—that pet scheme respecting which he has taken so much credit to himself for originating. He charges the present Government with not providing means to meet the expenses which it entails upon the Colony. This was his duty, not ours. He introduced the bantling into the world, and should have provided for its support. He should have seen that the taxation imposed was equal to the requirements of the system; and the remark of the hon. leader of the Government in this House was correct when he stated that the country was led to understand that the assessment would meet the expenditure.

Hon. Mr COLES.—The means provided were sufficient; but the understanding was not that the land assessment would cover the expense.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—If the assessment was not sufficient it should have been. That the hon. member should introduce a system not commensurate with itself shows his policy to be defective. To render him entitled to the credit which he generally receives, he should have devised means equal to the support of the system for all time. The sum raised by the tax imposed under the provisions of the Bill which the hon member introduced was less than £4000. I admit that at the time the measure became law the necessity did not exist for a much larger assessment, as the expenses of education then did not exceed £9000; but they far exceeded this amount before the party went out of power, therefore it devolved upon the hon member to devise some scheme to meet the increasing expenditure. When the present Government came into power the annual cost of Education was some £14,000, and the sum raised by assessment had considerably decreased on account of the purchase of two large estates by the late Administration. At present the expense is about £17,000, and the consequence is as stated in the Address, a difficulty to keep the expenditure of the Colony within the receipts. I advance nothing against the system itself; all I say is, the hon. member should have based it upon a policy that would have borne it through all the storms and waves of existence. He should not seek to blame the present majority if they have been unable to meet the demands of a system which he claims to have originated, and which they have done their utmost to nurture and mature.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—They have only increased its expense.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—Yes, I say mature the education law, which at first was very defective, but as it stands at present on the statute book improved by the majority of this House it is a credit to the Colony. The Act is about as perfect as it can be, but the great hiatus is the deficiency in the means of support. The hon member would be delighted if we should impose a heavy tax to meet this want; but did we undertake this responsibility, he would be the first to cry out against us for placing burdens upon the people.

The Committee arose and the house adjourned.

D. LAIRD, Reporter.

MONDAY AFTERNOON, Feb. 24.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—Mr. Chairman, when the House adjourned this forenoon, I had been replying to the sentements put forward by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, and I flatter myself his arguments have been fully met. It is unnecessary that I should enter into the various details of public expenditure adverted to by that gentleman, as many opportunities of answering him more fully and effectually, than would be appropriate now, will arise during the Session. The Government is quite prepared and ready to meet any charge or insinuation which may be brought against it. When the adjournment took place, I was endeavouring to show that it lily became the Leader of the Opposition to attribute blame to the Government on account of the charge borne on the Revenue for Education. The present system of Education originated with that gentleman. We, I may say, inherited it, and it became our duty to improve it, as far as possible, but it was not our province to provide new sources of revenue for its support. Had we done so, the hon. gentleman would at once take the credit of having introduced the system, and at the same time blame the Government for incurring unnecessary expense. When the late Government went out of power, the operation of the Educational system cost £14,000. That amount has since increased £3000. These facts, Sir, in my opinion, fully justify the allusion in the Speech to the subject of Education. It is impossible to continue the present system—to keep the expenditure within the income, without a change in the tariff. The hon. gentleman referred to the Prince of Wales College. The question of the establishment of that institution has been before the House in previous sessions; it was constituted by an Act of the Legislature and the necessary funds were voted for its support. It is enough for the Government, therefore, to meet any charge connected with the College, by saying that it is in successful operation. When the hon. gentleman says that it is no improvement upon the old Academy, I beg to differ from him, and I have no doubt that a personal visit would have the effect of inducing him to change his opinion. The College presents a vast improvement, under the able management of its talented principal, over the Academy; and I trust that the day is not far distant when its influence will be felt over the length and breadth of the Island, if supported as it should be. True it is, that the late Government kept up the Academy, but in such a manner that in 1859 the Legislature thought it unwise to expend the public money upon it, and granted but £3 for repairs.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—That fact shows that the building was in a good state of repair.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—It became the duty of the Government to make the building a credit instead of a disgrace to the Island, and the exterior of the building alone now offers to the passer by an aspect very different from that it presented of yore.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—What of Government House?

