grounds for the Legislature here to interfere with the Award when it was under the consideration of the Imperial Government.

But the proprietors, having a majority in the House of Assembly, have passed the Award into an Act, and also a Bill to carry out one of its provisions; but as these Bills were opposed in every stage by six members representing the tenantry, I think they will not receive the Royal assent. But if the people were to forward to the Queen a petition against the Bills, there is no doubt that Her Majesty would disallow them, and the British Government, in order to avert future agitation and trouble, would then be more inclined than ever to settle the whole question of the land tenures.

The Commissioners were a year in taking evidence and preparing their Report, and the Government will require time to investigate such a mass of evidence to come to a fair decision—a decision which, I believe, will "atone for past errors of policy," and enable the tenantry to commence a new era from whence to date their emancipation and prosperity.

WM. COOPER.

Ch. Town, April 22, 1862.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR—The right granted to us by the Franchise Act to elect our representatives by universal suffrage is truly one of the greatest privileges we enjoy. A Parliament is indispensably necessary to the welfare of any country; and to render it productive of permanent good, the members thereof must necessarily be good, honest, patriotic, philantropic, well-informed and well educated, in order that they may ably, wisely and advantageously fulfil the important functions assigned them—perfecting the laws and constitution of their country, and otherwise directing and promoting its prosperity, and the welfare of its people. And to obtain a Parliament of this description, it is necessary that the body of the people should have the privilege of exercising their choice in the selection of its members; for we must naturally expect that the mass of the people will not elect men whose policy, character or intellect will be likely to militate against their greatest interests. It is true that many electors have, on various occasions, voted for men who proved themselves foes to their rights, liberties and national prosperity. But this dereliction of so important a duty was owing either to a want of knowledge of the real character of the candidates, or, if their real character was known, to their intrigues and the ignorance, prejudice, or selfishness of their constituents. It is the cause of deep regret, internal misery, and national insignificance and degradation, that among ourselves the great privilege of universal suffrage has been grossly abused through silly prejudice, party feeling, or sectarian rancour; but we may venture to express the hope that a sense of their duty, and a consciousness of the wrongs perpetrated against them heretofore, by which the people are now generally imbued, will unite all parties and sects in the common interest—will stimulate all to the formation of an upright and efficient Parliament, and will place all on the alert against the base intrigues and perfidious machinations of all designing and evil-intentioned candidates who may solicit public patronage at the approaching political crisis.

When we take into consideration the lamentable condition of our country—increased debt, landlord oppression, failure of the Land Commission, and what not; and when we reflect that the present state of things is the result of the maladministration of the party which now holds the reins of Government, we are inclined to attach double importance to the privileges emanating from the Franchise Act which will enable us to remedy the present sad state of things, by removing the present Administration and placing a better one in its stead—the two-fold object aimed at and looked for by nearly all classes and grades of the community, as the result of the coming election. And when we consider how important it is that every one should have a voice in the achievement of this grand object, we cannot but feel shocked and indignant when we become acquainted with the fact, that there is a certain class of respectable and useful members of the community debarred from the exercise of this great privilege, namely, the schoolmasters. What! schoolmasters not allowed to vote? who number nearly three hundred; having rights to maintain and interests to promote; having oppressed friends to sigh for, and wronged countrymen to sympathize with; having patriotism stamped on their hearts, and their very souls yearning in common with every right-thinking inhabitant of our Island home, for extinction of all contentions and prejudices, the amalgamation of sects and parties, universal harmony and good feeling, Parliamentary success and rural happiness, public welfare and national importance. Shocking! yet true. By the revisions made in the Acts relating to elections by the party now in power, it is required that every voter, not otherwise qualified, must be provided with a certificate of performance of Statute Labor or commutation thereof, from the Road Overseer of the Precinct in which he may reside, before he is entitled to a vote. Schoolmasters being exempt from Statute Labor, will not, of course, be able to produce such a certificate at the hustings, and will consequently be debarred from voting.

