

The Legislative Council sent down a Bill, passed by that branch, for the prevention of fraud by secret bills of sale of personal property. Read a first time. Also a Bill to authorise the Lieut. Governor to prohibit the exportation of saltpetre and other articles used in the manufacture of Gunpowder.

The Hon. COL. SECRETARY said the latter Bill had been introduced into the upper House, in conformity with a circular despatch from the Colonial Minister, recommending the passage of such a Bill, which despatch he laid upon the table. A similar measure, he presumed, would be passed by all the Colonial Legislatures; the object of it—as was obvious enough—was to prevent any trade arising between Russia and the Colonies, for the supply of materials used in the manufacture of Gunpowder.

The Bill was then read a first time—the rules suspended, read a second time, committed to a committee of the whole House, and agreed to therein, read a third time, passed, and sent back to the Council.

**Petitions again taken up.**—The petition praying for the erection of a Court House at Casuarine, was referred to the special committee already appointed relative to the division of Princes County.

**Petition for a Light House at the North Cape.**—Referred to Light House Committee.

**Petition of Daniel Wall, a Loyalist.**—Referred to the special committee appointed to report on a petition from inhabitants of Lot 30, respecting claims of Loyalists to land on that township.

The Hon. Col. Treasurer presented the School Visitor's Report as laid before the Board of Education.

House adjourned.

Having met in the afternoon, Mr. McGill reported that the Committee appointed for that purpose had presented the address to His Excellency respecting a survey of Lot 30, and that His Excellency stated that he would comply with the desire of the House.

**Petitions again taken up.**—A petition praying aid towards a Library at Tignish—referred to Supply.

The following papers, laid before the Executive Council and referred to the House of Assembly, were then taken up and read:—**Petition of Maxime Gallant** and others, respecting the erection of a bridge at Haldimand river, and report of Superintendent of Public Works thereon—referred to House when in Committee on roads, bridges, and wharfs. **Petition of W. McDonald, light-house-keeper at Panmure Island**, praying for an assistant—referred to Light House Committee. **Report of B. Davies, Esq.** on winter mails boats—referred to Committee of Supply. **Report of Commissioners on the opening of a new line of road at Murray Harbor**; and also the report of commissioners respecting the opening of a new line of road from Emmans's to Matthews's, at Grand River—referred to House when in committee on the consideration of all matters relating to roads, bridges and wharfs.

MR. HEARD'S PETITION.

**Petition of William Heard**, and also petition of merchants and freholders of Charlottetown, recommending the prayer of Mr. Heard's petition to the favorable consideration of the House, were taken up and read. On a motion being made by Mr. McDonald to refer the petitions to Supply, a long and animated discussion ensued, in the course of which the Hon. Col. SECRETARY detailed the circumstances under which Mr. Heard's steamer was employed in the summer of last year to carry the mails between Charlottetown and Pictou—he shewed that there was no contract entered into, as the preliminary to the signing of any contract was, that commissioners should examine and report on the fitness of Mr. Heard's boat for the service she was intended for—that commissioners did examine and report on the boat—that those commissioners were not political partisans of the Government and unfriendly to Mr. Heard, but rather the reverse, and that their ability to discharge the duty assigned them could not be questioned; that their report was decidedly unfavorable to the employment of Mr. Heard's boat as a mail packet, and that therefore she ceased to be employed, and the Lady le Marchant was taken in her place; that notwithstanding, Mr. Heard continued to ply the Rosebud between Charlottetown and Pictou, as an opposition boat, to the serious injury of the Government contractor, until forced to lay her up early in the autumn, when it was deemed unsafe to run her during the prevalence of moderately high winds;—that Mr. Heard then publicly complained of the want of liberality on the part of the Government in not employing his boat, when, from the circumstances related, it was impossible for the Government to do anything of the kind;—and that for the services performed in carrying several mails between Charlottetown and Pictou, on the Rosebud's trial trips, Mr. Heard had been liberally remunerated by the Government. He was therefore not entitled to any grant of money from that House.

The Hon. Mr. WARBURTON and others on the same side of the House supported these views, and argued against the principle of encouraging disappointed public contractors to come before the House with applications similar to Mr. Heard's.