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—It is unnecessary that I should refer to that, after the statements made this morning by the hon. member Col. Gray. It will be time enough to discuss it when the accounts connected with it shall be before the House, when I have no fear of their being found satisfactory. As that gentleman stated this morning, if we are not prepared to dispense with a Lieut. Governor, we must have a decent house for him to live in. The late Lieutenant Governor, by message, declared the building not fit for his successor to occupy; and surely the hon. member (Mr. Coles) will admit that Sir Dominick Daly's long residence in Government House qualified him to form a reliable opinion on the subject. I think, however, that an inspection of the improvements which have been made would satisfy the hon. member as to the futility of his objections. To revert to the subject of Education; when the hon. gentleman charges the Government with a want of forethought in not providing means to meet the demands consequent upon the constantly increasing number of schools, I ask why it was that for nine long years of his tenure of office no adequate provision was made to prevent the evil of which we now complain. He must have known that the Educational institutions would naturally increase, as well as other branches of the public service. Able financiers have doubted the soundness of the policy of imposing taxes to meet the full amount of the current expenses of Government. I do not advocate the policy of burdening the energies of a young country by heavy taxation, but a moderate debt would not have that effect. The Hon. Joseph Pope, while a member of this House, was of this opinion. He argued that Government should not be tied down to the exact amount of revenue—that it was quite legitimate that posterity should bear a portion of expenditure, of which they would receive the benefit. This principle is acknowledged by the Imperial Parliament. If it were not for her national debt Britain would not occupy her present proud position. The same policy, to a limited extent, may be applied to a young and growing country. It is, of course, advisable, where possible, to keep the expenditure within the limits of the revenue, but that is not always practicable. I do not intend to go into the details of other items of expenditure and of the causes which rendered them necessary. My honorable colleague (Mr. Haviland) will give the Committee full information with regard to them. I may mention, however, that the visit of the Prince of Wales cost some £3000. The great Exhibition of the industry of all nations to be held in England in May next, rendered it an imperative duty on the part of the Government to see that the products and manufactures of the Island should be represented there. This necessarily entailed some expense. The Volunteer force was also the cause of another exceptional outlay. The grant for that service will be justified by public opinion. The organization of that force was necessary, and was, and will be, approved by the people. As to the deficiency of the revenue, referred to in His Excellency's Speech, it amounts to but £1100. It is matter of congratulation that the decrease is no greater. I would not have been surprised had it amounted to some £6000 or £7000. The interruption to our extensive and rapidly increasing trade with the States, consequent upon the political convulsions which have been and are agitating that country, has necessarily affected the financial and commercial position of the community. Had it not been for that circumstance, it is reasonable to suppose that the revenue of last year would have exceeded that of the preceding by £6000 or £7000. It became, under the circumstances, a matter of impossibility that the revenue should cover the expenditure voted under a condition of affairs which had subsequently ceased to exist.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—As my hon. friend has referred to me in connection with the financial state of the Colony, it becomes my duty to address the committee. When I came to the House this morning I was at a loss to know whether the Opposition would follow the courteous and graceful example set by the leaders of the Opposition in the Assembly of Nova Scotia, who waived all discussion on the address, purposing to meet the measures of the Government as they arose. But, Mr. Chairman, the leaders of our Opposition have been so long concocting their schemes against the Government, that if they did not promulgate them without loss of time, they would meet the fate of the frog in the fable. They could not wait till the various matters came up before the House. But, Sir, I can tell the hon. leader of the Opposition, in answer to the slur he threw out against the Government this morning, when he said that the main object of the majority was to make the debate on this question and all others as short as possible, that we are prepared to meet him on any and every public question which may come up for discussion. It may suit that hon. member to make charges against the present Government, but in his conscience he knows that if the conduct of this Government were put into the scales against that of the last, his side would speedily kick the beam. The hon. member found fault with the Speech because it contained no allusion to the Volunteer movement. He is rather difficult to please on this as on a good many other subjects, for when the subject was introduced into the Speech last year he was so dissatisfied with the subject that he branded the Volunteers as being an Orange faction. He opposed the Bill for their organization, and he voted against the grant which was proposed for them; but, Sir, on that occasion he was left in a miserable fragment of a minority. But, Mr. Chairman, I was not a little surprised and amused at the new character in which he exhibited himself this morning. He appeared, forsooth, as a teacher of English grammar. He complained of the style of the paragraph before us. Well, Sir, whoever will take the trouble to look at the amendment to that paragraph will come to the conclusion, that so far from having been abroad when the leader of the Opposition penned that precious document, the schoolmaster must have been locked in, and very securely too. As to the deficiency of the revenue, which he makes a ground of censure against us, I have not the slightest unwillingness to contrast the excess of expenditure over revenue for the three years during which the present Government has been in power, with the last period of the same extent, while that hon. member held the reins, when he

> "Was monarch of all he surveyed,
> When his right there was none to dispute."

The present Government, since it has been in power, has expended £27,042 13s. 7½d. more than the Revenue, and Mr. Coles and his Government expended £26,745 12s. 1½d. more than the Revenue during the last three years of their tenure of office. Yet with those figures before him, he presumes to get up and lecture the Government and tell us that we are not competent to manage the finances of the Colony. If he will take the trouble to examine the accounts, he will find how the different balances arose, and he will discover that the present Government has more to show for our expenditure than he has for his. We have bought the Selkirk Estate and Lot 54.

