

Hatters' business. For his (Mr. Clark's) part he was opposed to the prayer of the petition in toto.

Mr. LAIRD thought the best way to compete with imported manufactures was for the domestic manufacturer to undersell them. Let Mr. Hobbs adopt this principle, and he had no doubt he would succeed; but as to imposing heavier duties he, for one, was not willing to go for such a measure. In fact, he was altogether opposed to the prayer of the petition.

Hon. Mr. PALMER (who, on presenting the petition, moved that it be referred to the House on ways and means), said, that his reason for making such a motion was simply to ascertain the opinion of the House on the subject. There were various opinions as to taking imported articles with a view of protecting the domestic manufacturer; but if the petitioner had any claim on the House, it could be duly considered at the proper time.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY said, if the referring of the petition to supply did not pledge the House to any particular line of action upon it, he was not opposed to its being so referred; but as to the petition itself, he was not disposed to vote for a grant, or otherwise to alter the present rates of the Revenue Bill, as prayed for.

Mr. COOPER said, it had been the custom to encourage beginners, but they were those who manufactured on a large scale, and had extensive establishments. The present petitioners had no such establishment, but unreasonably asked the House to start him in business. This would not do. If the petitioner could not make a living at his trade without the House granting him money—a request that many others had as much right to make as he had—why did he not take a farm?

Mr. LAIRD said the petition had better be withdrawn, and he would make a motion to that effect.

Hon. Col. SECRETARY thought it might be as well to refer the matter to the House in committee of the whole on ways and means, because he felt inclined to encourage anything that would lead to extend and develop the manufactures of the Colony.

If Mr. Hobbs could manufacture hats cheaper than the imported article he ought to be encouraged; but it was well known that in a new country the manufacturer has but a poor chance of making a fortune—and among the rest a hater had not the best opportunity of support and patronage. Why, he knew of an individual now in Charlottetown, who carried on that business some years ago, but was nearly starved for want of support. The only consideration that might operate favorably to the petitioner would be to increase the duty on hats imported; but it seemed that the House would not be willing to make such an increase. He thought, also, that the principle of encouraging one tradesman any more than another by augmenting the duty on the particular articles imported which were manufactured by such tradesman, was unsound, and he would not be willing to adopt such a precedent.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH agreed with the last remark of the Hon. Col. Secretary, and in this particular case he thought there was no trade so well protected by duty as the latter, for the freight and duty on hats amounted to about one third the value of the article. He was therefore against the grant.

Hon. Mr. MOONEY was decidedly against the prayer of the petition; for if manufacturers were so protected by the increase of duty, and favored by the Legislature by grants of money to set them up in business, it would throw competition overboard at once. He thought the business of a hatter, if properly prosecuted, would pay as well as any other branch of manufactures.

Hon. Mr. PALMER again urged that the matter be referred to supply, where it could be properly discussed. He was not over sanguine as to the benefits that would arise from it, but all it was only fair to give it a just consideration. He admitted at the same time that, if a grant were given to Mr. Hobbs, all other tradesmen had as strong claims on the consideration of the House as the petitioner.

Mr. McINTOSH was opposed to the prayer of the petition, which, if it was for the establishment of anything new and of public benefit would be something; but a common hatter, he thought he asked too much of the House when he expected it to set him up in business.

The question was then put on Mr. Laird's amendment to reject the petition, which was carried.

Hon. Col. Treasurer moved that the House do resolve itself into a committee of the whole to consider of ways and means, to-morrow, as a great many petitions had been received, which would require attention.

Mr. Laird presented a petition of inhabitants of New Glasgow and adjacent Settlements, praying the removal of the Commissioners Court, for the recovery of Small Debts for the District, to New Glasgow Bridge. After a short discussion the petition was rejected, the remedy being elsewhere. Adjourned for one hour.

T. KIRWAN, Reporter.

WEDNESDAY, March 24th, 1858.

PETITION OF DANIEL SCOTT, CONTRACTOR FOR THE BUILDING OF SOUTHPORT WHARF.