Messrs. McDONALD, PALMER, LONGWORTH, DOUSE, and others, said they would vote for the petition going to Supply, not from party feeling or consideration for Mr. Heard as an individual, but from a sincere desire to encourage what they considered a great enterprise for a small country like this, and one in which Mr. Heard had embarked much capital and incurred heavy loss. That his steamer had afforded much accommodation to the public, was manifest enough from the encouragement it had received from the travelling community, but that that encouragement had not been such as to reimburse him to anything like the amount of outlay occasioned in getting his boat ready for, and in keeping her on the station. The Hon. Mr. PALMER, in advocating these views, distinctly and repeatedly stated, that he did not accuse the Government of wrong doing in refusing to employ Mr. Heard's boat after receiving the Commissioners' report—there was great necessity for caution and care in entering into a contract for such an important service, after the unfortunate casualty of the Fairy Queen; and he had no doubt that had he, (Mr. Palmer), been a member of the Government he would have acted with respect to the matter under consideration just as the Hon. Col. Secretary and his colleagues had done, and would probably withhold us support from the application then before the House. But viewing the petition on its own merits, and without any reference to the Government, he would support the application for a small grant, as a reward for individual enterprise.

Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN spoke favorably of petitioner's claims on the score of enterprise, but considering his position as a member of the Government, and remembering how fairly and liberally the petitioner had been dealt with by the Government, he could not vote for the petition going to Supply, as his doing so would be equivalent to a censure upon himself and his colleagues in the administration.

The discussion in which nearly all the members present participated—but for whose remarks in an extended form we have not space—having been brought to a close, the Hon. Col. Secretary moved in amendment to Mr. McDonald's motion "that the prayer of the petition be rejected." The House divided:—For the amendment—Hons. Col. Secretary, Col. Treasurer, Messrs. Mooney, Wightman, Whelan, Clark, Laird, McGill, Munro, Dingwell, Perry, Muirhead—12. Against it—Messrs. McDonald, Yeo, Douse, Longworth, Palmer, H. Haviland—6. **Prayer rejected.**

**Petition of George Thresher**, praying for an annuity of £50 in consideration of his long services as former Deputy Secretary and Registrar. The petitioner stated that such an annuity was promised to him by Sir Alexander Bannerman's Government at the time of his leaving the Secretary's Office.

The Hon. COL. TREASURER, who was Secretary at the time alluded to, denied that any such promise had been made with his concurrence. Mr. Thresher left the Secretary's Office, not to make room for any particular individual, nor in consideration of any promise being made to him, but because his age and infirmities rendered him unfit for the duties of the office.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY stated that he had no knowledge of any such promise being made to Mr. Thresher as that stated by him. He did not charge the petitioner with stating an untruth; but he was certainly under a misapprehension, for no promise of an annuity was or could be made to Mr. Thresher by the Government.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN remarked that perhaps a hint or suggestion about getting an annuity might have been casually and privately made by Sir Alexander himself to Mr. Thresher, without pledging the Government to secure it. After a few further observations from other hon. members, Mr. H. Haviland, who warmly supported the petition, moved that it be referred to Supply. Mr. Muirhead moved in amendment that the prayer be rejected, which was agreed to.

**Petition of Isabella Ross**, widow of the late Clerk Assistant of the House of Assembly, was taken up and read. Mr. H. Haviland moved that it be referred to Supply. Mr. Perry moved in amendment that it be referred to the Georgetown members, to make provision for the support of petitioner's family out of the money voted for the relief of the poor. The question was taken on the original motion for sending the petition to Supply: Ayes—Messrs. Douse, Yeo, Palmer, Haviland, Wightman, McDonald, Dingwell, Munro, Whelan, Mooney, McGill, Longworth—12: Nays—Hons. Col. Secretary, Col. Treasurer, Messrs. Perry, McIntosh, Clark, Muirhead, Laird—7.

Several hon. members having obtained leave of absence for a few days, the House then adjourned.

MONDAY, March 10.

The Hon. Col. Treasurer presented a petition from Thomas Robson, of Sackville, N. B., praying a grant for the invention of a Fog Bell. Referred to Light House Committee.

The House again went into Committee on the Bill to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the sale of spirituous liquors. The Bill was agreed to with some amendments.

