occasion to take up the pen for the same purpose; and succeeded, as I thought, in administering a sound drubbing to the ardent admirers of that arch-hypocrite and scoundrel Cromwell. I, as well as many others, have no doubt been somewhat disappointed in our expectations; and the *gallant* Capt. Orlebar may sincerely congratulate himself on the spread of his inconsistent doctrines. It can surprise no one who considers the example given by its leaders on last winter, that the Young Men's *Christian* Association and Literary Institute should propose for discussion within a twelvemonth after the eulogistic lectures delivered before this institution, on Cromwell and Hampden—"Whether the beheading of Charles I. was justifiable?" and carry the question in the affirmative,—and that, too, under the very *ægis* of the Establishment and officers of the Crown. The Ch.Town Debating Club, from the members of which better might have been expected, also lent its influence to foster an opinion which must be viewed with alarm by every one who has a due regard for the continuance of the connection between the N. A. Colonies and the mother country. Ross's Weekly, then, as it would seem, was but the exponent of a growing disloyal sentiment, and on that account entitled to an honor which it seldom receives—that of being noticed by its contemporaries.

In pursuance of the promise contained in my last I now proceed to adduce some further evidence on the subject under consideration. No intelligent person, I presume, will affirm that the trial and beheading of Charles was in consonance either with the ancient laws of the realm, or the wishes of the people of England. Historians of different shades of politics and religious views are unanimous in affirming the negative, although the editor of Ross's Weekly asserts the contrary; and I may, therefore, dismiss this part of my subject, and proceed to the enquiry, Was the beheading of Charles justifiable? It is not my intention to exculpate Charles in defending what *he* considered the rights or prerogatives of the Crown, but which, if admitted, must be considered in the present day as subversive of popular rights. This acknowledgment, however, does not prevent us from offering in palliation, not in exculpation, of these encroachments, his own erroneous instructions as to the rights of the crown, the uncertainty or indefiniteness of those prerogatives, and the violence and stubbornness of his parliament; and in deposing him—a punishment, in my opinion, greater than the offence, was meted out. The friends of Charles urge, and with much truth and force, that the precedents of former reigns furnished him with a decent pretext for all his proceedings. To the intelligent reader it may be deemed unnecessary to refer to the reigns of Elizabeth and James for the exercise of those powers which were deemed tyrannical when exercised by Charles. It will not be necessary to examine at any great length the grounds of difference between Charles and his subjects, suffice it to say that in levying taxes without the authority of an act of parliament—in confining insolent traitors by his mere mandate, he had the precedent set him by his predecessor. James was never accounted a tyrant, although he invaded the liberties of his subjects quite as much as did Charles. Elizabeth has been styled the mother of her people, even while history informs us that the lives of her subjects of a particular creed were in continual jeopardy. Nor was the Star-Chamber less active during their reigns than during that of Charles. Now why is this? The answer obviously is, that fanaticism has not yet lost its power of fascination on certain minds, and the beheading of Charles having been perpetrated by a faction who assumed a superior sanctity, cannot fail to find favor in the eyes of many of our own day, who consider themselves shining lights in spiritual matters, and who are always ready to connive at any piece of injustice or rascality perpetrated by ostentatious "Saints."

As to the opinions of Carlyle and D'Aubigne on the beheading of Charles, they are considered by the learned and moderate men of all parties as next to worthless. Even Macaulay does not escape the charge of partiality and violence when impeaching the character of the king. The "bloody" parliaments of that reign were more reprehensible, and had more influence in bringing about the evils and disorders for which that period is distinguished, than the acts of the king. In fact, the parliaments were the disgrace of the nation, and might be styled what Lord Denman styled trial by jury in Ireland at a certain trial—"a mockery, a delusion, and a snare." The trial and execution of Stafford and Laud afford an apt illustration of this truth. The Earl of Stafford, being the most able and devoted champion of the crown, was the first victim signalled out for vengeance by that Parliament, whose violence and utter disregard for all law merit the contempt of posterity. By some it may be argued that the Parliament was actuated by motives of justice in demanding that he, as the greatest enemy of popular liberty, be brought to trial. Let us hear what Hume says, vol. v. p.p. 152-4: "Immediately after Stafford was sequestered from parliament, and confined in the Tower, a Committee of thirteen was chosen by the lower house, and intrusted with the office of preparing a charge against him. These, joined to a small committee of lords, were vested with authority to examine all witnesses, to call for any paper, and to use any means of scrutiny, with regard to any part of the Earl's behaviour and conduct. After so general and unbounded an inquisition, exercised by such powerful and implacable enemies, a man must have been very cautious or very innocent, not to afford during the whole course of his life some matter of accusation against him.