Mr. McGill, from the Committee to whom was referred the petition of Daniel Scott, to examine the same and report thereon, presented to the House the report of the said committee, which was as follows:—

Your Committee to whom was referred the Petition of Daniel Scott, Contractor for the building of Southport Wharf, have to report:—

That on the 19th February, 1856, the Petitioner entered into a Contract, with the Government, to build the Southport Wharf, to be completed before the fifteenth July, a penal condition of the Contract being, that in the event of his not having completed the work within the time agreed upon, he should be liable in damages at the rate of 40s. per diem, for every day after the expiration of that time, until the final completion of the work.

That by the petition of the contractor it appears that whilst he was employed in building the wharf a heavy storm broke the boom by which the timber was secured, in consequence of which accident a great part of the timber was lost.

That the contractor failed to complete the wharf within the time specified for its completion; but his non-fulfilment of the contract with respect to time, he alleges arose from the breaking of the boom, and the large amount of extra work performed which was not specified in the original agreement, amounting to £264, being 50 per cent. over the first contract.

That from information which your Committee have received, it seems that the Government on finding that the contractor had not completed his engagement within the specified time, engaged parties to assist in its completion, to whom, for their assistance therein, was paid the sum of £349 4s 9d, and that this sum has been charged to the petitioner.

That the arbitrators, Mr. Benjamin Davies on behalf of the Government, and Mr. Colin McPhoe on the part of the contractor, who were appointed to inspect the extra work, to value the same and report thereon, estimated the value thereof at £264.

That your Committee have examined the said Mr. Benjamin Davies and Mr. Colin McPhoe touching the premises, who have stated, that the performance of the extra work inspected and valued by them, involved a considerable extension of the time specified in the original agreement, for the completion of the wharf.

That the account of the contractor with the Government, independently of the penalty, stands thus:—

Table with 2 columns: Description and Amount. Includes 'Cash paid by the Government to parties employed by them to assist in completing the wharf' (£349 4 9) and 'Balance due Contractor' (£163 15 0).

Table with 2 columns: Description and Amount. Includes 'By amount of Contract' (£408 0 0) and 'Allowed by Arbitrators' (£264 0 0).

Table with 2 columns: Description and Amount. Includes 'Balance due Contractor' (£163 15 3).

That your Committee find that the number of days on which the Government claim the penalty of 40s. per diem, for non-performance of the contract is 118, making the whole penalty amount to £236, which, if insisted upon by the Government, will make their account with the contractor stand thus:—

Table with 2 columns: Description and Amount. Includes 'To Balance on account of contract, extra work performed' (£163 15 3).

Table with 2 columns: Description and Amount. Includes 'Balance' (£236 0 0) and 'By amount penalty 118 days at 40s.' (£236 0 0).

And that, disposed to take the most favorable view of the facts, the loss of a part of his timber and the performance of extra work necessarily requiring an extension of the time originally allowed for the performance of the contract as herein above set forth, and on which the petitioner bases his prayer for the remission of the penalty incurred by him; your Committee would recommend the petitioner to the favorable consideration of the House, and that the penalty incurred by him for breach of the agreement be forgiven.

Mr. McGill moved that the report be referred to the House when in committee of supply. After some discussion, on the suggestion of the Hon. D. Montgomery, Mr. McGill withdrew his motion, and moved that the Report be referred to a committee of the whole House. This motion being agreed to the House went into committee accordingly, Hon. E. Whelan in the Chair.

Hon. J. WIGHTMAN.—The petitioner had no doubt lost money by the contract; but the fault had been entirely his own. He knew what he was to receive for the work, and he knew in what time he was bound to complete it. The truth was not stated in the petition. His timber had not been properly secured. On the morning when it went adrift, I was at the wharf at six o'clock in the morning; the morning was perfectly calm; the timber was all scattered; but there was none of it adrift; none of it outside. Their might have been a storm the night before. I saw some men in a boat, and I asked them if they were come to look after the timber. They said they were. I told them that, if they did not secure it speedily, it would be lost. They said they would by and by. Complaints had been made to me about the contractor's great neglect of the work, and I had them before the Government. I saw some of his securities, and they wished that the Government would take the work out of his hands, employ suitable men to finish it, and charge the expense to him. As to what was paid to Doirant, I know not whether it was quite reasonable or not; but he was accounted the most competent person whom the Government could engage to superintend the completion of the work. Mr. McGill has said that Scott told him I would be in favor of his petition as I knew the facts. I gave Scott no reason to say so; for I believe the loss which he has sustained has been entirely owing to his own negligence. It certainly would be most unfair that the country should, in the first place, be made to suffer great inconvenience from his neglect, as they certainly did for a considerable time; and then be made to compensate him for the loss sustained by himself through that neglect.