Now, whether the deprivation of the school masters of this important right was intentionally done by the Tory party to work out their own unworthy ends, or not, time will tell. If they will not remedy the defect in the Act, after receiving this notice of its existence through your columns, we may feel assured that they, in remodelling the Act, purposedly allowed a defect to remain therein, which shut out a large portion of the community from exercising the Franchise. Let us hope that this session will not terminate with that stigma resting upon them, but that they will immediately supply the defect, and thereby restore to the schoolmasters their important right of recording their votes in favor of those whom they may deem adapted to set the political machinery of the Colony in healthy and vigorous operation, to revive the liberty and happiness of the people, to make the country flourish and progress, and to

"—— plant laws within the State,
To shield alike the humble and the great."

I have the honor to be, Sir,
Your humble servant,
ZEPHYR.

Lot 4, April 15, 1862.

The Examiner.

Charlottetown, April 28th, 1862.

LATEST FROM EUROPE.

The R. M. Steamship *Canada* arrived at Halifax on Wednesday morning, 16th inst., in 10 days from Liverpool via Queenstown.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The public interest in the business of Parliament was centred in the Budget, which Mr. Gladstone developed, with his usual force and lucidty. The Chancellor of the Exchequer leaves things as they are, except the Hop Duty, which he proposes to repeal from and after the 15th September next (thus preserving the tax for this year), and in lieu thereof he proposes the re-imposition of the Beer Duty, but in modified form, the new tax being only 3d. per barrel; and a modification of brewers' licences. This will put home and foreign hops upon an equality, but it will involve a loss of £45,000 to the Revenue. He also proposes to put a licence tax of 12s. 6d. a year upon private persons who brew beer, if they occupy a house valued at upwards of £20 per annum, or pay a rent of £150 a year for a farm. He leaves it to Parliament to take their choice—the Hop Duty or the New Scheme: *aut Cæsar*, he says, *aut nullus*. He likewise proposes a new arrangement for calculating the wine (Customs) Duties. He estimates the Revenue for the year at £70,190,000, and the expenditure at £70,040,000 leaving in the Exchequer the rather short balance of £150,000, less, we presume, the estimated less of £45,000 by the extinciton of the Hop Duty. The new Wine Duties are to take effect at once; and on the Monday after the sailing of the steamer the chancellor was to propose the re-imposition of the Income Tax, at 9d. in the pound, for another year. There was considerable discussion and carping at details after Mr. Gladstone sat down, but his propositions will all be adopted.

The English papers have been occupied with the results of the action between the Merrimac and the Monitor: and very properly. The whole system of naval war is changed. The majestic fleet of Britain is rendered practically useless. Whether to adapt shields to existing ships, or to build new iron rams and tortoises, or to do both, is the only question. That the Emperor's discovery of defensive armour for ships will cost England many millions, is certain. A contemporary says:—"We have once more to run a race for our maritime power, that is in fact for our national greatness and independence. There remains two great questions—first, is it wise that we should continue at present the enormous expenditure on which we have just entered for fortifications for harbours and dockyards—for it seems as if floating forts alone are to be henceforth of real use; and next, can we so far improve our projectiles, as to overcome the strength of the new armour? Can we, as Sir G. Lewis anticipates, find anything powerful enough to crack their iron sides? Alas, it is clear enough that for many a day to come the chief energy and expenditure of civilized nations is to be devoted to improve machinery of destruction.

In the House of Commons *Mr. Osborne* moved that it is expedient to suspend the construction of the proposed forts at Spithead until the value of iron-roofed gun boats, for the defence of our ports and road-steads, shall have been fully considered. Sir *M. Peto* seconded the motion, and declared the proposed forts at Spithead one of the most gigantic follies that were ever perpetrated in any country or in any age. *Lord Palmerston* admitted that there was much plausibility in the recommendation to suspend for a time, until a more serious decision could be arrived at and fuller information gained, the construction of the forts at Spithead, for the purpose of applying to the building of iron-cased ships the amount that would otherwise be spent on those forts. The Secretary for War had instructed the defence commission to re-examine the question of the utility of permanent forts as compared with floating defences alone, or in combination with floating defences, and to make a report thereon. Sir *J. Pakington* complimented Lord Palmerston on having exercised a wise discretion [illegible] the motion.