"This committee, by direction from both houses, took an oath of secrecy; a practice very unusual, and which gave them the appearance of conspirators, more than ministers of justice. But the intention of this strictness was, to render it more difficult for the Earl to elude their search, or to prepare for his justification.

"An accusation carried on by the united effort of three kingdoms against one man, unprotected by power, unassisted by counsel, discountenanced by authority, was likely to prove a very unequal contest; yet such were the capacity, genius and presence of mind, displayed by this magnanimous statesman, that, while argument, and reason, and law had any place, he obtained an undisputed victory, and he perished at last, overwhelmed, and still unsubdued, by the open violence of his fierce and unrelenting enemies." ROYALIST.

To be continued.

For the Examiner.

WILLIE POPE.

Air—Johnny Cope.

Pope sent a message to his Grace
Who fills the great Colonial Place,
Praying him to leave the tenant's case
To local arbitration.
Then hey, Willie Pope, &c.

But lest the savans should arbitrate
In a way that might displease the Great
Who guide Prince Edward's Craft of State,
He would hide their investigation.

When he found some landlords would not submit
To have those sages in judgment sit,
On the right or wrong of each title writ,
He sent home the application.

But with it he sent some letters too,
From some of the fell despotic crew,
Praying his Grace to have nought to do
With men of so mean a station.

"For we who are owners of this soil
Ought to keep hold of the reins and spoil,
Among these knavish sons of toil
Who sent the application."

Then wrote his Grace unto Dundas,
(Who knows as well as any a——
What measures *should* and should *not* pass
In Island Legislation:)

"I can't advise Her Majesty
To this arbitration to agree,
Unless it will turn out to be
For your grandees' gratification.

"And this I further will maintain:
That Landlords may their holds retain;
No matter how unjust their claim,
They may 'scape the arbitration.

"Thus we uphold the dignity
Of your crude mushroom nobility,
Above those boors of low degree,
Who fain would rule the nation."

Chorus.

Then hey, Willie Pope, are ye wauken yet?
Or with the Land Sharks treating yet,
To keep the tenants in your net
Till the end of their probation?

Lot 30, March 29, 1861. MASSEY.

The Examiner.

Charlottetown, P. E. I., April 8, 1861.

WHO ARE THE TENANTS' FRIENDS?

In our last issue we gave an account of the debate which occurred in the House of Assembly, on several of the previous days, on the subject of the petitions, praying that an Act might be passed to prevent proceedings being taken for the collection of arrears of rent until the award of the Land Commissioners shall be made known. We inserted, at the same time, the resolution moved by the Hon. Mr. Coles on this subject, carrying out the prayer of the petitioners, and also the amendment moved by Mr. Howat, recommending that the Lieut Governor should be requested to intercede with the proprietors to induce them to abstain from harsh proceedings against their tenantry until the award shall be given. We have shown the utter absurdity of this amendment, and have proved that it was intended as a mere "go-by" to the question of protecting the tenantry. We shall now only record the division, which took place at a late hour on Monday night, on Mr. Coles's resolution:—

For the resolution in favor of the tenantry being protected against Law proceedings for the collection of arrears of rent:

Messrs. Coles,	Whelan,
Kelly,	Perry,
Hensley,	Cooper,
Conroy,	Sinclair,
Sutherland,	Doyle.—10.

Against the resolution and in favour of Mr. Howat's amendment:—

Messrs. Howatt,	Davies,
Holm,	Owen,
Beer,	Ramsay,
Montgomery,	Gray,
James Yeo,	Pope,
Longworth,	McAulay,
Laird,	Haviland—14.

When Mr. Coles's resolution was lost Mr. Cooper moved the following resolution, when the division was precisely the same as in the case of the preceding resolution:—

"*Whereas*, His Grace the Duke of Newcastle has said that, 'while assuring proprietors that the award of the Commissioners will not be enforced against proprietors who have not consented to refer their claims to arbitration (which was intended to define the rights of proprietors and tenants), yet they should bear in mind that such refusal may materially influence the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, if called upon to support them in any future dispute with their tenants:' *And whereas*, there is no Act or bond to bind either party to abide by the award of the Commissioners, or any security given that the award will be put in operation:

"*And whereas*, all the tenantry should be equally protected until their rights are defined, either by the award of the Commissioners or by law: *Resolved, therefore*, that proprietors shall claim no more than one year's rent, as recommended by the Commissioners, until the rights of proprietors and tenants are defined and confirmed by the award of the Commissioners, or by due course of law."

The public can now easily draw their own conclusions from these proceedings, and it will not be difficult for them to determine who *are* or who are *not* the friends of the tenantry?