Mr. McDonald presented a petition from the trustees of the Georgetown Grammar School, praying for an increase of salary to their teacher. Referred to Committee on Teachers' Petitions.

House adjourned.

TUESDAY, March 11.

The Hon. Col. Secretary laid before the House a report of John Doirant, accompanied by a plan, respecting certain repairs required to Darnley Bridge.

**Petitions again taken up.**—The Petition of James Gillanders, Teacher, praying for a retiring allowance was read, and referred to the Committee appointed to report as to the necessity of making provision for sick and aged Teachers.

Mr. Clark, from the Committee to whom was referred the Petition praying for an Act to prevent swine from running large, presented the following report which was agreed to:—“Your Committee appointed to report on the several petitions praying that an Act may be passed to prevent the running at large of swine, submit the following report—That although much injury is done to private property, as well as the public roads, by the going at large of swine, yet your Committee think that a law to compel all persons to keep their swine from going at large, while it would operate beneficially in some settlements, would be found oppressive to many of the new settlers in woodlands. Your Committee cannot, therefore, recommend the prayer of the Petitions.”

House again in Committee on the Bill relating to summary actions before Justices of the Peace. Progress reported. Then the House adjourned.

THE EXAMINER.

CHARLOTTETOWN, MARCH 24, 1856.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

THERE was but little business of any importance transacted in the House during the past week, beyond receiving reports of special committees on routine matters. On Wednesday afternoon a warm debate arose on the report, presented by Mr. Longworth, relative to the petitions of the late N. LePage and John McKinnon, formerly Preventive Officers, praying for compensation for services alleged to have been rendered and expenses incurred in seizing the American Schooner *Dragonet*, last summer, for assumed violation of the revenue laws. Mr. Longworth moved to refer the report to the Committee of Supply, so as to give a grant to the petitioners. Every Tory member of the House was drummed up for the occasion; and Mr. Palmer, who appeared to have had a retainer from the surviving petitioner, came out furiously against the Government for not having met the demands of the petitioners, by paying their expenses, and dividing amongst them the £100 penalty exacted from the master of the *Dragonet*. With pretence and effrontery unsurpassed, he quoted law, almost without end, which had no direct reference to the case, but the object was, to confound, cajole and deceive the House. Mr. Montgomery was also uncommonly zealous in his efforts to enforce the claims of the petitioners, and appeared to think that nothing short of the £100 should be given to them. Mr. Douse descanted on the great injustice of not supporting revenue officers in the execution of their duty, and the whole minority, in short, with the exception of Mr. H. Haviland, appeared to be horrified at the conduct of the Government in not meeting the demands of Messrs. McKinnon and LePage.

The members of the Government and their supporters took the gasconade very quietly—replying, that McKinnon and LePage had acted not only contrary to the orders of the department with which they were connected, viz. the Excise, but also contrary to the express and repeated orders of the Government—that they were told by the Attorney General their seizure was an illegal one—that the £100 penalty recovered was not in consequence of their proceedings, but owing to the subsequent action of Mr. Clark—that their conduct throughout had been contumacious in the extreme, and could not have been regarded in any other light than as an attempt to get money under false pretences; but nevertheless that the Government had signified their willingness to pay some little expenses incurred by petitioners of putting constables on board the *Dragonet* in the first instance, and that the Government was still willing to pay those expenses.

Of course this explanation failed to satisfy the minority—strengthened, as usual, by the support of Messrs. Cooper and Laird, Mr. McIntosh, to his credit, coming out of the wholly

alliance on this occasion. They were evidently certain, from the high and confident tone assumed, that the Government would be left in a minority on the question, and a direct censure would, therefore, be cast upon the conduct of the Executive; but the minority were mistaken in their calculations, for the following resolution was carried on a division of 10 to 8:—

“Whereas certain proceedings taken by the late Napoleon LePage and John McKinnon, late Preventive Officers, with respect to the seizure of the American Schooner ‘*Dragonet*,’ were in direct opposition to the orders of the Collector of Excise and of the Government, and were entirely erroneous; but nevertheless the Government offered to discharge the necessary expenses incurred by those proceedings, in order to save the then Preventive Officers harmless; and whereas the conduct of the late Napoleon LePage and John McKinnon, in adopting a course at variance with the commands of their superior officers, would, if recognized and encouraged, be subversive of that due subordination and regularity which should at all times prevail between superior and subordinate officers. Resolved, therefore, that it is inexpedient to entertain the application now before the Committee for a grant of money from this House, the Government having already, as above stated, offered to pay the necessary expenses attending the unauthorized seizure, and the House in Committee of Supply will make good the same.”

