in the same shape in which it was passed by the other branch of the Legislature last session, containing no new provision or change in any material point; and, therefore, I hope it will not occupy much of the time of this House. The opinions of its necessity which I entertained then still actuate me. It does not propose to change the principles of the elective franchise; but to establish those principles by adopting a variety of safeguards to prevent fraud. Experience has shown that great impositions have been practised at elections. At present, as your Honors are aware, the elective franchise extends to all persons liable to perform statute labor, and ever since that Act came into operation great frauds have been practised by persons voting more than once; and great temptations have been held out to persons to commit perjury. The present law is rather uncertain as to the residence which would entitle persons to vote who claim the privilege on account of having performed statute labour, and that is proposed to be remedied in such a way as to give no cause to complain. I will not trouble the House at present with any further remarks; but if I hear any objections made to the Bill I will take the liberty of replying.

Hon. Col. SWABEY—His Honor the Leader of the Government has informed us that the Bill contains the same provisions as the one which was before us last session, and therefore he cannot expect me to support it. I cannot, however, in justice to myself give a silent vote, because it contains some provisions which I must oppose. In the first place I think this Bill will have a tendency to abridge constituencies very much; some will say that it cannot do so because there is the same qualification; but when you come to consider the details you will find that it does, and on that ground I will oppose the Bill. If it was calculated to correct any reasonable amount of abuse I would support it; but I am apprehensive that there will be more persons sworn than there were before; and I think it will be impossible for the polling to be got through in one day, because certificates will be disputed, and Overseers will be called in to prove them and it appears to me that the matter will be endless. I do not see that there is any great necessity for a certificate; I think it was quite safe enough as it was before. I was opposed to the Bill last year, because I thought it would diminish the constituencies, and I am of the same opinion still

Hon. the PRESIDENT—When this Bill was before this House last session the principle of it was fully admitted; therefore it cannot be reconsidered as it would be under other circumstances. But your Honors will remember that after the principle was admitted this House, by a majority of 8 to 3, decided that it should be published, and further discussion delayed till this session. I objected to some of the details of the Bill last year; the principal one was that it was going to disfranchise a certain people, which should not be done without their sanction; and as the Bill has been published, and there has not been a single petition against it, my objection is removed. If it were going to take away a privilege from them they should have petitioned against it; but as they have not done so we are bound to consider them satisfied.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY—Did they not petition against it last year?

Hon. the PRESIDENT—Yes, but not this year. I have still some objections to the details of the Bill; but they will be discussed when the House is in Committee. The principal objection is, that an elector is required to produce a certificate from the Road Overseer. Many of the Overseers can neither read nor write, being men of straw; and by one Overseer refusing 20 certificates the Government might be upset; therefore I think it is an improper authority to give to any Overseer.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON—I think the certificates would be the means of getting more work done on the roads.

Hon. Dr. JOHNSON—I cannot see any impropriety in the Bill; it does not limit those who are entitled to vote; it only requires them to certify that they are entitled. If a man has privileges he has duties to perform; and if he desires to vote, how I come with certificate in hand prepared to prove his vote. I approve of the Bill, because I think it will have a tendency to promote honesty.

Hon. Mr. GARDINER—If an Overseer cannot write how is he going to make his return? I think there cannot be a better provision than such a certificate, or a better way to satisfy the Returning Officer that a man is entitled to vote.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON—It is an acknowledged principle that no person shall vote who has not performed statute labour or paid commutation money; this Bill is on that principle, and I do not see any reason why it will not work well. There are two reasons why I will support that clause. As parties will have to perform their statute labour before they can get their certificates, I think more work will be performed on the roads: and as they will have to produce their certificates, there will be less chance for them to practise fraud. His Honor the President says that many of the Overseers cannot write; but the most intelligent men in the districts are generally chosen for Overseers, and I do not think that there is any necessity now to appoint men who cannot write; besides, the Bill provides that they shall be furnished with printed forms.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—I do not object to the certificates, but to the persons who are to grant them. If you would give the authority to the Road Commissioners it would not be so objectionable; but to give it to the Overseers is to me an absurdity.