Mr. COOPER.—In the report, I see nothing to justify the petition. Even although the special committee have drawn all their information from one side, from those who were referred to in support of the petition, they have not been able to set forth anything, whereby it can be sustained. It is time to put a stop to such petitioning. It has been too long encouraged. Members are, on account of such petitions, kept in the streets, and mobbed in the lobby. If matters such as Scott petitioned about, could not be left entirely to the Government; if they were not fit wholly to deal with them they ought to be sent about their business.

Hon. D. MONTGOMERY.—The committee had not derived all their information from one side. They had examined Mr. Davies, the Government arbitrator, and Mr. McGee. Mr. Davies gave it as his opinion that the contractor was entitled, not only to extra pay, but extra time on account of the extra work not specified in the original agreement. Mr. Doirant was expected in town, and had his case, he would have been examined also. The allowances—12s. 6d., per day, for several days, in some instances—made by the Government to parties employed in completing the wharf, were certainly very high.

Hon. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—I had the special committee applied to the Government for information concerning the matter, as they ought to have done, they would have received it, and been convinced that they had no grounds whereon to recommend the prayer of the petition to the favorable consideration of the House. Why did they not send for the inspector of Public Works? The block was not touched until after the time fixed by the contract for the completion of the whole was expired. By his contract, Scott was bound to do any extra work within the time specified therein. Had he completed his work, even within a month after the expiration of the time, the Government would have passed by that breach of the contract, and would not have insisted upon any penalty on account of it. It was at the request of Scott's securities that Doirant and others were employed to assist in completing the wharf. Doirant was a suitable man—he had a head. The hon. member for Princeport (Hon. D. Montgomery) says he is the only man in the Island fit to build a bridge; he has told him so to his face; and no doubt Doirant, when so highly praised, must think himself entitled to good pay. The work done by the parties employed by the Government, was done late in the fall; it was an outer block; and the men, working in the water, underwent a good deal of hardship, and were entitled to good pay.

Hon. THE SPEAKER said the report of the select committee was a very doubtful one. They say, in it, that they are disposed to take a favourable view of the facts; but it is evident enough that they themselves think they have none to set forth very favourable to the prayer of the petition. He thought, with Mr. Cooper, the Government were the best judges of the matter, and the House were not called upon to interfere. He knew something about the business, and was convinced that whatever loss the contractor had sustained had been caused by neglect and imprudence on his own part, which it would ill become the House to countenance. If the House allowed such cases as Scott's to be bolstered up, they would have plenty of them. It was not the first time that that individual had been accommodated with a special committee when he was not entitled to it.

Mr. POPE.—He quite agreed with what had been said by the Hon. the Speaker. The contractor was an old experienced hand in such matters. He had entered into and signed the agreement with a full knowledge of the penal consequences of a non-fulfilment of it to himself; and, having failed to fulfil it, he ought to take the consequences. From all he had heard about it, it seemed that Scott had been guilty of great neglect; and his own securities having gone to the Government and requested them to take the work out of his hands, was a sufficient proof of it. The arbitrators had certainly estimated the extra work at a very extravagant rate; but there had been also great extravagance on the other side, in the allowances made to Doirant and others employed by the Government.

Mr. MACGILL said the statement made by the special committee was not *ex parte*. They had consulted the original contract, in the office of the Hon. the Colonial Secretary; but they had not been allowed to take it out of the office. And as for Mr. Davies, whom they had examined, he was certainly not a party concerned, and they had the estimate of the extra work in his own hand writing. He would move a resolution to the effect that the House recommend that the penalty incurred by the petitioner be remitted.