Mr. Palmer's disappointment regarding the division was clearly manifested at the close of the debate by the exhibition of bad temper.

We have seen many precious specimens of misrepresentation and detraction in the columns of the *Islander* during McLean's management of it, but he is entitled to much consideration for having attained in the last issue the most conspicuous position that any unprincipled duce could arrive at, for skill in the use of the long bow. Duncan had the courage to shew his ugly phiz in town during the past week, and as Ings has the printing of the Journals, the editor had an opportunity, through the help of his friends in the House of Assembly, of looking into the Auditors' classification of the Public Accounts for the past year. Let us see what use he made of the opportunity.

He states in the first place, that £15 were paid to Mr. Coles for a visit of inspection to Mill River Bridge. Now, there is no such entry in the Public Accounts, nor any where else, for this plain reason, that Mr. Coles never received one penny for any services rendered by him in connection with the erection of Mill River Bridge.

In the next place, he states that £130 are paid to the Clerk of the Council over his stated allowance—that is also untrue.

The next item with respect to the Assistant Clerk of the Legislative Council, is a misrepresentation.

The next statement, which informs us, that a declaration was made by the Liberal party some years ago, to the effect, that ten pounds would be sufficient to pay the Clerk of the Executive Council, is a downright falsehood.

The next item, which states that £100 are paid to the Road Correspondent, “which being £60 more than was paid by the *ancien regime*,” is a wilful misrepresentation. The £100 salary is paid to the Road Correspondent and Assistant Clerk of the Legislative Council. Mr. Morpeth, one of the Tory party, held the latter office under the Tory Government, and was paid in something about the same proportion as Mr. Ball is now paid; there was no objection then. With respect to the Road Correspondent's duties in former years, Mr. McGowan, it is true, received only forty pounds from the Treasury, BUT HE PAID THE ROAD ORDERS VERY OFTEN BY GIVING GOODS OUT OF HIS SHOP, and then there were only fifteen or sixteen road districts in the Island, with which the Correspondent had to keep up accounts, and only between two and three thousand pounds appropriated to the road service. Now, there are over thirty road districts in the Island, involving more than double the correspondence and more than double the accounts, and about eight thousand pounds are disbursed for the roads and bridges service. Even if the whole £100—which is not the case—had been given for the performance of Road Correspondent's duties, it would be more dearly earned than the £40 under the old regime.

The next statement in the *Islander* says:—“£10 for indexing Acts of Session—formerly done by Mr. Cundall for 40s.” We do not believe that Mr. Cundall ever indexed the Acts of the Session for 40s., but this we do know, that nobody but him has indexed the Acts of the Session since the present Government came into office. Surely, therefore, an honest partizan of the Tories, like Mr. Cundall, would not overcharge the public.

The statements about the salary of the Private Secretary are nearly all untrue.

“£10, to Superintendent of Public Works for plan of new Market—being a useful political agent, he must be well fostered.”

The above is a quotation from the *Islander*—the italics are ours,—the £10 alluded to were paid to Mr. Henry Smith, by the Tory Government—whether or not he was “a useful political agent,” the *Islander* people best know.

The statements respecting the Queen's Printer's accounts are all false, as might be expected. The Queen's Printer's charges last year did not amount to the sum stated—that sum includes the cost of printing the Journals of the two branches of the Legislature, which are well known to be contract works. With respect to the £100 which Mr. Whelan is said to have charged for Stationery, it is another most glaring falsehood. He never charged a shilling for any such thing.

But the whole article is, from beginning to end, such a tissue of misrepresentations and downright falsehoods, that it seems incredible that any man could be so foolish as to publish what he knew must be exposed. On Saturday evening, Mr. Lord and Mr. Coles brought those fabrications to the notice of the House of Assembly, and the latter refuted them in toto. The minority were nearly all present, but so ashamed were they of the misrepresentations of their pet paper, that not one word was said in justification. Mr. Palmer was as silent as the grave. The indefensible character of the paper was tacitly admitted by its friends.