Hon. Mr. HUTCHINSON—It is easy enough to produce a certificate in town; but in the country it may not be so easily done. The person who goes to vote should satisfy the Returning Officer that he has performed his statute labour or paid his tax. When the House is in Committee I intend to propose an amendment to that clause, as I think it is necessary, for if a person cannot get his certificate he should not be deprived of the privilege of voting. With regard to the disfranchisement of Princetown, if parties have not come forward and petitioned against the Bill it merely shows that they have neglected to do so, and that is no reason that they should be deprived of their privilege. I do not intend to offer any factious opposition to the Bill.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—I will say a word or two in reply to objections made by his Honor Col. Swabey to the principle of the Bill. He says that it will abridge the privileges of the electors. I grant that it will abridge what they have heretofore practised as *privileges*, but not their rights, that is, where they take the *privilege* of voting two or three times where they are only entitled to vote once; and this is the only way the Bill is intended to interfere with such privilege. I cannot see any other way in which it restricts their privilege. Every man who had a vote before may still vote, and it is intended that he should vote. His Honor says that every elector will have to produce a certificate; but that is not the case; none will be required to produce certificates but those who vote on a statute labor qualification, and of them none but suspicious characters; that being the case it is no abridgment and no person can complain. (Dr. Johnson—Hear.) In these respects I am happy to find that the objections to the principle of the Bill have dwindled down to a very trifling affair. I quite agree with his Honor that the Bill would be more unexceptionable if it contained a provision for the registration of votes; but perhaps there is a good reason that it does not. You could not have it on any principle differing materially from that in operation in Britain; there would have to be Registering or Revising Officers of character and education, and you cannot expect to get them in this Colony unless they are adequately paid, which would require a larger sum of money than we can at present afford. But his Honor will recollect that the statute labor certificate is one step towards registration.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—Yes, if there were proper officers to carry it out.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—No other officers will be required but the Overseers. It has been said that the Government may be affected by the partiality of the Overseers; but they are so bound down that they cannot use any influence or partiality which could affect the election. If a man performs his statute labour he can demand his certificate as a right, and the Overseer is liable to a fine if he refuses it. It has been said that many of them cannot write; but that need not prevent them from granting certificates; because they can count money and they can count the numbers on the roads. They will be supplied with printed certificates. I have seen many jurymen, and good jurymen too, who could not write. I am not apprehensive that there will be any difficulty in that respect.

The House then went into Committee on the said Bill. Hon. Mr. Forgan in the Chair.

On the second clause being read—

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY rose and said—His Honor the President and his Honor Col. Swabey are of opinion that, since the inhabitants of Princetown Royalty have not petitioned against this Bill that they are willing to be disfranchised; but I can assure your Honors that such is not the case. It has been said in the other end of the building that Princetown is only a paper town; but I would ask your Honors if you consider Princetown Royalty a paper Royalty? It contains 450 or 500 eight acre lots, all in a high state of cultivation. It contains more houses, more inhabitants and more independence than Summerside. If you take real and personal estate into account, and put them in one scale and Summerside in the other, you will find that it will weigh down Summerside with another town like it. And when we look at the burden which the inhabitants of Princetown Royalty have sustained, by paying £12 10s. for each lot, together with an annual tax of (taking the town lots into account) about £1 per hundred acres, while the township lands only pay 6s. 8d., it appears to me to be such an unjust measure to deprive them of the privilege of sending a representative to the House of Assembly that I cannot support it. I do not deny the right of the inhabitants of Summerside to representation; but I do deny their right to have it at the expense of Princetown.

Hon. Mr PALMER—I am sorry that this clause does not meet the approbation of his Honor. There is no doubt that any community, however small, having a privilege would make a struggle to retain it, and of course the smaller the community the greater the privilege. I can pretty well understand that his Honor, being from the neighbourhood of Princetown Royalty, and his interests being bound up with those of his friends there, that it is quite natural for him to take exception to that part of the Bill. But notwithstanding all that has been said, I do not think there is anything in his Honor's arguments to cause us to forego the provisions of the Bill which is now brought to us. I will not travel over all the arguments which might be adduced, but will merely say that no man wholly uninterested could resist the conclusion that Lot 17 is more likely to be, and more worthy of being made the capital of the County than Princetown. It may be very true that Princetown contains more inhabitants; but is it likely to continue to do so? Summerside was unknown till a few years ago, and it is not its mere number of inhabitants that gives it a stimulus; but its natural position, being so adjacent to the terminus of the great railway at Shediac, which makes it a place of business and it will keep it so. The line now established between St. John and Shediac will likely be held in perpetuity, and as long as it is, Summerside will increase in importance. It will be the chief town of the County, whether Princetown exists or not; and it is an acknowledged principle that the convenience of the few should give way to that of the many. It has been said that Princetown has paid a higher rate of taxation; but if they have they have had a privilege which was a compensation for that as long as they held it; and as it is nothing more than an agricultural district, I have no doubt that if the inhabitants apply to the Legislature they will get their taxes reduced; for their claim would be unanswerable, and if that was done their mouths would be stopped. I will support the measure unless I see some stronger objections to it than I do at present.

Hon. M. RAMSAY—If the Government had passed this Bill when they removed the Court House and Jail, Princetown would not have so much to complain of; but if it is passed now, after they have paid such a high price for their land, I think they will have just cause to complain.