Mr. LAIRD.—(He believed that Scott's loss had been occasioned by his own neglect; but he thought the wages allowed by the Government to Doirant and others were extravagantly high. It seemed that £30 had been allowed for inspecting or superintending the work.

Mr. McGILL.—Shepherd had been allowed £43 for inspecting. Mr. CLARK stated that much of the work, either done by, or immediately under the direction of the contractor was so imperfect and unstable that it was found necessary to pull it down and rebuild it. But the chief consideration was the great inconvenience suffered by the public from the work's not having been completed until long after the expiration of the time within which Scott had contracted to complete it. He believed Mr. Jacob Dockendorf, Scott's own brother-in-law, represented his neglect to the Government, and requested them to employ suitable men to complete the work. It would be, not only an act of great impolicy, but one of positive injustice to the public, on the part of the House, were they to grant the prayer of the petition.

Hon. the COLONIAL TREASURER.—The petition did not state facts. Scott's own securities agreed that Doirant should be appointed inspector or superintendent of the work; and at the time the contract was signed, Scott and his securities both were told that the penalty would positively be enforced, if

the contractor failed in the performance of his agreement. The wages paid to the men employed by the Government might be thought high; but it was well known that good workmen could not be got at that time under 8s. a day. If the House should agree to take the matter out of the hands of the Government, their doing so would serve as a notice to the Queen's Street contractors to petition in the same way as Scott. When the arbitrators gave in their estimate, it was thought too high; but, when it was referred to the umpire, he went still higher; so the Government had no other recourse than to fall back upon the contractor, as they have done. I move that the Speaker now take the chair.

Hon. D. MONTGOMERY.—He thought the petitioner was entitled to something more than the Government inclined to allow him. Doirant was certainly very competent as an inspector of bridges in the course of erection; but the wages allowed him, by the Government, and charged to Scott, whilst he was employed merely as a day labourer, were certainly rather high; and to other allowances also charged against Scott, the same objection, he thought, might very justly be made. Besides he thought Scott's non-fulfilment of his agreement was the first on which it had been thought right to exact the penalty: whilst it was very well known that scarcely one had ever been fulfilled within the time specified for its completion. This consideration should incline them to deal leniently with Scott, even although they could not quite exonerate him from blame. It was not completed within the time specified and agreed upon. He did not blame the Government; for he thought their determination was one which had long been called for, with respect to such matters. He was convinced that greater strictness than had hitherto been exercised in that way, would be for the benefit of the public. He thought Scott had been to blame; but, as he had undoubtedly lost considerably, the House might very properly exercise some lenity in their consideration of his case. He could not support the motion of the Hon. the Colonial Treasurer, that the committee rise without reporting.

Hon. COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Doirant was not employed as a common workman, or day labourer; but as a foreman employed in a shipyard, and he was paid accordingly. Mr. McGill is wrong in supposing that Shepherd was paid for inspecting; he was not paid as an inspector; only as a common workman; but every thing in the account is charged at an extra price. Owing to Scott's neglect, the public could not get with carriages of any description to the wharf. The work had been delayed only a month, at that time of the year—the fall—it would have occasioned very serious inconvenience to the public. Neglect to that extent, however, might, perhaps, have been overlooked in some measure; but it became evident that Scott did not intend to complete the work that fall; and had not the Government interfered as they did, by employing proper workmen to finish it, it would not have been finished that year. The Government advanced the money required for the prosecuting of the work, for Scott could not; and the securities had previously suffered. The Government and the country both have certainly had enough of Scott as a contractor for public works; and I hope he will never get another contract of that kind. (Hon. D. Montgomery.—Pay him off and be done with him.) Had the Government acted otherwise than as they have done by Scott, it would not have been fair to other contractors; and full soon would they have been told that, as he belongs to the Snatcher party, he had been allowed to escape. If all defaulting or dilatory contractors were served in the same way, they would soon learn to execute their contracts within the time specified and allowed for completion of them.