Hon. Mr. COLES—We purchased the Worrel Estate.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—Yes, but not within the last three years of your power. Every farthing of the amounts paid for the two properties we bought will be repaid, which we all know is more than can be expected in the case of the Worrel Estate. I was, Sir, astonished at the course of the hon. gentleman on the subject of the cost of the Educational system of the Island. He blames the Government for the natural and inevitable expansion of the system of which he has ever vaunted himself the author. Oh! what narrow-minded, miserable political charlatanry for such complaint to emanate from such a source! I believe he would have been but too happy if the Government had crushed the system. Had such been the case, we would hear long and loud repetitions of the aspirations of former days, when he expressed the hope that the day would speedily arrive when every man, woman and child in Prince Edward Island would be able to read and write. I will now read some of the extraordinary items of expenditure connected with the various branches of the public service since we held the reins of Government, in order to show how we have exceeded the Revenue. The additional Master to the Normal School, £120; the repairs and improvements to the Prince of Wales College, £716; the extra salaries of the Professor and the Master of the College over that of the Masters of the old Academy, £238; the Land Commission expenses, £728; taking the Census, £586; the Selkirk Estate, £13,987 16s. 7d.; Lot 54, £3066 9s. 8d.; interest on the balance of Selkirk Estate, £342 10s. 0d.; the reception of the Prince of Wales, £3000; the Volunteers, £400; repairs to the three County Jails, £852; grant for the International Exhibition, £500; increase of 6 members to the House of Assembly, £600; loss of Land Tax on Selkirk and Lot 54 Estates, £200; increase on Education for three years, £6000; amount charged against present Government in 1859, but which was spent by Mr. Coles's Government in 1858 and 1859, and ought to have been charged to them as appears by the Report of the Committee on Public Accounts in 1860, £5600, making in the whole the sum of £37,000 or £10,000 more than the debt we are charged with by the Leader of the Opposition. Beside these facts, I ask the honorable member to contrast the credit of the present Government with that of which he was the Leader in 1859. Where was then the confidence of the public in his administration? At that time Treasury Warrants were at a ruinous discount—at a discount which was a robbery of every schoolmaster, contractor, and public officer in the Colony. The Government of that day had to seek the solace of Jews' Alley, they paid to a merchant of Halifax 7½ per cent as discount on warrants. At present there are thousands of pounds lying ready for investment in warrants at par, and, I believe, a small premium could be obtained. The Government need adduce no stronger proof that the public repose confidence in their administration of the public affairs of the Island. Yet, Mr. Chairman, with these facts staring him in the face and patent and notorious to the whole country, he presumes to lecture us on political economy. To qualify himself for that only, I recommend him to go to school for a while. It will not do to cram bunkum down our throats, with reference to our financial management, when warrants are at a par. His arguments are ridiculous and fallacious. He must have drank of the waters of oblivion and must suppose that we on this side of the House have partaken of them also, if he imagines for a moment that the circumstances to which I allude have been forgotten. The hon. member charged the Government with having bribed the schoolmasters with an increase of salary to advocate their cause at the hustings. As far as I am concerned, and I am sure that I can speak for my colleagues, the imputation is groundless. He has accused us also of having appointed a political partizan to the office of School Visitor. Really, Mr. Chairman, when I heard such a complaint and remembered the antecedents of the hon. member in connection with that situation, I could scarcely refrain from laughing outright. Does he forget Mr. Stark whom he dismissed from office because he would not consent to become a political partizan? Dismissed, because expressly invited to the Island to introduce Stowe's scholastic system, he wished to carry it into practice in its integrity, by having the Bible read in the schools!

Hon. Mr. COLES—I deny that Mr. Stark was so dismissed.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—Mr. Chairman, I am content to leave that question to the decision of public opinion and the knowledge of the facts possessed by the people of the Island. But, Sir, who came next? Whom did the Government of the day nominate as successor to Mr. Stark? Mr. Blake Irving. Not by any means a political partizan. Oh no! Quite the reverse. He did not write in the 'Examiner,' abusing one of the most worthy and estimable men and best officers in the Island, the former Postmaster General, the deceased Mr. Owen—a gentleman who meddled not in the political struggles of rival parties, but attended to the duties of his office with unremitting and exemplary zeal. The partizan pen of Mr. Irving was not idle on the events of the three days session. If the office of School Visitor is, as that hon. member stated, a political one, he and his party made it so, and we cannot be blamed by him if we should have followed the example thus set us. I shall not trespass further on the time of the Committee, as I shall have other opportunities of addressing it during the progress of the debate. I rose merely to notice some of the remarks of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, because he is the greatest violator of principles propounded by himself.