Hon. Dr. JOHNSON—If Princetown is destined to go ahead this Bill will not hinder it; it does not propose to disfranchise the place, but merely to change the representation. Members are sent to Parliament to represent people, not places, and there are no people in Princetown to represent, and if the people in the Royalty have paid a higher rate of taxation they have had corresponding privileges.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON—The census shows that from 1848 to 1855 the population of Princetown decreased 42 and as the land is all under cultivation, and it is likely that it will be thrown into larger farms, it will decrease still more. Many places are far in advance of Princetown, and are therefore better entitled to town representation. When the census was taken in 1855, Lot 17 contained 160 inhabitants more than Princetown and Royalty, and Summerside has grown up since then.

Hon. Col. SWABEY—I would be very sorry to disfranchise any district, and if this Bill had been intended to give a representation to Summerside without taking it from Princetown I would be better satisfied; but I would like to know why the people of Princetown have not petitioned against it; I do not think they are extremely anxious to retain their privilege or they would have done so.

Hon. Mr. HUTCHINSON—I decidedly disapprove of Princetown being disfranchised; if that place was allowed to retain one member the Bill would not be so objectionable: but to deprive them of both and give them to Summerside, is quite unfair.

The question of concurrence was then put on the clause, and it passed in the affirmative.

House resumed.

Message from the House of Assembly by Mr. Howatt, with a Bill to alter and amend the Act to incorporate the Crapaud Dredging Machine Company.

Adjourned for one hour.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

FRIDAY AFTERNOON, March 15.

ROAD SERVICE.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND, by command of His Excellency, presented to the House the Estimates of the expenditure of the Government for the current year. The House then resolved itself into a Committee of Supply—Mr. McNeill in the Chair. After making a few remarks, Mr. Haviland moved the following resolution:

Resolved, That the sum of £6,000 be granted for the service of roads, bridges and wharfs, for the present year, including all special grants, and that the same be appropriated to each County in the following order:—

Queen's County, including Charlottetown and Royalty,	£1300	0	0
Prince County,	1100	0	0
King's County,	1100	0	0
Special grants for Queen's County,	800	0	0
Do. Prince County,	650	0	0
Do. King's County,	650	0	0
Roads opened under the Compensation Act,	100	0	0
Contingent expenses of roads, bridges and wharfs, to be equally divided between the three Counties,	300	0	0

Hon. Mr. COLES said he thought the amount was not sufficient; that there was scarcely a sum sufficient voted to fill up ruts in the roads. He then referred to the number of petitions before the House, which prayed for grants for bridges, some of which were falling down, and remarked that if they were allowed to go down, it would take the revenue of one year to put them up again; and he considered it would be better to dispense with some other expenditures that a large amount might be appropriated to the service of roads, bridges and wharfs. The sum proposed, when divided among thirty or forty districts, would give but a small portion to each, and if no more could be obtained he would prefer expending the whole amount on bridges and wharfs, as these large public works should not be allowed to go down. Mr. Coles then asked what had been done in reference to the Main Post roads which last year were to have been let by contract.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH said he agreed with the hon. member who had just sat down, when he spoke of the propriety of keeping up the public works of the Colony; but they should be just before they were generous. Before putting their hands in the public purse they should ascertain how much money they had at their disposal. The sum voted last year for the services just mentioned was £5000, and the roads and bridges were kept in as good a state of repair as during former years when thousands of pounds more were granted for these purposes than the sum proposed this year. In reference to the Main Post roads, Mr. Longworth then stated that tenders were advertised for, but that the Lieut. Governor and Council were expressly directed not to enter into any contracts unless they considered it expedient to do so; and that tenders were received, but that they were so extravagant that the Governor and Council could not think of allowing the Statute to go into operation. No Government having the well-being of the country at heart would have acted otherwise. As regarded the state of the roads throughout the Island last year, he heard no complaints, so there was good ground to presume, or fairly to assume, that they were kept in good repair. Considering the large amount which was granted for Education—and the Educational grant was increasing—he thought a much larger sum could not be appropriated to roads and bridges. For various purposes large sums were necessarily drawn from the Treasury during the present year, The purchase of Proprietors' Estates and the visit of the Prince were two of these which might be noticed.

Hon. Mr. THORNTON next addressed the Committee and complained of the amount placed at the disposal of the Legislature for the service of roads, bridges and wharfs, being too small. He then referred to two or three very important bridges in his District, one of which require £150; and they had commenced a very important work which it would be impossible to complete with the small sum which would be apportioned to the District. He thought it would be far better to curtail expenses in other respects—such, for example, as giving £800 for Government House—than to allow important public works to go down by giving such a small sum to keep them in repair, and which was quite inadequate to what was required.

Mr. CONROY spoke to the same effect, and alluded to the bridge at Cascumpec, saying he would prefer having that bridge finished before having a Steamer calling at Cascumpec, much as he desired the latter. It would be of no special interest to himself, but the bridge was absolutely necessary for a large District. £1200 or £1300 had been already expended upon it, and for want of £200 more it was lying useless from year to year.