Hon. E. PALMER said the Government must be acquitted of all desire to be hard with Scott. He believed that, touching the matter in question, they had done their duty to the country. Scott had agreed to stipulated damages. It was not usual to do so; but when done the damages could not exactly be accounted a penalty, as it was known by the party seeking the contract what they would be before he signed his agreement. It might be that Scott had a claim upon the Government; and he (Hon. E. Palmer) would not presume to say arbitrarily that he had not. He could not see his way clearly to say that something ought to be allowed him. If he (Scott) really thought he had a claim, the best way would be to allow him to have his case laid before a Jury in the Supreme Court, and there determined on its real merits. He imagined the Government would throw no obstructions in the way to prevent his doing so. If the House should take this view of the matter, and decline coming to any decision concerning the prayer of his petition, it would afford a precedent with respect to similar petitions in future, and the House might say to any such petitioner, As we treated Scott, so we treat you. In Great Britain, the performance of Government contracts was exacted to the very letter of the Agreements; and it would be at once for the credit of our local Government and the benefit of the country, if the case were so here. He was perfectly disinclined in the matter; but, as it was before the House, it was his duty to consider it, and give his opinion concerning it. He thought if the Government would waive any technicalities which might stand in the way of Scott's having his case laid before and determined by a Jury, he might have recourse to that mode of adjudication between himself and the Government; and he (Hon. E. Palmer) was of opinion that that mode would be the fairest and the best way of determining the question.

Hon. the COLONIAL SECRETARY.—Of course the Government would not object to his taking such a course.

The chairman then put the question on the motion of the Hon. the Colonial Treasurer, that the Speaker take the chair; and the committee divided:—

Ayes—Hon. the Colonial Treasurer, Hon. the Colonial Secretary, Hon. J. Wightman, Hon. R. Mooney, Hon. the Speaker, Hon. T. H. Haviland, Mr. Yen, Mr. McIntosh, Mr. Munro, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Laird, Mr. Muirhead, Mr. Clark, Mr. Pope, Mr. Dingwall and Mr. H. Haviland—16.

Nays—Mr. McGill, Hon. D. Montgomery and Hon. F. Longworth—3.

And the Hon. the Speaker resumed the chair accordingly.

R. B. IRVING, Reporter.

The Examiner.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., JUNE 9, 1858.

[The "defamatory" and atrocious production to which reference is made in the following extract from a late paper, graced the columns of last week's Protector. We are not surprised at its finding a place in that pious sheet,—it would be a wonder, indeed, if literary offal of this description did not find its way to such a quarter; for the more base the production, the more unfounded and malicious the slander, so long as Roman Catholics and the pastors of their Church are the subjects, the more readily will the Sanctified Press give its aid to disseminate the poison.]—EDR. EXAMINER.

LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP HUGHES.

A New York correspondence, as vulgar and scurrilous in style as malicious in conception, published in an obscure journal at the State capital and reproduced here by the Express and Tribune, has brought forth the following letter from the Most Rev. Archbishop. That the defamatory production of the Albany journal's vicious correspondent was immediately transferred to the pages of the Express did not astonish us, for such is the meat it feeds on, but we are really surprised by a respectable journal like the Tribune should disgrace its columns by inserting such patent slander.

The Archbishop's letter is addressed to the Editor of the Courier and Examiner, and dated 21st instant.

I take the liberty of forwarding to you a journal published in Albany, which reached me this morning, through the medium of the Post Office. It contains, as you will perceive, an article of three columns scurrilous in its language towards myself, and malicious in its intended purposes as affecting the public mind.

I do not notice it with a view of repelling its defamatory imputations. Many such articles have come under my notice, and been allowed to pass unheeded by me. I had begun to suppose that my age, if not my office in the Church, would shield me from personal insult at the hands of all honorable men having control over the public press, and of course having the power to influence public opinion for good or evil. It is not my intention, heretofore, with the antecedents of my life, more or less known to my fellow-citizens, to interpose any shield of defence against the imputations and slanders contained in the article to which I have taken the liberty of calling your attention.