PROCEEDINGS IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

In debate, in the House of Assembly, on the 26th February last, the Hon. Mr. Coles used the following language while commenting on an erroneous statement in a despatch from the Lieut Governor to the Colonial Office, respecting the time at which the Land Commission Bill received the concurrence of the Legislature—His Excellency having written, on the 30th of April, that this Bill had passed, when the public records show that it had neither received the assent of the Legislative Council at that time, nor, of course, could it have been submitted for His Excellency's approval, who is, in his own person, a separate and distinct branch of the Legislature:—

"His Excellency's Despatch of the 30th April states that the Act had passed through both Houses, whereas it appears from the Journals of the Legislative Council that it did not pass that Body until the following day, the first of May. I suppose the Government depended on the party of new Councillors then lately brought in from the country to do their bidding, and therefore considered the Bill as good as passed. I hope and trust that these new members of the Council will see that an unwarrantable reliance has been placed upon their support, and announce their independence. Now, Sir, I cannot say that this Despatch, containing such a statement, was the reason that His Grace the Duke of Newcastle thought the Royal assent should be withheld for the present from the Bill; but there is no telling what may have been the result. He is well aware of the uncertainty of legislative action. In no matter does he know what may happen in a day. A nation may be ruined in a day. Such a course as that Her Majesty's Representative should pen a falsehood to the Colonial Office is dishonorable to one holding his high position. But the Lieut. Governor is not so much to be blamed or held responsible for the statement in the Despatch as the members of the Government, or those from whom he received the information, for it cannot be expected that His Excellency can be otherwise acquainted on any particular evening with the proceedings of the Legislature during that day than from the members of his Council."

On the following day, 27th February, Col. Gray attempted to read Mr. Coles a lecture on the impropriety of his conduct in imputing to the Lieut Governor a false statement. Mr. Coles denied, most emphatically, having charged the Lieut. Governor with the *authorship* of the falsehood. He stated, as on the former day, in nearly the same language, that he held the Council, and not His Excellency, responsible for the untruthful statement in the despatch above referred to—adding these very important words:—"How did His Excellency know it" (the Land Commission Bill), "had passed unless told so? His Excellency could have no idea it had passed unless he had been so informed by one of his Councillors. *for he is a gentleman of too high standing to pen a falsehood in reference to this matter.*"

The Hon. Mr. McAulay, a supporter of the Government, admitted shortly after Mr. Coles made the above remark, that his (Mr. Coles's) accusation of falsehood was against the Government. The hon. and gallant Col. then seemed to pull in his horns, and, in plain words, the subject was dropped *in the House.*

But it was revived in the *Islander* a few days afterwards. The editor of that paper, evidently jealous of Mr. Coles's influence, and desirous, no doubt, of creating a breach between him and the Lieut. Governor, stated that Mr. Coles charged His Excellency with "lying and falsehood," (although the first word was never used by Mr. C.,) and suppressed the main fact that the Council were held responsible for the imputation. When this false account of the affair appeared in the *Islander*, Mr. Coles addressed a note to the Reporter, Mr. D. Laird, requesting to be furnished with a correct report of what he did say on the evening of the 26th February. This was given by Mr. Laird, and corresponded exactly with the extract above quoted. It was then clear that the *Islander* misrepresented the whole matter. It was to be expected that a paltry subject like this would now be forgotten; but it seemed to rankle in the breasts of the Government; or His Excellency may have been desirous of ascertaining whether the Clerk of his Council or the Reporter to the Assembly had put a false construction on his words. Whatever may have been the motive, we know that the Hon. Mr. McAulay, on Wednesday last, asked the House to drop some important business then under its consideration, in order to determine whether the Reporter had given a correct version of Mr. Coles's remark, made *only* five weeks before, respecting the misstatement in the Despatch. Mr. McAulay attempted to justify the adoption of this proceeding on the ground that he had seen the Parliamentary Reporter, with the objectionable speech in it, *only* the previous day; but it was shown that the printed debate was on the desks of members a week before, and that so far back as the 4th March, (six days after the debate occurred), the Reporter gave the extract from his original notes, already referred to, which enabled Mr. Coles to show that *he* did not calumniate the Lieut. Governor. There is, however, good reason to believe that this subject was discussed at the Executive Council on Tuesday last—that His Excellency very properly desired that the matter should be cleared up, and Mr. McAulay was selected to bring it before the House on the following day. After a short and laboured speech, in which there was not one spark of his usual fire, he moved the following resolution:—

"*Whereas*, during the debate in this House on the afternoon of the 26th February last, the Hon. Mr. Coles, Member of the 3rd Electoral District of Queen's County, did rise in his place, and then and there made use of words to the following effect: "What shall we say when we find Her Majesty's Representative descending from his high position and degrading his Commission by penning a false despatch, in plain English, writing a lie, to the Secretary of State; and allowing himself to be instigated thereto by his constitutional advisers;" and whereas, in the published report of this debate, the expressions then made use of are not set forth in their proper order and form, as spoken by the Hon. George Coles aforesaid, therefore,

"*Resolved*, That the Reporter be called to the Bar of this House to give his explanation of the said omission."