Hon. Mr. HENSLEY next spoke against the inadequacy of the amount, and in answer to what fell from the hon. member from Queen's County about complaints being made in reference to the state of the roads, would say that he (Mr. Hensley) himself complained in writing about the matter; for tho' he had only travelled two or three times on the public roads duridg the summer, he met with a mishap on each occasion on account of bad bridges. One occasion was going to Georgetown; when crossing a bridge it gave away, and had it gone down all the Lawyers in Charlottetown he believed would have been killed—not excepting the hon. member from Queen's County, (Mr. Longworth,) which would have been a great loss to the Island. (Laughter.) On another occasion, and shortly afterwards, when going to St. Eleanor's in company with Mr. Thompson, while they and other important persons belonging to the Commission were crossing a bridge, the horses fell through it, and three miles farther on they were compelled to take the horses out and to pull the waggons over by hand. Thus the Commission were nearly annihilated thro' bad bridges. On another occasion the Chairman of the Commission took a short drive out into the country, and crossing a bridge it broke, he was thrown out and his legs nearly broken in consequence. These examples showed that the grant last year was not sufficiently large. He was aware, however, that the finances of the country for the present year would not admit of a large sum being appropriated for the service of roads and bridges.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND said it appeared that from the smallness of the grant last year for the service of roads and bridges the Lawyers in going to Georgetown were nearly all killed, and had such a catastrophe occurred he supposed the country would not have shed many tears if the hon. member from the East Point should have escaped. £6 000 was perhaps an amount too small to grant for this service, but it was necessary for them to adopt the tailor's rule, to cut the garment according to the cloth. According to the Estimates brought down by the Government, no less than £43,000 were required to meet the necessary demands of the current year, and he would defy any hon. member to make a lower estimate. A few pounds might be shaved off a few items, but it would be very trifling. Last year the revenue was about £43,000, and before the present session of the Legislature closed probably they would dispose of the larger part of £50,000. He thought the House could not vote a large sum. If hon. members on both sides would come forward boldly and say it was necessary to increase the taxes, and would support the Government in raising them, then he would have one reason to give way and to go for increasing the vote.

Hon. Mr. THORNTON.—No!

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—The hon. member says No!—he is willing to run us down hill full gallop, but when it comes to tugging up hill he prefers slipping his traces and strolling off to fatten in better pastures elsewhere. He rises in his place and would make the country believe if he had the helm of affairs the ship of state would soon be put before a favoring breeze;—he would grant all that was necessary for roads, bridges, wharfs and everything else besides. More than one-third of the revenue of the Colony was devoted to Education, for which amount for such a purpose there was not a parallel in the civilized world; and he (Mr. Haviland) was in favor of fostering education for an educated people were more easily governed and knew how to cherish their rights, and hon. members should consider the liabilities and resources of the Colony.

Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN was in favor of placing an additional tax on land, both wilderness and clear. He would go to the extent of 10s. per hundred acres for all lands, and in his opinion that was the only tax of which the people would not complain. Mr. Wightman then spoke of the public works in his District which needed money, and said he thought no less than £7,000 would keep up necessary communications for another year.

Hon. Mr. YEO said he thought £6,000 was a sum quite as large as the country could afford. Petitions were laid before the House from the hon. member's part of the country praying to be relieved from paying rent.

Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN—The people would cheerfully pay taxes, but are unwilling to pay rent.

Hon. Mr. YEO—Where are the taxes coming from if rent is not paid? That was very unreasonable. If the sum proposed for the road service was too small, the deficiency would have to be made up by statute labor. Anything put on to raise the revenue, such as an advalorem duty, was spoken against; and indeed it would be not much to propose to do so in King's County, where it appeared there was so much smuggling. (Laughter.) But, judging from the Custom House returns, it was just as bad in Prince County. Speaking with justice or reason, the sum voted was as large as could be afforded, unless hon. members wished to see the country run headlong in debt. He thought the roads were as good last year as they were two or three years before.

Hon. Mr. THORNTON—No! no!

Hon. Mr. YEO—Yes. Yes! yes! from the North Cape to the East Point.

Mr. OWEN said he would have been glad to have had £12,000 voted for the road service, but where it was to come from he could not see. The sum proposed must suffice for the present year. In the District which he had the honor to represent much would be required, as they had a large bridge to finish. Last year they had only their proportion out of £1700, and out of the monies apportioned to three roads districts, they saved £126 for the new bridges. The amount this year would be sufficient to enable them to give £100 to each of their districts, after which they would have £650 left for special grants for the County. He thought £6.000 was sufficient for the present year, and that the roads were not in a worse condition than they were in last year.