There were two Colonial and United States Mails during the past week, but they furnished no news of any importance.

We beg to say that, at the request of Mr. Warburton, we have discontinued the notice in reference to the Notes of the Westmoreland Bank not being received at the Treasury. We may further state, that we have been informed from undoubted authority that the position of the Westmoreland Bank is not inferior to any other Banking Institution in the Provinces.—*Com.*

CORRESPONDENCE OF THE EXAMINER.

LONDON, February 29th, 1856.

The members of the Peace Conferences are now assembled at Paris, and the difficult work of negotiation began on Tuesday.

The question of precedence has been solved alphabetically. Austria takes the lead, France follows; Great Britain is next to her, then come Russia and Sardinia, and Turkey brings up the rear. The first fruit of the Conference has been the signature of an armistice, to apply to land operations only, and to extend to the 31st of March. Prussia is trying hard to get admitted; but she has no claim, and will doubtless be excluded. The Ministerial papers tell us that Lord Clarendon will assume a high tone,—that Lord Palmerston is determined to maintain a high position, worthy of the country he represents. It is added that the Emperor of the French is in perfect accord with the English Government. If this be true, the negotiations, will soon terminate one way or the other. Speculation as to the result is useless. The people of England heartily desire peace; but upon adequate terms. They expect conditions equal to their exertions and their sacrifices: they would insist on them and obtain them, or continue the struggle. They think thus, not because they desire a continuance of the war, but because they feel that firmness at the present moment will best conduce to the restoration of European repose. The news from the Crimea is almost wholly confined to the completion of the destruction of the Docks, and the blowing up of Forts St. Nicholas and Alexander at Sebastopol. The operation seems to have been performed with very great skill: the docks are a heap of ponderous ruins: the Forts are a mass of rubbish. The sunken shipping will be the next object of attention. This work will be difficult because it must be, for the most part, performed under water by divers; but the means and appliances are at the command of our officers. There is every reason to expect that the Russian fleet, once sunk, is sunk for ever. The last accounts left the armies in good condition—all, however, very dull, of course, at the prospect of a peace without the test of another campaign. It is evident that little will be done by the armies on either side until it is seen which way the negotiations at Paris are likely to turn. The apparent desire of Russia to put an end to the war, raises a suspicion in many minds that she is not sincere. Sir E. Lyons has left England to resume the command of the Black Sea fleet; and Vice-Admiral Sir R. Dundas is re-appointed to the Baltic fleet.