ARRIVAL OF ANOTHER CONFEDERATE VESSEL IN THE MERSEY.—The brig Adelaide flying the Confederate flag, arrived in the Mersey on Wednesday, from Charleston, which port she left on the evening of the 3rd ult., having run the blockade without any hindrance from the blockading fleet. The Adelaide is 273 tons burden, and commanded by Capt. Swan. She has a full cargo of cotton and rosin on board. The Adelaid left Charleston in company with the barque Ettiwin, bound to Liverpool, the barque Mary Wright, and four schooners, all laden with cotton. The sunken stone fleet at Charleston is fast breaking up, the harbour being covered with broken timber. The cargo of the Adelaide comprises 6.9 bales of cotton, 18 of which are Sea Island, and 442 bales rosin.

CAPTURE OF A FEDERAL SHIP BY A CONFEDERATE PRIVATEER.—Captain Hadfield of the D. G. Fleming states that on the 4th inst., in lat 26 N., Lon 39 W., he saw a large American ship about five miles ahead, steering north-east. The American ship suddenly backed her main yard, when a rakish fore and aft schooner ran alongside, and the American ensign was hauled down. The ship then squared away to the north-west, after which the schooner stood for the D. G. Fleming, but on seeing the British ensign flying passed under her lee with the Confederate flag flying. Her name is the S. C. Evans.

It is understood that orders are in course of transmission to all the dockyards throughout the United Kingdom to suspend any further operations upon wooden ships.

FRANCE.

The Marquis De Lavalette's sudden return to Paris from his Roman Embassy, is the topic of discussion in diplomatic and political circles,—some affirming that the Ambassador has been recalled because he and General de Goyon disagreed about Roman and Italian affairs, while others contend that he has been summoned to the French capital in order to take counsel with and orders from the Emperor with reference to some new phase of the Italian anarchy.

The French squadron stationed in the Mediterranean will return on the 12th of April. Six vessels will be sent to Cherbourg to escort the Emperor on his visit to the London Exhibition.

PARIS, Saturday Afternoon.

The Moniteur of to-day announces that the sum to be paid by any person desiring exemption from military service is fixed for this year at 2500f. The bounty for re-enlistment for 7 years has been fixed at 2200f.

The late naval engagement in American waters has been the subject of discussion in the Imperial Cabinet Councils, and the opinions of naval men as to the prospects of the future of naval architecture canvassed with a view of ascertaining how far it would be wise to proceed, or otherwise, with the designs and plans of iron-cased vessels now in progress of building. The Paris journals generally express their satisfaction that France had the prudence of trying her experiments in plated vessels on a smaller model than has been selected in England; first, because the expense is infinitely less; and next, because the large-sized vessels are found to have answered badly. The 'Pays' says the Defence and the Warrior are comparative failures in England, principally from the fact that they do not answer the helm freely; whereas the French iron-cased vessels, the Gloire, the Normandie, the Invincible, and the Couronne, although large in size, move, it affirms, with facility. The same journal then inquires whether the English vessels just named can be considered *formidable machines of war*, and expresses a doubt on the point.

THE INTERVENTION IN MEXICO.

PARIS, April 1.—The 'Patrie' of this evening says:—"The rumour that General Douay had received orders to return to Toulon is unfounded. Gen. Douay is still embarking troops at Oran, to transport them to Vera Cruz. General Lorencez arrived at Vera Cruz on the 5th of March."

PARIS, April 2.—The 'Patrie' of this evening says:—"We have reason to believe that the French and Spanish Government intend signing a new treaty for regulating their joint action in Mexico."

The 'Moniteur' of yesterday published in its bulletin a distinct denial of the assertions made in the Spanish papers, that the French Government had requested the Cabinet of Madrid to recall General Prim. The French Government, says the 'Moniteur,' confined itself to expressing its disapproval of the convention concluded between Generals Prim and Doblado, and afterwards accepted by the plenipotentiaries of the allies, because this convention appeared to it to be contrary to the dignity of France. M. Saligny has in consequence been alone entrusted with the full political powers with which Admiral Jurien de la Graviere was invested. Admiral Jurien de la Graviere has received orders to reassume simply the command of the naval division. A telegram received yesterday from Madrid adds that a ru-