Hon. Mr. THORNTON said he had no objection to offer to the division of the money, but objected to the amount. He then referred to the advalorem duty put on some articles last year, and to the decrease made in the pay of Schoolmasters, and said that only for the hon. member from Tryon (Mr. Howat), who proposed £45, their salaries would have been cut down £1000, and the money taken to defray the expenses of the Government. He was opposed to taxation, and the only tax to which he would consent would be an additional one on wilderness land.

Hon. Mr. COLES addressed the Committee again at some length, and referred to the effects produced by increasing the duty on Spirituous Liquors, to the Educational scheme, and to the financial state of the Colony.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND spoke again, and referred to the hon. member for Saint Andrew's Point (Mr. Wightman), who was always very anxious for large votes; but who liked to absent himself from Committee of Ways and Means. Mr. Haviland then replied to the remarks just made by Mr. Coles

Mr. CONROY addressed the Committee. Referring to some items in the Estimates, he mentioned the sum expended in making preparations for the reception of the Prince of Wales, and said he considered it was most lavish, considering the resources of the Colony. He thought, too, that the sum spent on Government House was nearly sufficient to have built a new one. In his opinion the mention of increasing taxation would be most unpopular in the country.

Hon. Col. GRAY said that it was not the proper time just then to take up the items in the Estimates seriatim, and make remarks upon them. He understood the question before the Committee was the amount proposed for Roads and Bridges, and not the amount of the expenditure occasioned by the visit of the Prince of Wales.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND said he did not imagine when he moved the resolution in relation to Roads and Bridges, that hon. members were going to enter upon matters connected with the visit of the Prince of Wales. He, however, was under the impression that whatever was spent in that way, there was loyalty enough in hon. members to induce them to concur, and that none would say the expenditure was "most lavish," unless it could be shown there had been something grossly wrong in the manner in which the money was expended. It was humiliating to think that British subjects would complain, and that any one should endeavor to make political stock out of the circumstance of a few pounds, shillings and pence being spent in making suitable preparations for the reception of the Heir apparent to the British Throne. He believed the majority of the well-thinking people—of the bone and sinew of this country—would be well satisfied, and that they would not say too much money was expended for that object. The manner in which he was received was an honor to this small Island and they had reason to be proud of it. Though nearly £3000 were spent, and though it was a sum larger in proportion to the revenue than the £5000 expended by New Brunswick; still common sense, or common reason would say that they should not have invited His Royal Highness, if they did not purpose to give him a suitable reception. Surely no person expected that the Prince would have been regaled with a potato and herring. Yet because they endeavored to entertain him in a manner which accorded with the dignity of the personage, the expenditure is called "most lavish." On his account £1,300, or £1.400 New Brunswick currency were expended on Government House in Fredericton, N. B., and £1,300 on a house in St. John, that the Prince might sleep in it one night, and £400 to bring the Volunteers to the City, that they might do him honor. It was quite impossible that a smaller sum could have been expended in this Colony. A pity it was that some hon. members did not go outside the Bar last year, when a sum was voted for the reception of the Prince of Wales.

Adjourned till 10 o'clock to-morrow,

J. D. GORDON, Reporter.

The number of deaths from diptheria, in the United States during the past year, is said to be no less than 10,000

All who suffer from coughs, colds, bronchitis, croup, whooping cough, and most to be dreaded of all, Consumption, can find sure relief in *Dr. Wistar's Balsam of Wild Cherry*, which always cures where other remedies fail.

Correspondence.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—In your number of the 22d ultimo I notice a communication purporting to be from Mr. D. Fraser, of Belfast Cross Roads. In this communication Mr. Fraser admits that he is the person alluded to by "Loyalist," in his letter of the 25th March last, and published in the *Examiner* of the 8th April, as having received instructions from the Government to procure 100 men of "the right sort" from Belfast to settle on Lot 54, for the purpose of securing the return of Mr. Owen at the next general election. Mr. Fraser's grounds for making this admission are, that as he is the only Commissioner of a Small Debt Court in Belfast who received the office of J. P. from the present Government, he must, as a matter of consequence, be the individual alluded to by "Loyalist." But I confess I was not aware of the fact that Mr. Fraser is the only Commissioner of a Small Debt Court in Belfast who received the office of J. P. from the present Government, until enlightened on the subject by himself. I did think that *one other* Commissioner of a Small Debt Court in Belfast, at least, had received the office of J. P. from the present Government. However, I am not going to quarrel with Mr. Fraser upon this point. "As the cap fits him so well, he may wear it"—with this additional feather, that Mr. Fraser is Clerk of a Small Debt Court in Belfast as well as Commissioner. With this cap, thus decorated, and so admirably suited to his "manly brow," Mr. Fraser will make quite a respectable appearance at the head of the Belfast Orangemen on the 12th July next, when they will walk in procession to celebrate the anniversary of the Battle of the Boyne, and to "worship the memory of the ph'egmatic Dutchman." Mr. Fraser accuses "Loyalist" of making use of "equivocating insinuations to make it appear evident that he was the person whom he meant." This is rather strange logic of Mr. Fraser's. I never knew equivocation to be employed in making things to appear evident: I was always taught to believe that "equivocating insinuations" were only employed to conceal facts, and not to make them appear more evident. I think that as a reward for this strange discovery in logic, Mr Fraser ought to receive the appointment of Professor of Logic in the Prince of Wales College; and this would be adding another feather to his cap.