But I owe it to the cause, the honorable impartiality and kindness which I have experienced, even in the worst of times, at the hands of the press, to state at once, and in the most emphatic manner, that so far as I am conscious of truth and of my own thoughts and actions, there is not a syllable in the article referred to that is not equally false and malicious. The object of the writer and publisher is evidently to inflame the minds of a portion of our people by a statement which, if it prove

true, would render me unfit to live in a civilized community—but which, so far as I am concerned, or any one else, is of no value, as my knowledge and consent, is as false as if it came immediately from the latter of them. I am, with respect, your obedient servant,
J. J. HUGHES, Archbishop of New York.
New York, May 21st, 1858.

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE SECOND ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF PRINCE COUNTY.

GENTLEMEN.—Agreeably to the request of several of yourselves, I have consented to present myself as a candidate for the representation of your district at the approaching election. It is, therefore, but proper that I should briefly and publicly advert to some things which, in my humble opinion, should engage the attention and elicit the energies of public men on this Island, at the present time. What you have to engage in, my countrymen, at the forthcoming election, is matter of practical fact, and not of speculative theory. You will have to return two men to represent your interests in the new House of Assembly; and your enquiry should be, "Whom shall we send? Shall we send men who will link themselves to a band of shodders? or shall we send men who know our wants, feel our wants, and whom we know will honestly, to the best of their abilities, endeavour to promote our general and local interests, by striving to legislate in that way which may tend to ease our burdens, develop our resources, and thereby endeavour to increase our domestic comforts?"

You know that, since our earliest recollection, the landed tenure of this Island has been the burden, the weighty burden, which has cast its withering shade over our fair country. Every House of Assembly, from the days of Governor Smith up to the present time, has been expected to deal vigorously with the land question; and whatever blame some may lay to the present Government for the manner in which they have dealt with this vexed question, it must be admitted that, under the present Administration, more men have been settled upon their own estates than was ever the case before. The question is, doubtless, one that should be dealt with firmly. Property justly acquired should be justly protected; and for such protection, the faithful discharge of its duties should be as vigorously exacted. Large estates held without proper authority should revert to the Government. Estates, comparatively unproductive to the State, should be aroused from their slumber, and put in working order. If their owners sleep, the people's representatives should not, but be ever awake and active. Means should be resorted to for rendering home more agreeable to our daughters—more attractive to our sons. The necessity of this, I think, is apparent to all who have given any attention to the subject. In all the older settlements, mothers sigh for absent sons; the sister inquires, "When will my brothers come home?" and a betrothed, in many instances, sighs for an absent and a much loved one, who will not again return to the arms that are ready to embrace him, and the heart that beats for his return. And all these disquietudes of mind, those sighs and tears, are the result of proprietary influence.

Discontent prevails, like an epidemic, over the length and breadth of our land; it commences at an early period, and is yearly receiving its reward in the number of strong arms and generous hearts which are being pushed off from our shores. Had content prevailed to a greater extent than it has on this Island, our population would now greatly exceed that of a fourth class city of Europe. How are we to rectify this evil? I reply, by rendering our Island more attractive to our children. And how is this to be done? There are various ways; but, in a general way, they may be said to all centre in one point, and that is, the opening up of a good home market—a market which every farmer's child would wish with his eggs, butter, cheese, poultry, &c. This is what gives zest to industry, and lays the foundation of content, love of country, and individual enterprise in the youthful mind. But how can this be done? Many of you know my views on this matter already, but suffice me again briefly to repeat to them. I refer to the formation of duly incorporated fishing companies, on an enlarged national basis. But where are the funds? First, I reply, in the union of the strong and active arms of our sons, which is a wealth more valuable than gold, inasmuch as it is a wealth which gold cannot purchase; but still it is a wealth lost in a great measure, for want of union. We have too much native industry, and too little native heart and spirit united for laudable enterprises; and therefore it is that hundreds, ay, thousands, of our young men are not any more in pocket at the age of 30 years than they were at the age of twenty-one.