The Hon. Mr. Whelan then moved to strike out of the preamble of the foregoing resolution all after the words "false despatch," down to the word "advisers," and insert the following:

"But the Lieutenant Governor is not so much to be blamed, or held responsible for the statement in the Despatch, as the members of the Government, or those from whom he received the information, for it cannot be expected that His Excellency can be otherwise acquainted on any particular evening with the proceedings of the Legislature during that day than from the members of his Council."

Now, with respect to the amendment moved by Mr. Whelan, it will be observed that it is a literal transcript from the published reports of what Mr. Coles did say when qualifying his remark about the Lieut. Governor's inaccurate despatch. In voting against the amendment, it was clearly the object of the majority, who would not allow any alteration to be made in Mr. M'Aulay's resolution—either to throw the imputation of falsehood altogether on the Lieut. Governor, or to make the reporter admit that he had given a garbled and false report of Mr. Coles's speech. But in this the majority most signally failed.

In the afternoon of Wednesday, when Mr. D. Laird, as one of the Reporters, was called to the bar of the House, and sharply questioned, he declared most positively that the report published was a correct one—that Mr. Coles did use the qualification, imputing the origin of the falsehood or misstatement to the Executive Council; and when he (Mr. Laird) was asked whether he had omitted any important remarks or particulars in the speech of Mr. Coles, he answered promptly and distinctly that he had not done so. Mr. Gordon, the second Reporter, was also called to the Bar, after a good deal of opposition from members of the Government. On the 27th February, when Col. Gray called the attention of the House to the remarks made by Mr. Coles on the previous evening, the latter gentleman repeated his declaration that he did not blame the Lieut. Governor but the Executive Council for the false statement in the despatch. Mr. McAulay's speech shews likewise, as we before stated, that *the* "*Government*," and not the "*Governor*," were censured. Mr. Gordon was the reporter on that morning, and he was summoned to the bar to prove whether the published report from him corresponded with his original notes. He was not allowed to testify, from memory, as to the correctness of the published report, and was compelled to read from his phonographic notes, which he read with remarkable facility on the spur of the moment, and which most conclusively established the correctness of the published report from his pen, covering with shame and confusion the party who voted for Mr. McAulay's resolution, by which it was attempted to be shown that a faithful report of the debate had not been printed. So signal was the defeat of the majority that they readily agreed to an adjournment of the House, (moved by one of the minority), as soon as the examination of the Reporters was brought to a close.

On the next day, Thursday, the majority were somewhat startled by receiving through the Speaker a letter from each of the Reporters, declining to do any further service for the House, as their veracity was impeached by the examination of the previous evening, and because one member (Mr. McAulay), who originated the whole proceedings, had declared that "their reports were incorrect all through." As these letters are highly important, and must be accepted as testimony to the correctness of the published reports, while they bear Mr. Coles out in the position he assumed from the first in this matter, we readily give insertion to them here:—

(COPY.) THURSDAY, April 4, 1861.

To the Hon. the Speaker of the House of Assembly.

SIR,—Having this morning carefully considered the proceedings of the Hon. the House of Assembly yesterday, in reference to calling the Reporters to the Bar of the House, to answer for the correctness of their reports of the 26th and 27th of February last, in the course of which proceedings it was publicly stated by an Hon. Member that the report was incorrect all through, a statement not yet unretracted, and as I was, on the afternoon of yesterday, summoned to the Bar of the House, and said to be put on my trial, I have to inform the Hon. the House through you, that I have no desire any longer to occupy a position where my veracity may be impugned publicly, without having the privilege of a public reply, and of being subjected to trying ordeals in reference to other men's unguarded statements. I feel called upon to state that I am loath to transcribe any more of my notes of the debates of the present session, in which there are so many personal attacks, every word of which is important in the view of some hon. members; and as I have not attained that proficiency in the phonographic art as to claim to be a verbatim reporter, particularly when hon. members speak at the rate of 150 words per minute, and as I cannot tell how soon, if I continue reporting, I may again be called upon to answer for an omission in some hon. member's speech, I beg to tender my resignation as Reporter of the House for the present Session.

Yours, very respectfully,

(Signed.) DAVID LAIRD.

(COPY.)

To the Hon. the Speaker of the House of Assembly.