But the great and unpardonable sin which, in Mr. Fraser's opinion, Loyalist has committed against *his* person and dignity is, that he attempted to expose the nefarious intriguing schemes of the Government, and *his* (Mr. Fraser's) readiness to become their tool for putting their wicked designs in practice, without putting his real signature to his communication. Now, I hold it to be not only the privilege but also the duty of every good subject and lover of even-handed justice, on receiving information that the powers that be are conplotting against the interests and privileges of a certain class of Her Majesty's subjects, with a view of prolonging their own tyrannical sway over the whole population, immediately to bring the matter to light, in order that the parties intended to be injured may be on their guard against such wicked designs of the Government. Such information was received by "Loyalist" from a very respectable authority, and he had good reason for believing it. That the proscriptive persecuting policy of the present Government since the commencement of their administrative career in this Colony was quite sufficient to justify the belief, is a fact which cannot be disputed; and knowing that Mr. Fraser had, in a special manner, pledged his "voice and his heart" to uphold and carry out that policy, I felt that "Loyalist" would be very remiss in his duty to a portion of his fellow Colonists if he did not bring the matter before the public, without any loss of time. But Mr. Fraser complains that "Loyalist" did not affix his proper signature to his communication. If he wishes to know the reason why he did not do so, I will tell him. It was simply because he did not wish that any of his friends or himself should become the victims of Orange cruelty. I know that in all countries where Orangeism has succeeded in raising its diabolical form, or establishing its hellish influence, its practice has invariably been to hunt down and single out for vengeance and persecution any person who might incur the displeasure of that *confraternity*. Even in this Island instances of Orange revenge of recent occurrence I might here mention, but I forbear doing so.

Mr. Fraser denies ever having received any instructions from the Government in connection with the settlement of Lot 54. Nothing on earth could be more likely than that Mr. Fraser would pursue this course of proceedure in reference to this matter. We all know well that Government officials of every grade, under the present administration, frequently have to go through the operation of "eating the leek;" and why should Mr. Fraser be exempt from the process any more than his superiors in office? Had he not in doing this before him the illustrious example of the Colonial Secretary, who, it is said, was completely put through the delectable operation of "eating the leek," last winter, for having in two numbers of the *Islander* advocated a *certain scheme* as the only measure that would relieve the tenantry and secure the future peace and contentment of the people of this Island? and is it not a notorious fact that "lying," "denying," "equivocating" and "deceiving," "bungling and shuffling" are the true characteristics of the present Government and their long list of retainers? Yes, if they can lay any claim at all to any sort of consistency, it is for being addicted to the peculiarities just alluded to. I must, therefore, appear quite "evident" that Mr. Fraser did receive from the Government such a letter as that mentioned by "Loyalist" in his communication, with strict injunctions to secrecy; but that out of a vain desire of being looked upon as one largely enjoying the confidence of the Government, he exhibited the letter to a number of his friends, as a proof of the high esteem in which he is held by the Government: thus betraying the confidence reposed in him. The Government finding that their intriguing schemes had been discovered through the vanity of their *leaky* confidential agent at Belfast Cross Roads, they absolutely told Mr. Fraser that there was no alternative for him but to "swallow the leek," as the editor of the *Islander* had done, or be prepared to incur their displeasure both now and for the time to come. Mr. Fraser believing in the doctrine that it is fitter that one individual should lose his character than that a whole Government should suffer, he immediately yielded implicit obedience to the behest of his tyrannical masters, and brought forth that letter published over his signature in the *Examiner* of the 22d ult. And as a further proof that such was the case, Mr. Fraser states in his letter that he would "not have noticed any anonymous letter regarding himself personally, but for the purpose of exonerating others." Thus admitting explicitly that he wrote that letter solely for the purpose of exonerating the Government.

Mr. Fraser also denies that he is master of an Orange Lodge; but for denying this he offers the best reason in the world, when he says that "many who entertain a different religious belief are among his best and most upright customers." I presume that Mr. Fraser here means Roman Catholics; and as Mr. Fraser is extensively engaged in commercial business at Belfast Cross Roads, it would not be very conducive to his best interests if these "most upright" customers were to withdraw their patronage from his establishment, which they would be quite likely to do if they were sure that he was master of an Orange Lodge, as they must then consider him in no other character than that of a sworn enemy. This would be of itself a sufficient reason for Mr. Fraser to deny his connection with Orangeism. Mr. F. may deny as much as he pleases his connection with Orangeism, but can he deny that a meeting of Orangemen was held at his residence not long ago, when deputations from the various Lodges attended—indicating that some business of importance had to be transacted; whatever the nature of that business was is best known to those who attended the Lodge on that occasion. But one thing was very remarkable—the night turned out very disagreeable: such a night as that which Burns describes in "Tam O'Shanter."