Hon. Mr. COLES. As to violation of professed principles, the Hon. member affords quite a striking instance in his own person. I must however, do him the justice to state that he has made a good speech in a bad cause. But, Sir, I will not review some of the statements in that speech, and shall be as brief as possible in doing so. With reference to the Volunteers, what I said was, that from the fact of four hundred pounds having been granted for the service last Session, and in view of the disturbed condition of the United States, some reference to them should have been contained in His Excellency's Speech. In fact, from the promotions which have been made in that body, I thought it likely that it would constitute the most prominent topic. The Hon. member says that the late Government dismissed Mr. Stark from the School-Visitorship. Now, Sir, I deny it. What are the facts of the case? Mr. Stark was engaged by the late liberal Government at a Salary of £200 a year. The Royal Agricultural Society believing him competent, agreed to give him £100 per annum as a lecturer on Agricultural Chemistry. He represented himself as qualified for the duty. When the term of his engagement with the Society was about expiring, that body, on the motion, not of any member of the Liberal Party, but of a member of the Legislative Council, and a member of the present Government, the Hon. Jeremiah Simpson, resolved to withdraw the grant of £100. The Society having communicated their resolution to the Governme nt, that body, in discharge of its duty, notified Mr. Stark of the action taken by the Agricultural Society. In consequence of the withdrawal of the grant from the Society, Mr. Stark resigned his office of School-Visitor, and not on account of the agitation of the so-called Bible question. But, at the instigation of the Tory party, he was, I believe, induced to say that that question led to his loss of office. The minutes of the Executive Council will verify my statements as to the circumstances under which the School Visitorship became vacant. The Tory members were opposed to him, as knowing nothing about agricultural chemistry.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND. Mr. Stark, however, said that his advocacy of the introduction of the Bible into the schools led to his dismissal.

Hon. Mr. COLES—If he said so, he must have stated what was untrue. With reference to what has been said on the subject of Education, I contend that the Government were bound to provide for the expence necessarily incident to its expansion. Because the late Government calculated to pay about £9000 for the support of some two hundred schools, it is absurd to say that when the present Government came into power and added one hundred to the number of schools, and as a matter of course, made an equal addition to the number of teachers, and also increased their salaries, that not they, but their predecessors should have provided the means of defraying the additional charge. The hon. member for Georgetown has referred to the increased amounts for the Prince of Wales College and the Normal School, and to the cost of the visit of the Prince of Wales, as items of extraordinary expenditure. There will always be some extra sums to be provided, but, Sir, does he forget the £3000 the late Government voted towards the patriotic fund? Sir, the present Government have not expended on the roads and bridges within £5000 or £3000 a year, as much as we did when in power. The hon. leader of the Government stated that that the bridges are in a very dilapidated state. It is not to be wondered at, if they should be in such a state of Government House, through which the hon. leader put half of it. With reference to the debt of the Colony, the hon. member for Georgetown admits that in the three years of the present Government the expenditure has exceeded the revenue some £20,000. This admission affords a striking proof of the Governments adherence to their pledges to the people. They made great professions of their intention to diminish the then debt of the Island; instead of doing so, they have largely increased it, and that under a higher tariff than the late Government imposed. When we were in office, we generally saved some £2000 or £3000 a year, to provide for the construction of important public works. The Liberals were in power nine years, and during that period they incurred a debt of not more than £9000, and they purchased the Worrell Estate and Lot 11. They constructed heavy public works, bridges, lighthouses, &c., besides paying the Legislative Council.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—I must inform the hon. member that the accounts for the purchase of the Worrell estate appear in the journal of 1855, and therefore have nothing to do with the comparative statement I made, which dated from 1856.