HON. SIR,—I wish to make a remark in reference to a speech delivered by the Hon. Mr. McAulay, which to-day I read from my original notes. As this speech stands in the *Parliamentary Reporter* the word "Government" occurs in the first sentence, but to-day I believe I read "Governor." This discrepancy originated in the following circumstance. In Phonography the logographs for the words *Governor* and *Government* are alike, and not being quite collected at the time, I suppose I read the one word for the other. On looking carefully over my original notes since—I say *original notes*, for I copied off the speeches delivered on the forenoon of Wednesday, February 27th, in the corresponding style of Phonography, shortly after they were delivered, and from these I transcribed what appears in the *Reporter*—on carefully looking over my original notes, then, I find that *Government* is the word which Mr. McAulay used. If I read "Gentleman" a little further on in the speech, instead of "Gentlemen," it was because the words are also written alike, the only distinction being in their position—*vide* the Phonographic Manual, page 83, and the Phonographic Magazine under the letter G.—The word in the original notes is in the plural, and reads *Gentlemen*.

If the House be pleased to receive this explanation, I merely request the privilege of having it mentioned, or the proper word or words—if there are two—inserted. I may say, too, that I think any short-hand writer would say that it was unfair that I should have been called upon to read *ad promptu* from my original notes speeches delivered 5 or 6 weeks ago, especially when all the speaking on Wednesday morning of February 27th was not very deliberate.

I must now state, Hon Sir, that I am ready and willing to resign my situation as one of the Reporters to your Hon. House, at any moment, for it is contrary to my principles to serve any man or body of men after my fidelity is doubted, and much more so when it is publicly impeached.

If I have forfeited the confidence of your Hon. House, of course I will not be expected to appear any more at the Reporter's Desk—at least not until an explanation be given.

I remain, Hon. Sir,
Your humble obd't serv't.

(Signed) J. D. GORDON.

Wednesday evening, April 3rd, 1861.

I have carefully examined Mr. Gordon's original phonographic notes of the speech referred to in the foregoing letter, and can certify to the truth of his statement with respect to the words "Government" and "Gentlemen."

(Signed) DAVID LAIRD.

A good deal of discussion ensued on the reading of the letters. The majority felt that they had got into an awkward predicament. Here were two reporters of their own choice, whose sense of honour had been outraged by the folly and indiscretion of the majority, and who seemed determined to sacrifice with barbaric hands the unrecorded eloquence by which some members of that majority hoped to amuse, instruct and astonish the world. The Hon. Mr. Longworth, feeling, perhaps, that he was the only man capable of extricating his party from the difficulty, proposed the following resolution:—

Resolved, That in calling Messrs. David Laird and J. D. Gordon to the Bar of the House, on the 3rd inst., this House did not intend by any means to cast any reflection upon the integrity or competency of those gentlemen as Reporters to this House. This House has the highest opinion of the characters of those gentlemen in both those respects,—the object of this House in adopting the course it did, being for the purpose of enabling those gentlemen, or that one of them who reported the debate on the evening of the 26th February last, to explain the circumstances connected with that debate, and whether the published report of the speech of the Hon. Mr. Coles contained the whole of the remarks made by that hon. gentleman upon the occasion referred to.

Mr. McAulay and others considered this was too heavy a dose for the majority to swallow. It was not only a declaration of confidence in the reporters, but a certificate as to the correctness of the reports. If this resolution had been passed, Mr. McAulay's resolution was clearly an unwarrantable attack on the reporters, and it should be expunged from the Journal. It was, therefore, decided that Mr. Longworth should withdraw his resolution, and the following, moved by Mr. Finlay McNeill, was substituted:—

Resolved, That the Clerk be requested to intimate to the Reporters the desire of this House that they continue their services.

Even this resolution had not the effect of bringing back the reporters, until Mr. McAulay, in private letters to the reporters, withdrew his offensive expressions as to the reports being incorrect, and, as we are informed, apologised to the reporters. Now, it may be justly said that this is a small affair to occupy the attention of a whole House of Assembly for the greater part of two days, and the whole thing to terminate in nothing but the confusion and disgrace of the party who brought it up. Mr. McAulay's resolution, it is evident to every one, has not been borne out by the results of the enquiry. The Reporters maintained to the last that their published reports were correct. If they were admitted to be incorrect, the majority would certainly have ordered the necessary correction to be made, and no doubt a vote of censure would have been passed upon Mr. Coles. Neither has been done. Mr McAulay's resolution is, therefore, not merely a dead letter, but an evidence of the most lamentable folly and reckless disregard for the time of the country we have ever yet seen manifested in the Assembly.