"That night a cheil might understand
The de'il had business in his hand."

Mr. Fraser, in bringing his letter to a close, indicates his intention not to reply to any thing that may be written in reference to him. That, in my opinion, would be the wisest policy for him to pursue: for by strictly adhering to that line of conduct he may avoid further exposure from

Yours, &c.

Belfast, May 4, 1861. TRUTH-TELLER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—That very great man in *his own* estimation—the great Belfast copyist—has thought it worth his while for once to write a letter for the press in answer to a communication signed "Loyalist" in your paper a short time since. I would ask him what occasion for "Loyalist" to give his proper name, when he admits the principal charge that "Loyalist" preferred against him, viz., that he was offering land on Lo. 54 to the "right sort of people" of Belfast, at five shillings per acre for the best part of the land. In that "Loyalist" made a small error, as in the letter which he, Daniel Fraser, read in his own shop, purporting to be from the Government, it stated that they would get the best land at four shillings per acre; and, perhaps, it is that slight error which makes him say that "Loyalist" accused him "falsely" and "deceptively," as in his letter in a late *Examiner*, he says: "Whatever I have said about Lot 54 I have done so without any *Government* authority for doing so." Certainly he could make free, it seems, with the Government lands on Lot 54, when he dared to make so bold as to offer it at such a sacrifice, "without authority so to do." But, perhaps, he has been ordered to make the offer by some member of the Government, but not officially—the same as Col. Gray did before the Royal Commissioners, when he appeared before them "as a private individual and not as a member of the Government." It seems it must be in that way that "Dan Fraser," of Belfast Cross Roads, got his authority as a Deputy Land Commissioner. Liars should have good memories and make all their fabrications agree. When Mr. F. denied anything at all concerning the transactions, he should have carried the falsehood through the whole of his letter, and not make such a damaging admission as the quotation given above from his own letter, for the letter alluded to above he did read to numbers of people—let it be his own production or not. But he surely could not be so vain and foolish as to write to himself, and then read it to people for the purpose of shewing them the esteem in which he is held at head quarters. His admission seems to imply that much, but the thing looks too foolish for any same man to do. I for one can scarcely believe it, for I think Mr. Fraser has surely more common sense than that. As to his statement, that "he is not a master of an Orange Lodge," it does not amount to much when he does not make a clean breast of it and deny that he is an Orangeman altogether, as he might be excused for the Orangemen holding their Lodge in his building. But, however, it is a great pleasure to see by his letter, that he is ashamed to acknowledge being an Orangeman; and it is to be hoped that a great many more will follow his example, and show their shame of being connected with such an extraordinary disloyal association, it being the only association in America that was capable of insulting the eldest son of our beloved Queen and the heir apparent to the British throne, in all his travels through both the United States and the British possessions. If Mr. Fraser thinks proper to answer this, he shall hear again from

Your's, &c.,

LOYALIST.

Belfast, May 8, 1861.

P. S.—Just as I was going to enclose this, a person came in who told me that D. Fraser had sent away the paper in which his letter against me was published, to his Clerical friend in Nova Scotia, to enable him to "graduate" on his Mr. F's., "epistolary correspondence." Might I ask him also to forward this to the same address at his earliest convenience, as it might perhaps help to enlighten that graduating luminary. L.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—In case you should feel yourself in the least compromised by a charge of untruth in yesterday's *Islander*, in reference to a letter you published for me in the *Examiner* of Monday last, I beg leave to say, that Mr. Ings positively refused to print the letter, as it appeared in your paper; though he qualified his refusal by adding, that if a certain passage—containing a very short extract from a speech once delivered in the Assembly—were altered and somewhat modified, he would then comply with my request. I had no wish to press Mr. Ings to do what was evidently disagreeable to him, nor did I feel disposed to alter one word of the letter in compliance with his suggestion; but had he *not* refused to print it, I should certainly not have sent it to you, as I wished it to appear in the *Islander*, because I take that paper to be the organ of the present Government—former expressions therein contained to the contrary notwithstanding.

I think the refusal to publish is plainly admitted in the editorial notice, brief though it is; and from its stupidity it is apparent that the writer of it could never have soared, even to the "Cock-Sparrow element," as it betrays an *inconsistency* that must be obvious to any one more clear-sighted than an Owl!

Requesting to apologize for this further trouble,

I remain, Sir,

Your obedient serv't.,

CHARLES WRIGHT.