Hon. Mr. COLES—Well, if the money was expended in 1855 it was saved in other years. The hon. member has boasted of Treasury Warrants being now at par, and cites that fact as a proof of public confidence in his Government. Well, Sir, the reason why the Warrants issued by the late administration were at one time at a discount was, that when the Bank was established, some £30,000 were required to be paid into its vaults, and that necessarily depreciated the Warrants. Instead of a diminished revenue, the Government, I maintain, should have shewn an increase. The farmers have had good crops and have obtained good prices for their produce, and when such is the case, the revenue receives a proportionate increase. I am glad to hear that the affairs of the Stanfield estate have afforded me so much satisfaction to the Government, but it appears that up to the present time but £800 have been received from it. What portion of that property has been sold has been disposed of to favorites of the Government. Parties residing in the neighborhood, on application, were told that the land was not for them—that it was intended for parties resident in Nova Scotia. As it seems, Sir, that the Land Commission has cost the country £728., I hope that the long expected Award will soon be received and laid before the House and country. The reference to opposition in the House of Assembly in Nova Scotia, made by the hon. member for Georgetown, was not very appropriate. The leading public question in that country, is the Railway policy of the Government, as the Land Question is with us. Mr. Johnston, the leader of the opposition, thought it not worth while to get up a discussion which would not lead to any result. The hon. member, Mr. Longworth, has stated that the Hon. Joseph Pope was of opinion that it was not good policy to impose an amount of taxation equal to the current expenses of the year. That opinion may, perhaps, be safely acted upon in countries possessing responsible departmental government, as in Great Britain; but I can assure the hon. member that when Mr. Pope was a member of the Government, he was as anxious as any one to keep the expenditure within the revenue. He also claimed credit for the Government, as being honest and constitutional. As to the honesty of the Government, I shall not say anything; but a more unconstitutional system never existed since the concession of Responsible Government. Some excuse must be found for their having abandoned the principle of Responsible Government, by excluding heads of departments from the Legislature. When their party came back from the hustings with a majority of only two, they naturally felt that if any of them took office and went back for election, some might not be returned. The essence of Responsible Government is the privilege it gives the people of expressing their opinions on the policy of the Government, by a re-election or rejection of its principal officers. The hon. member stated that if a farthing were added to the taxes, I would cry out against it. Sir, it is a bad rule which will not work both ways. The late Government added 1½ per cent. to the tariff, to meet the deficiency of the revenue. Then a great cry was raised against us. We were charged with oppressing the people by an immoderate taxation. That addition has enabled the present Government to defray a portion of the expense of education. When the Liberals went into power, the revenue of the Colony was about £22,000, and when they went out, it had increased some £20,000. At that time education cost between £13,000 and £14,000. The increase consequently paid the whole charge of education, and left £6000 applicable to the general purposes of Government. The members of the present Government argue that the proceeds of the land tax should cover the expense of education. That is absurd: it was never dreamt of; it would be most unfair to lay all the burden of the educational system upon the owners of land, because many receive benefits of that system who own no land, and therefore it is but just that the balance should come out of the general revenue. As to the grant for representing the Island at the great Exhibition, the hon. member, Mr. Longworth, may flatter himself that the Government have done a great deal towards that object, and that the people will approve of their action in the matter; but, Sir, they did nothing at all until the Charlottetown Debating Club took up the subject. They did not do justice to the people of the Colony; instead of making a bargain with a speculator, they should have come down with the despatch, and thus have given the people ample time to prepare the articles they might have wished to transmit. This course was adopted in other Colonies.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH—Not in Newfoundland.

Hon Mr. COLES—Newfoundland is in a very different situation from this Island. It has no manufactures. Tradesmen and farmers have complained of the shortness of time which was afforded them to prepare for the Exhibition. Several farmers have stated to me that the samples of grain sent are not of as good quality as could have been procured.

Mr. Beer—I do not intend, Mr. Chairman, to follow the last speaker through his various statements. I merely intend to refer to the comparative statement of revenue and expenditure for the separate periods of 3 years of the late and present administration, as made by the hon. member from Georgetown. By that it appears that in the last three years of the late Government, the expenditure exceeded the revenue by about £27,000, without their having purchased any land. The present Government show an excess of about the same amount, but out of that sum, they can shew about £16,000 paid for the purchase of land. This proves to my satisfaction that, if the late Government had continued in office for the last 3 years, the debt of the Island would have been £20,000 more that it is at present. The present Government are, in my opinion, entitled to the thanks of the Country. I now, in accordance with the rule we adopted, move that the Speaker take the Chair.

The House adjourned.

TUESDAY, 25th Feb.

Hon. Speaker laid on the table a copy of the Report of the Commissioners of the Asylum for the deaf and dumb, in Halifax, Nova Scotia.

Committee on the Address resumed.

Hon. Mr. COLES—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for the city (Mr. Beer) stated that the late Government would have spent in the last three years £20,000 more than the present Government have done, had they remained in office. I do not know on what facts he bases his assertions, but I do know that the expenditure of the last year of the liberal Government did not exceed the revenue of the previous one. The depressed state of business in 1859 caused a difference in our revenue of £10,000. Had we continued in power, we would not have gone on incurring debt, as the hon. member alleged, for we had saved from the revenues of previous years considerable sums to provide for the construction of heavy public works. We built the new ferry wharf at the foot of Prince Street, and rebuilt that at South portwhich had been carried away. But, Sir, apart from those considerations, it will not do for the Government to say that they are doing no worse than the Liberals did when they held the reins. The present party came in expressly pledged to do better, and if they were not expected to do so, why were the Liberals turned out of office? But a bad excuse is better than none at all. The Government admits that the excess of expenditure over income in the three years they have been in power is greater by some £3000 than that of their predecessors for the same length of time. The hon. member, Mr. Haviland, advanced one statement which I cannot allow to pass without allusion. He said that between the end of our last financial year and the establishment of the new Government, we had expended £4000 or £5000 which had come into the accounts of the following year. He well knows that any Government must pay its current expenses. The quarterly salaries of the public officers must be paid, and he should bear in mind that, out of the sum he referred to, the expenses of two general elections had to be defrayed. I have no doubt, Sir, that the Government has paid thousands since the end of the last financial year.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—Not one.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—Well, Sir, that will be seen when the public accounts are before us.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—All the Warrants we have issued will be borne on this year's Revenue.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—It has been admitted that some advances have been made, therefore the Government must have advanced more than the House authorized.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—In the sum to which I referred which was £5600, there was one item of no less amount than £3301. 11s. 10d., the Warrant for which in favor of the vendors of the Worrell Estate had been ordered by the Hon. Member's Government and issued by the present.