In the House of Lords the principal question discussed has been that of the Wensleydale peerage. Lord Lyndhurst is determined to resist the attempt, now being made by government, to establish a precedent for the creation of life peers *ad libitum*. Once allow the hereditary character of the House of Lords to be destroyed and that branch of the legislature, the noble lord declares, will be forthwith dependent on the House of Commons and the ministry of the day. “And if our hereditary peerage is thus overawed, where, he asks, will be the security for the hereditary monarchy? The question is probably one of the most important that has arisen since the passing of the Reform Bill. It is the first step in a great constitutional struggle. Lord Brougham and Lord Campbell pointed out to ministers the means for preventing a collision between the Crown and the Barons of England—viz. by issuing another patent granting the barony of Wensleydale to Sir James Parks and his heirs. This would have been an easy solution of the difficulty, but the Lord Chancellor has staked his reputation on the creation of life peerage, and refused to adopt *à coute qui coûte*. The struggle came on in the House of Lords on the 22nd inst., the attendance of peers and visitors being unusually large. Lord Glenolig stepped in to the rescue of the government by moving that the following questions be submitted to the judges:—“Is it in the power of the Crown to create, by patent, the dignity of a baron of the United Kingdom for life. What rights and privileges does such a rank confer?” Lord Campbell denied that the judges were the constitutional advisers of the peers in such a matter. He maintained that the proper course was to proceed to the committee of privileges, and to have the question there discussed. The Lord Chancellor supported a reference to the judges, as did also Earl Granville, but the resolution was opposed by the Earl of Winchester, and Lord Brougham, and ultimately rejected by a majority of 142 against 111. Their lordships then went into a committee of privileges and Lord Lyndhurst moved for a report, declaring Lord Wensleydale not entitled to sit and vote in parliament. His lordship declared that the only conclusion that could be come to, after perusing the charters creating peerages for life, was that this had never been done by the Crown without the consent of parliament, and that which was now sought to be effected had never before occurred in the history of the country. Earl Grey moved the following amendment:—“That the highest legal authorities having concurred in declaring the Crown to possess the power of creating peerages for life, and this power having been exercised in former times, the House of Lords would not be justified in assuming the illegality of the patent creating the Right Hon. Sir James Parks, Baron Wensleydale for life, and in refusing, upon that assumption, to permit him to take his seat as a peer.” Earl Stanhope (better known as Lord Mahon) supported the original motion in a speech of great ability, and which called forth the repeated cheers of the house. The Duke of Argyll declared that government had had recourse to the creation of this life peerage in order to improve the appellate jurisdiction of the house. Lord Brougham held, in common with Lord Lyndhurst, Lord Campbell, and Lord St. Leonards, the opinion that the creation of a life peerage giving a seat in parliament, was beyond the Royal prerogative—if they would—illegal, according to the law and constitution of the country. The Lord Chancellor again defended the part the government had taken in the creation of this life peerage, but his speech was without effect, for, on a division, Lord Lyndhurst's motion was carried by a majority of 92 against 57. The report of Committee of Privileges affirming Lord Lyndhurst's resolution was adopted on Monday without a division, Lord Granville promised on the part of Government that Lord Wensleydale would not attempt to take his seat until the matter had been fully considered. On the 10th of February the House of Lords, in reply to a question from the Earl of Hardwicke, Lord Pamure said nothing that gallantry and science could effect would be left undone to ensure the destruction of what was above the water in Sebastopol or beneath it. On the 21st, in the Commons, Sir Joshua Walsley's motion for throwing open the National Gallery, the British Museum, and other public institutions on Sundays was fully discussed, and was met by a direct negative—the majority against the motion being overwhelming and conclusive—376 against 48. The only man of mark who spoke in favour of the motion was Lord Stanley. That young nobleman was listened to with attention and respect, but his delivery is so indistinct and thick as to mar the oratorical abilities he otherwise possesses. It was probably out of consideration for him and his noble father that none of the opposition leaders spoke in the debate, although they all voted against the motion. Lord Palmerston gave a decided negative to the proposition, adducing as a reason, among others, the general expression of the country against it. The first division, testing in some degree the ministerial strength in the Lower House, took place on the 15th February, upon a question connected with the Irish judges. Sir John Shelley (sometimes called Sir John Shallow) moved for returns relative to those functionaries, three of whom are of the respective ages of 85, 84, and 82, Baron Pemefather, the eldest, being blind. Ministers supported the motion which was opposed by Mr. Napier and other oppositionists, and only carried by a majority of 11. The government want the judges to resign in order that they may appoint Mr. Keogh and other partisans in their places. This is objectionable enough, but at the same time the public think, whoever they might place on the bench, that certainly a blind man ought not to sit on it. In addition to Mr. Lowe, another member of the government has been charged with plagiarism. A Bill introduced by the Irish solicitor-general for the regulation of juries, is declared by Mr. Whiteside to be the same measure he introduced himself the other night, but Mr. Fitzgerald, unlike Mr. Lowe, attempted a defence. Mr. Whiteside's measure, he said, was drawn from an old bill, and he went to the same source. Unfortunately, several mistakes had found their way into the printed copy of Mr. Whiteside's bill, and all these are to be traced in Mr. Fitzgerald's measure, thus showing at once the materials used by the Irish solicitor-general. It would appear that the position of the administration is not so firm as its friends could wish: the defeat of the Government on the Wensleydale peerage question has already been adverted to. This defeat has been followed by a check almost as severe in the lower House. The Dues on Shipping bill has been virtually abandoned, having been referred to a select committee. Mr. Lowe's habit of calling things by their right names has alarmed timid friends; and by driving them into opposition, led to the result thus indicated. The debate came on on Monday, and it was generally anticipated that the division would prove unfavourable to the Government. Mr. Lowe was accordingly put up to restore confidence; but his candid and trenchant mode of reasoning only made matters worse. The opposition was led by Sir Frederic Thesiger in a very effective speech; and seconded by Sir Francis Baring, the quondam Whig Chancellor of the Ex-