May 18, 1861.

Latest Intelligence from Europe.

The Royal Mail Steamship *Europa* arrived at Halifax on Tuesday last. Latest English dates furnished are to the 4th inst. The principal features of the news will be found in the following summary.

It may now be taken for granted that there will be no fighting this year between Austria and Italy; Cavour is too much master of the situation to be dragged into the war without his consent, and he has pledged himself not to commence hostilities with the Austrians in Venetia. We may therefore hope that something may turn up which will lead to a peaceable solution of that difficulty. It is clear, however, that this state of things renders the chances of a collision between the French and Austrians less probable, and makes Poland and Holstein the best nursery grounds for Napoleon's crop of difficulties ready to break out in war, which is as necessary for his maintenance as bread and meat are for ordinary men.

The Russians have completely changed their first tactics with regard to the Poles; all the concessions are explained away, and rendered ridiculous, and the repressive measures of to-day are much the same as those of 1831. The concessions of 1861 were by no means an advance on those of 1832, though, as those of 1832 were never realized, a little honesty intended would have been better than great promises never intended to be kept. But the "loyalty" and "sincerity" of the Russians in 1861 are no greater than they were in 1832.

In the meantime the Prefects of the French departments are reporting to the Minister of the Interior that the Warsaw massacres are exciting the deepest pity and indignation throughout France. The Emperor's policy would doubtless prefer an understanding with Russia, and the official journal has repudiated any idea of giving material aid to the Poles. But the first move of the Emperor was to give France an impetus against Russia, and when once such a gigantic machine is set in motion it will roll rather by the laws of gravitation than in obedience to any fresh impulse which the action of one man can impress upon it. The Crimean war must have opened certain channels of sympathy and antipathy, whose currents tend to reproduce the state of things which originally produced them. The internal condition of France, the stagnation of trade, the discontent of politicians, the scandals of the Court, the indignation of Catholics, and the fermentation of the immense army, are gradually rendering another war necessary for the stability of the Imperial system. If the Emperor marched into Italy again, he must alienate for ever either the Catholic or the revolutionary party; in attacking the Russians in Poland he carries with him the sympathies of both, prepares the way for a misunderstanding with Prussia, which will eventually give him the Rhine. This is one among the dark shadows which loom over the horizon, behind which 1862 and its events lie hid.

The Archbishop of Tours has published a letter to M. Delangle, the Emperor's Minister of Justice. The Bishop of Poitiers himself has not spoken more decidedly. He says if the temporal power of the Pope should be entirely abolished, the conscience of Catholics all over the world will hold the Emperor of the French responsible. With regard to the present state of uncertainty, "clear and unambiguous declarations must put an end to the anxieties which, for the last two years, have been torturing the minds of the Catholics." As to the Minister's late circular, he says—"Your threats have no terrors for the clergy. We will not allow ourselves to be influenced by any human consideration. Believe me, M. le Ministre, the Government had better think twice before it engages in a conflict with men whose sole motive is a conscientsous determination to do their duty."

ITALY.

A despatch from Rome, dated the 23rd, states that the garrison is being relieved by other French troops. The Pope, in receiving the French General Dumonte, eulogised General Goyon. Numbers of peasants from the Marches and Umbria are taking refuge in the Pontifical territory, in order to evade the levy for the Italian army.

PARIS, April 27.—Naples despatches of the 24th inst. assert that several provinces are in a state of insurrect on. Martial law has been proclaimed in the Abruzzi, Capitanata, and Basilicata. The disturbances in the latter province are said to be most serious. Numerous executions have taken place at Venosa. The inhabitants of the village of Rasside having offered resistance, the soldiers set fire to their houses. Mountaineers have joined the band of insurgents. In engagements at Monte Verdo, the soldiers of the Italian army were repulsed. Fears were entertained by the government that band of insurgents might attack the regiments stationed along the chain of the Apennines. Disturbances had been provoked by Garibaldians in Calabria at Cosenza. Reinforcements had been demanded from Turin.

NAPLES, April 28.—2 26 p. m.—A demonstration made by some undisciplined National Guards was terminated by the majority of the guards presenting an address to the Prince of Carignan, in which they disavow the disturbers of order. The National Guard is also about to offer a grand banquet to the regular army. Order has been completely restored. Signor Spaventa will remain in office. Naples is tranquil. The Bourbonians are completely discouraged. The Prince of Carignan's proclamation produced a most excellent effect. 6 p. m.—Perfect tranquility prevails in the city. Yesterday, at 4 p. m., the drums of the National Guard beat a general alarm, and numerous patrols traversed the streets. Numerous arrests have been made among criminals who had escaped from prison and assumed the uniform of the National Guard. The events of yesterday were the result of a Bourbon conspiracy.

News from the provinces announces that a reactionary movement had been made by some Bourbon soldiers and brigands,