Hon. Mr. COLES—Well, Sir, the Government have received £6000 out of that estate. The warrant referred to, was made out to pay into the Court of Chancery at the time when the vendors of the Worrel Estate had proceeded against the Government for a claim which we disputed. We were told by our professional advisers that it was expedient to deposit that amount to abide the event of the suit. The Government has now been three years in power; but during that period, they have paid nothing on account of that estate, although we were accused by them, when they were in opposition, of being guilty of dishonesty, in not having satisfied the claim of the vendors. If they were sincere in the opinions they expressed at that time, they ought to have paid the claim before this.

Hon. Mr. POPE—Mr. Chairman, the whole of this discussion is irregular in the extreme. All this debate about the comparative expenditure for the last three years' of the two administrations can be gone into with much greater propriety, when the public accounts shall have been submitted to the House. This is not the proper time to take up such a question. The paragraph in the address, which has given rise to this irrelevant and irregular discussion is merely expressive of the thanks of this House to His Excellency, for having ordered that the public accounts for the past year shall be laid before us, and of our regret that the revenue has not covered the expenditure. The amendment moved by the hon. leader of the opposition does not refer to Education—that subject might, not inappropriately, be discussed now. But a general attack on the government, and a discussion of all and every charge that the leader of the opposition and his party can rake up against it should be made, not on an occasion such as the present, but when the speaker is in the chair. That hon. member has charged the government with having added some £6000 or £7000 a year to the cost of education, and stated that his government never contemplated drawing from the general revenue, on this account, more than £9000; but, sir, in 1854 it absorbed £11000. The amendment coincides with the original paragraph, in the expression of regret at the difference between revenue and expenditure; but I cannot give him credit for sincerity as I have no doubt that he is exceedingly happy in the reflection that the difference exists.

Hon. Mr. HENSLEY—Mr. Chairman, the Opposition have been twitted with the course pursued by the House of Assembly in Nova Scotia, which body, in order that no time might be lost in giving expression to the public feeling with reference to the death of the Prince Consort, passed the Address unanimously. We have been recommended by hon. members on the other side to adopt a similar course on this occasion. We might have done so, if here, as there, the Address had been merely an echo of the speech. But, Sir, when topics of discussion are introduced into this Address which are not referred to in the speech to which it is intended as a reply—when the majority see fit to travel out of the record, the blame of delay must rest with those who have challenged discussion unnecessarily, by inserting in the Address an expression of opinion] uncalled for by his Excellency's speech. I regret as much as any hon. member, that the expenditure for the past year should have exceeded the revenue, but when we are told in the Address that it is impossible to equalize the expenditure with the revenue, because a certain portion of that revenue has been appropriated to one particular branch of the public service, (I refer to Education) I submit that it is unfair to this side of the House to ask us to give an opinion on a statement of facts, the correctness of which we have no means of ascertaining. The members of the Government have had access to the public accounts and until members on this side of the House shall have had an opportunity of examining those documents, it is premature to call upon them for confirmation of a statement, the truth of which they have no opportunity of testing. If the Government, in possession of all the information on which to found their opinion, have come to the deliberate conclusion that under the existing Education system it is impossible to keep the revenue within the expenditure, it becomes their bounden duty to provide a remedy for such a state of things. It will not do to postpone from Session to Session action on a subject which requires instant and effectual redress. It is unprecedented for a Government to come before the Legislature with the declaration that the excess of expenditure over revenue was constantly increasing—and that they did not intend to adopt any measures to remedy the evil—that they would continue to hold office and allow the debt to accumulate, because the system which led to the embarrassment in the public finances emanated from political opponents. Sir, if the policy of the party which introduced the present system of Education has been found by their successors in office to be wrong, I cannot for a moment allow the excuse that because their predecessors had introduced the system, they incurred no responsibility, if they allowed it to operate unchanged to the disadvantage of the country. It is not sufficient for the Government to say to the party opposed to them, "You inaugurated the system, which now bears so heavily upon all the revenues of the Colony; we do not intend to trouble ourselves about it. It may take its course. Its continuance may involve the country in ruin, but we will perpetuate it as a blot upon your name." Hon. members on the other side may consider that such treatment of such a matter may be very good policy in a party point of view, but the financial state of the Colony demands the serious attention of members on both sides of the House; and I trust that when the matter shall be fairly and legitimately before us, members of both sides will give it their best attention. For the reasons I have given, Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the amendment; but if the majority will strike out the paragraph which attributes to the Education system the excess of expenditure over revenue, I will have no objection to vote for it. The statement in the Address that it is impossible to keep the outlay commensurate with the income, imposes the absolute necessity of either reducing their expenditure or increasing the tariff.

W. M. HOWE, Reporter.

SUMMARY.

SATURDAY, 1st March.