The *Islander* promises to publish the evidence of the reporters on this subject. We shall do the same. And we shall, moreover, publish from the columns of the *Islander*, and from the pen of Mr. W. H. Pope, specimens of the foulest abuse that was ever cast upon any Lieut. Governor, *without any qualification*; and we shall then ask if Mr. Pope is the proper person to reprimand others on the impropriety of using offensive language towards the Queen's representative. In the meantime, we shall content ourselves with making two short extracts from the speeches of Col. Gray in the Assembly, wherein he accused a Lieut Governor of *falsehood* and *misrepresentation, without any qualification*. These extracts are important, because Col. Gray was one of the first to roll up his eyes in horror at the charge of falsehood against the present Governor, and because he is one of the masters of the Colonial Secretary who professes to have such a profound respect for the representative of Majesty, to which he was such a total stranger while Sir Alexander Bannerman and Sir Dominick Daly administered the public affairs.

In the debate on the address in answer to the Lieut. Governor's speech in 1859, Col. Gray used the following words while speaking of the loss of the Loan Bill:—

"The loss of that Bill was attributable not to the influence or action of the proprietors, *but solely to the falsehoods and misrepresentations contained in the Despatch which was sent from here.*"—*Parliamentary Reporter*, p. 11.

In the course of the same debate, on the following day, Col. Gray repeated this offensive language as follows:—

"I stated, Sir, that the Bill guaranteeing the Loan had been abandoned by the Imperial Parliament, *in consequence of the falsehoods and misrepresentations contained in the despatches on the subject of the financial condition of the Colony.*"—*Parliamentary Reporter*, p. 12.

Now, Col. Gray was well aware that Sir D. Daly wrote the despatches which he referred to, and the charge of "falsehood" and "misrepresentation" was, therefore, intended exclusively for his Excellency, for there was no qualification attached to the words, coupling the Executive with the transaction. And this, forsooth, is the Leader of the party who becomes so horrified when an offensive word is spoken against the Lieut. Governor! Are they not

"All, all honourable men?"

THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL BILL.

This Bill was the subject of discussion in the Upper House on Thursday last, and a majority of their Honors very complacently voted for the obnoxious principle contained in the first clause of it—that is, declaring their own existence at an end as soon as it becomes law. The new Councillor also voted for the measure. Indeed, we have no doubt he was brought there expressly to vote in that way; so that if the Bill receives the royal allowance he will have just about time enough to warm his seat before bidding good bye to it for ever. With a lofty contempt for small incomes, which is generally held to be one of the marks of a plebeian origin, a majority of "their Honors" also voted to increase the property qualification of candidates for the Legislative Council from five hundred to one thousand pounds. There can be no doubt that the object of this high qualification is to enable the large landed proprietors to obtain a majority of seats in the Council; but we can scarcely think that the majority of the House of Assembly will agree to this alteration in the Bill, notwithstanding that *their* leaning to the proprietary party is unquestionable.

Although we are, and have always been, opposed to an elective Council Bill on principle, we shall not be sorry if the present measure becomes law. It will be a great disappointment and discouragement to the party in power if it should not miscarry like the Land Commission Bill, for they know as well as we do that only a very, very small proportion of the present majority of the Council would be able to come back to their seats under the provisions of the new law. We suppose, however, that should the thing ever leave this Colony, secret agencies will be set to work to strangle the unfortunate bantling in some dark chamber in Downing Street.

A RESIGNATION AND AN APPOINTMENT.

On Wednesday last the Hon. John Goff announced in his place, in the Legislative Council, that he had resigned his seat therein. The hon. gentleman gave no reason publicly for this act, but it is generally believed that he was opposed to the Elective Council Bill, and that being a Government measure he considered it better to resign his seat than vote against it. If this be the case, and if Mr. Goff has acted wisely in resigning his seat, why then every member appointed by the present Government is bound to support the measures of the Administration or resign his seat. The public will draw their own conclusions from these facts as to the amount of independence enjoyed by the majority of the Council under the present regime.

On Thursday Charles Haszard, Esqr., of Belle Vue, was sworn in a member of the Legislative Council in the place of Mr. Goff. Mr. Haszard is a near relation of the Premier, and a connection of several other members of the Government. He was, besides, not many years ago, a candidate for legislative honours in the Assembly, *but was rejected.* The party now in office used to denounce it as a high crime for the Liberals to appoint a gentleman to the Legislative Council after failing to get a seat in the Assembly. But times are wonderfully changed with the present dominant party in more ways than one.