This Island, when compared with others, cannot be called a new Colony, yet in enterprise it is in a purely infantile state; and this requires a government that will treat with it encouragingly. The reason of this is, that up to the time of Sir A. Bannerman, the stroke of the proprietor's lash was never, even in an effectual degree, removed from off the down-trodden energies of this Island; and even now it is but partially removed. Yet, were it wholly and for ever removed, it would by no means remove the discontent it has engendered among the sons of the Island; but the fact nevertheless is, that the more the lash is removed, from which it follows that any Legislature, who wish to legislate for the enduring good of this Colony, must, in curtailing the power of the proprietors, direct a proportionate attention towards the encouragement of such national enterprises as may be calculated to add to the wealth and development of our resources.

But at the present time an unjust cry is raised against the Government for issuing Treasury Warrants, which holders have to pay a discount to get cashed; but the fact nevertheless is, that the holders of the public accounts show, Bonds in the Treasury amounting to £25,156, and in the hands of the Attorney General Bonds amounting to £3,067,—a clear evidence of the indulgence of the Legislature, on the one hand; and of the money pressure upon our mercantile men, on the other. Now is no time to marvel that such is the case. The reason of which is, that we have no money market—no mercantile prices. The balance of trade is against the Colony; but the fact nevertheless is, that the more the balance of trade is against us, the more we are enabled to import; and, therefore, mercantile men, as a class, we have not got.

To counteract this, I think the time has arrived for holding out inducements for the formation of duly incorporated fishing companies; and I am decided in believing that they would render much aid to this Colony. They would draw a bond of unity among our sons, and afford a legitimately national scope for mercantile, nautical and mechanical enterprises. At present the commerce of P. E. Island is a blank. Men who have credit abroad import goods, and sell them at a high price, on reasonable terms. Fish will always be a paying article in the foreign market; and with such an export, we might import from the producing market, and not upon the principle now adopted, which brings many of our articles of import to us like a snow-ball rolling down a hill, which increases in size as it moves along, so that when it comes to us, we fairly stagger as we place it upon our already burdened shoulders. As our trade is carried on at present, we pay the foreign manufacturer and mechanic—the maker of the home manufactures of other countries, at our own cost and charges.

Such matters, as also the Alien Bill—alleged to be by the Examiner and also by Major Beete—and similar measures, I hold as worthy the attention of public men. If properly carried out, doubtless they would ultimately erect a pleasing mercantile banner over P. E. Island, the pleasant shades of which might be seen and felt from the East Point to the North Cape, from New Lenoxtown to the mighty ranges, and "beanty banks" of Lots 7 and 8; and also upon the pleasant rivers of Lots 12 and 13, where the Prince of Port Hill alone, in full armour clad, allows a gallant ship to sail.

Much is said about public economy, and this is right enough; and if the people will return men who really love their country, they may safely leave this matter in their hands; but if not, I am quite sure this no obligation which may be imposed will be a guarantee against extravagance.

I have the honor to be, Gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,
ROBERT GORDON.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

SIR.—As you are always willing to give your assent to any measure that would promote the well-being of our Colony, and as ready to employ all the influence you can command to eradicate that which would be the means of re-instating it in its former deplorable condition, I respectfully request that you will afford me a place in the columns of your widely circulated journal. According to appointment, the mercenary of the "Unobies," Ephraim Reed, attempted to deliver one of his illogical lectures on "Political Science," as he delights to style it, on Thursday, the 13th ult., at Barrett's Cross.

Owing to the inclemency of the weather, a large number of the inhabitants (Liberals) did not attend; but even those who did attend, were so few, that the elements poured out its contents copiously, and so obstinate to impede the progress of the mercenary and his partisans in prosecuting their designs, the Tories gathered round the renowned eloquist, as did the Americans Daniel Webster, at his memorable speech at the dedication of the Banker Hill monument. The specified hour having at length arrived for the lecturer to take his place, Ephraim was led by his colleagues to a neighbouring barn to give expression to his over-stocked predictions of the downfall of the present Government. The learned lecturer not having a sufficient share of common sense to teach him how to conduct himself when out of the tannery, abruptly took his stand on the forum (as such it may be called), and commenced his striking illustrations, until one of his antagonists insisted that the meeting should be duly organized, and a chairman appointed. This having been done, and as Ephraim, I think, had not been accustomed to submit to such tutoring, he thought he would despise those to whom he should have returned his most humble gratitude for that very important lesson, by vociferating