Hon. Messrs. Perry and Thornton, and Messrs. John Yeo, Doyle and Howat were appointed a Committee on new lines of road.

Hon. Col. Gray from the Joint Committee of both branches of the Legislature, reported an Address of Condolence to Her Majesty on the subject of the death of the late Prince Consort.

The Address, which was unanimously agreed to, is as follows:—

TO THE QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN;

We, Your Majesty's faithful subjects, the Legislative Council and House of Assembly of the Island of Prince Edward, in Parliament convened, beg leave to approach Your Throne with sentiments of loyalty and attachment to Your Royal Person.

It is with unfeigned sympathy that we tender to Your Majesty our heartfelt Condolence at the untimely death of His Royal Highness Prince Albert, Your Majesty's illustrious and beloved Consort; and it is our sincere prayer that in this trying and inscrutable dispensation of Divine Providence, Your Majesty and Your Illustrious Family may receive all the comfort and consolation which the Almighty in His benignity can impart.

In common with Your Majesty's devoted subjects throughout the Empire, we mourn the death of His Royal Highness, and deem this melancholy event to be a loss irreparable to the Nation.

The Address in answer to the Speech, which passed last evening, was presented to His Excellency, who made the following reply:—

Mr Speaker and Gentlemen of the House of Assembly;

I receive your Address with much satisfaction, and I thank you for the assurance of assistance which it contains.

You may rely on my desire to co-operate with you in all measures for the public good.

Mr. Holm obtained leave of absence till Monday afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Haviland introduced a general Act for the naturalization of aliens; also

A Bill authorizing limited liability in partnership.

Both were read a first time, and ordered for a second reading on Monday.

Hon Col. Gray presented a petition from certain inhabitants of Murray Harbor, praying an alteration in the standard of grain—received and laid on the table.

Also, Circular Despatch, announcing the death of Prince Albert.

He also reported joint Address to the Lieutenant Governor, requesting him to forward their Address of Condolence to Her Majesty.

CORRESPONDENCE.

FOR THE EXAMINER.

NOTES OF A TRAVELLER.

(*Continued.*)

N. But, pray explain to me how you think we New Londoners or other tenantry can refrain from paying rents without the consent of the proprietary claimants and their agents?

B. I would be sorry to suppose you or your neighbours quite so destitute of fact or information on that subject as to need instructions from me. I don't suppose you New Londoners are less than 400 or 500 hardy honest but determined farmers, able enough, if only willing and united, to take care of themselves; and suppose these men have not the means or the will to pay rents, and that a Sheriff or constable be found foolhardy enough to be instigated by the landlord or his lackey to levy or distrain for rents—and suppose on making his appearance, and making known his business in a settlement, a gong or a horn be sounded by a boy or a girl, and upon the hearing of such sound a few hundred able bodied men make their appearance, in a very peaceable attitude, with their hands in their pockets, who politely bow to the man of lawful authority, and wish him better employment, while a few sturdy matrons and their daughters signify their prior right to the property in cows, horses, pigs, sheep, &c., but that rather the officer should leave without some reward, they would call their little boys who had some *tar and feathers*, which should be generously dealt out to him, if needed,—and suppose the said matrons politely informed the legal functionary *ere he absquatulated*, that they were willing to sell their stock to pay for the land on the same terms that the Worrell or Selkirk properties were sold for,—and suppose such proceedings took place all over the Island,—what remedy could the proprietors adopt to better their circumstances, save and except to sell out to the tenants at once and for ever?

N. Your doctrine may be very plausible, keeping as it does within the bounds of law; but you know that in order to come to any general move of that kind we Protestants should unite with Catholics; and Mr. Secretary Pope tells us in the 'Islander' that if we don't keep the Catholics down, the Pope of Rome, Pius the 9th, will come over here amongst us, and take away our name and nation!

B. Oh, yes, it may be very natural for Mr. Pope to wish to retain his present salary, and whether at the expense of the Catholics or Protestants, or both, few will believe that he cares one single straw. Most of the tenants in the Island know very well that Mr. Pope is agent for some proprietors, that his brother claims to be a proprietor—that he is the paid servant of our present proprietary Tory Government—that he attempted to extract the prices of new leases from the Westmorland tenantry; and that money, whether in salary or fees, is the religion which is nearest to his heart. He knows right well that in case a Liberal Government came into power, which would do justice to the tenantry, he would be dismissed; and he knows equally well that a Liberal Government would not be long in power when the usurping land claimants would be compelled to sell their lands at the same rates at which the St. Peters' and the Belfast Estates have been disposed of; and consequently there would be no more land agencies for worthless or castaway lawyers to fatten on. If Mr. Pope expected that Catholics would, if in power, retain him with his present salary, he would turn bangman to put the rope round the necks of every Protestant in Prince Edward Island, rather than that they should stand in the way of his own aggrandizement. He is well aware, that if the tenants in all or most sections of the Island come to a determination before the next general election, to be free, that is, to have their lands on the same terms as our Belfast lands have been sold to the occupying tenants, there is no power on earth to control them. He tells us Protestants that we are 10,000 more numerous than our Catholic fellow Colonists; then what opinion must he have of our independence, if he wants to persuade us that we would be worse Protestants if we were freeholders than we are while slaves under the tyranny of the landlords? Or does he think that he can embitter us so much against our Catholic neighbours that we will remain ourselves slaves to our greedy proprietors, for sake of keeping Catholics also slaves? No, no—we shall all unite in the good cause to shake off the vampire of landlordism, and after we all become freeholders, we can inform Mr. Pope that our Protestant views or principles are quite as safe in our own keeping as they would be in his while we were the slaves of those by whom he is employed. Are not freemen always more virtuous, valorous and industrious than slaves? For my own part I can't be charged with any special favouritism towards Catholics, but at the same time I must admit that the few of them who became freeholders on the Selkirk property are quite as good neighbours and subjects as they were while slaves to the proprietor.