Our attention has been called to a paragraph in the last *Monitor*, headed, "Her Excellency, Lady Bannerman," in which her ladyship is charged with meddling in the politics of her husband, the Governor of Newfoundland, and "alluring him from the influence of his constitutional advisers." It is not our purpose to ask whether there is or is not the slightest foundation for the charge, but to reprobate, as we do most strongly, the sneering and insolent terms in which her ladyship is alluded to. Lady Bannerman was known in this community as one of the most amiable and estimable ladies that ever graced the courtesies and dispensed the hospitalities of Government House. The recollection of her sojourn here is, therefore, fondly cherished by persons of every class who had the honor of her acquaintance. But independent of this feeling, one would suppose that a lady occupying her high station in a distant land, would surely never be made the object of the taunts and sneers of a political scribbler, for no other reason than to gratify a morbid hatred towards her distinguished Consort, because his administration of the Government of this Colony was not acceptable to the cowardly assailant of his inoffensive wife. We did not think that party rancour would ever engender such baseness in a public journalist; indeed we can hardly yet think that political conflicts produce such results; and we are inclined to attribute the abominable example of meanness and cowardice, which we now briefly notice, to a disposition inherently vile and dishonourable, which might be fitly illustrated in the conduct of one who has no regard for kindred ties, and who could desert wife and children, leaving them to starve, or subsist on the scanty charity of their less inhuman fellow beings, while he, their natural protector, pursued a career of vice and profligacy in a foreign land.

OBITUARY.

Dennis O'Mara Gaul, the much beloved and only child of Pierce Gaul, Esq., of this City, died of Diptheria at Saint Dunstan's College, on Wednesday the 3rd inst., at the early age of eight years. The remarkable mildness and gentleness of his disposition, coupled with his playfulness and innocence, not only endeared him to his parents, fellow-students and teachers, but also gained for him the love and affection of all who were acquainted with him. Although he was so young, yet his docility and great aptitude to learn obtained for him a fund of knowledge such as is very seldom found in one of his tender years. Not the least remarkable traits in the character of this amiable youth, were his recollection and unaffected devotion during the holy exercises of religion: so that the words of the Wise Man are most applicable to him—"Venerable old age is not that of long time nor counted by the number years, but the understanding of a man is grey hairs; and a spotless life is old age. He pleased God and was beloved, and living among sinners, he was translated. He was taken away lest wickedness should alter his understanding, or deceit beguile his soul. Being made perfect in a short space, he fulfilled a long time, for his soul pleased God: therefore he hastened to bring him out of the midst of iniquities."

The remains of the deceased were accompanied to their lasting resting place on Thursday last by all the students and professors of the College, together with a large concourse of relatives, friends and citizens. Much sympathy is felt for Mr. and Mrs. Gaul in their sad bereavement.

"The innocent in hands, and clean of heart, who hath not taken his soul in vain, nor sworn deceitfully to his neighbor: he shall receive a blessing from the Lord, and mercy from God his Saviour." "Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of God."—*Com.*

Catholic Young Men's Literary Institute.

On Thursday evening next, 11th instant, Mr. Peter McIntyre, student at St. Dunstan's College, will deliver a lecture before this Institute. Subject—"History."

April 8. E. REILLY, Sec'y.

Souris Institute.

At the meeting of the Souris Institute, held on the 23d of Feb, the following gentlemen were almost unanimously chosen as office bearers for the ensuing year, viz:—Hon D. Brenan, Patron; Mr. Neil McDonald, President; Mr. Edward Kickham, Vice President; Mr. James McDonald, Treasurer; Mr. Philip Leslie, Secretary.

A Lecture on the late and present crisis in Italy was delivered by Alex. Leslie, jun. The lecture was remarkably free from sectarian prejudice, and quite original, was listened to with great attention, and elicited a lively discussion.

This Institute seems to be thriving, and the members consider the liberal supply of newspapers generously sent them by the Charlottetown Debating Club as a great boon.—Com.

Married,

On the 27th ult., by the Rev. Robert Laird, at the residence of the bride's father, Mr. James M. McNutt, Princetown Royalty, to Catherine O., daughter of Alexander Stewart, Esq., Indian River.

Died,

In this City, on the 7th ult., after a short illness, Eliza Annie, only daughter of Captain Samuel and Elizabeth Mutch, aged 4 months and 13 days.

At Charlottetown, of Diptheria, on the 3rd inst., Arthur Wellington, second son of Mr. Wellington Nelson, aged 7 years and 14 days.

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE, BOOKS, &c.

TO be Sold by AUCTION, at the house at present occupied by Mrs. Penny, Dorchester-street, on THURSDAY, the 2nd May next, at 11 o'clock, a quantity of valuable

Solid and Stained WOOD FURNITURE,

for three Sitting and four Bed Rooms. KITCHEN UTENSILS, Cooking and Franklin STOVES, House and Table LINEN, CUTLERY, GLASS and EARTHENWARE, together with a VERY VALUABLE LIBRARY.

Sale Positive! No Reserve! Terms—3 months' credit on sums over £10.

April 8, 1861. WILLIAM DODD, Auctioneer. 1sl

Seeds! Seeds! Seeds!

JUST opening at the Establishment of "J. W. BRADLEY & Co.," Dawson's Block, corner of Kent and Great George Streets, Charlottetown—

Various Field, Garden and Flower SEEDS, warranted of superior quality.

—ALSO—

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS of all descriptions.

In addition to the above, the Proprietors beg to acquaint the Public that they will receive, on the opening of the Navigation, large Consignments, consisting of Hardware, Hollow-wares, Groceries, Ale, Porter, Wines and Liquors, and respectfully solicit the patronage of purchasers.

April 8, 1861. 1sl & R W

GEORGETOWN!

SPRING SALE OF

Grocery Goods, Flour, &c., &c.

THE Subscriber will sell by AUCTION, at his Warehouse, in GEORGETOWN, on THURSDAY, the 18th of April, instant, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon, the following GOODS, to close consignments:

10 Chests and half chests TEA,	40 Bbls. FLOUR, best brand,
10 Sides SOLE LEATHER,	20 Bags MEAL, fresh,
Boxes Soap and Candles,	5 Kegs and Boxes Tobacco,
20 do. assorted Lozenges,	1 Doz. Steel Hoes,
10 do. do. Candies,	2 do. Potato Hoes,
6 Doz. Hay Rakes,	3 do. Brooms,
2 do. Hay Forks,	25 Bags Butter Salt,
2 do. Scythe Sneaths,	10 Sacks do.,
20 Boxes Cigars, a good article,	1 Plough,
1 Case of assorted DRY GOODS.	

Terms—All sums under £5, cash; over £5, three months' credit, on approved joint Notes of hand.

W. SANDERSON, Auctioneer & Broker.

Georgetown, April 8, 1861. 2in.

Tenders.

TENDERS will be received for the finishing of a Church on the St Peter's Road, Lot 34, until Saturday, the 4th of May next, at 2 o'clock, p m, either separately or together, (for Plastering or Carpenter work), according to a plan and specification to be seen at James Purdie's, Esq.

By order of the Trustees.

ALEXANDER ROBERTSON, Chairman.

St Peter's Road, April 8, 1861. 1sl

BENEVOLENT IRISH SOCIETY.

AT the Annual Meeting of the above Society, held at St. Dunstan's School Room, Charlottetown, on the 11th ult, the following persons were elected Office-bearers for the ensuing year, viz:—S. W. Mitchell, Esq. President; Richard Reddin, Esq. Vice President; Mr Matthew Murphy, Assistant Vice President; Mr Francis McCarron, Treasurer; Mr John O'Neill, Secretary. Committee of Charity—Mr Arthur O'Neill, Chairman, Capt Thomas Foley, Mr Charles McKenna, Mr Michael Kelly, Mr James McQuillan, Mr James McInnes, Mr Edward Ryan.

April 4, 1861.

To Close Consignments.

TEA! TEA!

BY AUCTION,

AT THE SALE ROOM of the SUBSCRIBER, on THURSDAY, the 11th APRIL instant, at 11 o'clock—

29 half-chests English TEA, 10 half-chests 'Chrysolite' TEA,
24 chests do do 6 do 'Benefactor' do.

—ALSO—

15 hhds. and barrels SUGAR, 70 boxes SOAP (assorted)
60 kegs NAILS (assorted) 25 barrels FLOUR, very choice
CIGARS, VINEGAR, CHEESE, &c, &c.

Terms—All sums under £10, cash; over £10 and under £40, 3 months; and all sums over £40, 6 months' credit, on approved joint Notes of Hand.

J. S. CARVELL, Auctioneer.

Charlottetown, April 1, 1861.

ENTIRE HORSE "ECLIPSE."

TO BE SOLD by PUBLIC AUCTION, on the Market Square, on SATURDAY, the 20th APRIL instant, at 12 o'clock, the well-known ENTIRE

HORSE "ECLIPSE,"

16 hands high, of Dark Chesnut colour. His Stock is much approved of for every purpose. Also a strong Farm HORSE, 15 hands high, rising 6 years old, 1 New CART.

☞ Terms Liberal.

WILLIAM DODD, Auctioneer.

April 1, 1861.

TO BE SOLD AT PUBLIC AUCTION, at the Province Building, in Charlottetown, on TUESDAY, the 11th day of June next, at the hour of 12 o'clock, noon, under a power of sale contained in a mortgage made by Thomas Smith and wife to James H. Peters: All that piece of GROUND, situate in Charlottetown, and known as Town Lot No. 92 in the first hundred of Town Lots in Charlottetown, together with all Houses and Buildings thereon. Terms Cash. Dated this 23rd January, 1861.

Feb. 4 JAMES H. PETERS.

STOVES.

A LARGE and well selected assortment of Cooking, Office and Parlor STOVES, Grates, &c., for sale cheap, to close consignment, by JASON WEBB,

Ch.Town, Dec. 24, 1860. opposite the Bank.