N. I understand, then, from your general views that although you are a freeholder yourself, you nevertheless can sympathize with the "bleeding tenantry" in other parts of the Colony.

B. Yes, it would be a barbarous feeling to think otherwise after my long residence in an unfortunate Island, where I so frequently witnessed the disastrous consequences of the leasehold system, and the many privations which poor emigrants had to endure while subduing as much of the wilderness as would enable them to raise a scanty pittance of the commonest food for themselves and their little ones. I never cared about Coles or his party, but I cannot shut my eyes to the fact, that it was some party who enacted in the face of the greatest possible opposition from the Tories and landlords, the Land Purchase Bill, by means of which the Worrell Estate and Lot Eleven were secured for the tenantry; and only for that same Bill the Selkirk property could not have been purchased. And although that model Protestant, Mr. Secretary Pope, would now make us believe that if Coles got into power again he would employ the Catholics to cut our throats, yet we must not forget that Coles was nearly eight years in power and the Protestants escaped unhurt, while he made the commencement of freeing the tenantry from the merciless pangs of the landlords. One thing is, however, certain, that is, that as soon as Coles gets in, Pope gets out; and hence the love, the kindly Christian feeling in the Protestant stomach of the latter towards the former as well as towards all who wish to see the tenants free.

N. Well, now, my friend, having ascertained so many of your enlightened and matured views, I am desirous, ere we part, to have your opinion on the Land Commission, and more especially that part of it, or in connection with which the "Land Spy" system was adopted. I mean the information got up by means of Whitman, who passed himself off among the unsuspecting farmers as an Engineer and Agent for a Railway and Fishing Company, while our Tory Government afforded him an office, with fuel and light, in the Colonial Building, under the tutelage of Mr. Secretary Pope, and found him also a clerk assistant in the person of Mr. Bevan?

B. Well, I am really sorry you have put such a question to me, not that I think there can be a second opinion entertained by any disinterested honest man in the Island, whether freeholder or tenant, with respect to that abominably atrocious proceeding. There is no character which has been held in such detestation and abhorrence in all ages and in all countries—call him approver, spy, informer, or what you will—he is still the same loathsome and despised personage wherever he goes. He is the tool of the despot—the agent of arbitrary power—the tempter of the depraved—the betrayer of the innocent—the hated of man; and it is to be feared, the accursed of God. Yet, also, wherever there is hypocrisy with power to reward such a character will be generally found. But whether the employers or the employed are most to be despised and detested, I am not at present about to decide. I wish, however, to remark, ere parting, on the old saying, that "when rogues quarrel honest men come by their own;" then if we take the reverse, when such characters unite in the dark to plot and contrive their machinations, what chance have the poor honest tenantry of obtaining either justice or fair play under such circumstances?

EDUCATION AND THE CHURCH.

No. 6.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTESTANT.

Sir;

Every person who is acquainted with history and who does not wish to be numbered amongst "illiterate agitators," must confess that the Popes have ever been the zealous friends of Christian freedom of thought and of the cultivation of the mind. Such being the case, it is not a little surprising that in this age of boasted enlightenment there are found Editors of Journals, and even office-bearers of Literary Institutes, who so far expose their ignorance as to insinuate that the Catholic Church holds that "Ignorance is the mother of devotion!" The Popes have, indeed, established the 'Index Expurgatorius' for the purpose of combatting and suppressing, as much as possible, the licentiousness of the Press, by which—to use the words of the 'Provincial Wesleyan' of the 12th instant—"Religion has been degraded from its lofty elevation to meet the basest purposes of the vilest minds; reason's noblest powers have been compelled too frequently to minister at the altars of folly and crime; and Holy Scriptures—given by inspiration, preserved by miracle—have been not merely misapplied, but arraigned before the bar of human curiosity and tortured into a seeming testimony against their own most righteous and stringent principles."

Many Protestants, whose candor contrasts strongly with the carping of the Editor of the 'Protestant,' ac