

pears in the Auditors' Report of the past year to be £2,208 7s. 5d., due upon deeds in the office of the Commissioner of Public Lands; but this amount, if it should be fully realised during the current year, will hardly meet the necessary expenditure for the same period. Thus suppose the affairs of the Worrell Estate being in that flourishing condition in which the members of the Government would lead the House to believe, it has not yet met its current expenses; and I do not believe that, at any future period, it will yield a moiety of the sum which has been expended in its purchase. Under these circumstances, I would ask, sir, is it probable that the present or any other scheme of a similar character will prove self-sustaining? Do they afford any encouragement to involve the country to the further extent of £150,000, at an annual interest of £7,500, upon an experiment which experience has always taught us must terminate in a serious loss to the Colony? I feel assured that they do not, I cannot therefore support the motion for going into Committee upon the Bill now before the House; on the contrary, I move an amendment, Mr. Speaker, that the Bill be committed this day three months.

Hon. Mr. LORD.—I do not intend to give a silent vote on this question. As to an investigation of the public accounts, I think the country will expect such an investigation, as those who fill offices receive money from the people and have a right to show that they have properly discharged the duties of their respective offices. With regard to the statement made by the Hon. Mr. Haviland, in which such a bad state of affairs is said to be shown; and which, if true, gives but poor encouragement for entering upon future enterprises of a similar nature. But I hope such a state of things is not the case. (Hon. Mr. Haviland—I pledge my word for its correctness.) I hope it will not turn out so bad as the hon. member thinks it will. In fact, I am confident it will not. I have made up my mind to vote for this measure (the Loan Bill), and in doing so, I am convinced that it is a measure calculated in the highest degree to benefit the whole country; and the more that land agents say against the measure, the more am I confirmed in my belief that it is for the benefit of the people of this Island. It is all very well for these gentlemen to oppose a Bill having for its aim the amelioration of the burthens under which the tenants of this Island are at present weighed down to comparative poverty and hopeless dependence,—it is all very well, I say, for them to oppose such a measure; and yet I am willing to accord to them full credit for all the feeling and anxiety they profess to bear towards the people of this Island, if they can show us, or point out any better and safer way to relieve the tenantry from their present burthens: But, if they will, if they can oppose us successfully, and snatch from our hand the means of doing good; and if, after depriving us of such means, they do not proceed with the same spirit which now actuates us;—if, in fact, they do not do as we now intend, the British Government may, at no very distant day, give its assent to a Bill levying a handsome tax on the incomes they receive for their lands in this Island. They will then be obliged to do indirectly what they now oppose. It is nothing but right that such landed proprietors should bear a tax on their property to compensate the tenant to a small extent, by lessening his taxes. It is a matter of regret to all persons who wish to see the tenant placed in a better position than he now occupies, to contemplate the large amount of money annually sent out of the Island—it is a serious loss, a drain on the country, to have £30,000 a year sent to absentee proprietors. Hon. members who are opposed to this measure may argue as they please, but I am certain that no loan of money, be the results of its application never so far short of what was anticipated, would draw near as much from the Island, as at present goes to the absentee proprietors. I would ask the hon. member for the first District of Queen's County, how much money he sends—(A member—"No; how much he collects.")—how much money he collects upon the estates for which he is agent? I am confident that what he collects in a few years, would pay the principal and interest of the purchase of those estates. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I am still of the opinion that if the money be borrowed and judiciously applied to the purchase of lands in this Island now under the thrall of the proprietor and his agent, it will be an incalculable benefit to the country. Is it not, sir, I ask, better for a tenant to sell his last cow to pay for his land than to pay rent to a landlord? Let him make any sacrifice, however great it may be, it will make him a free and independent man, and that is more than he would be if another possessed the land he held, and exacted rent, and distrained and crippled him in all his operations for the advancement of his own and his children's prosperity. I will support this Bill, sir, and while I do so, I will also support a resolution for a Special Committee to look into the public accounts, and see that they are correct.

Mr. MacINTOSH.—If, sir, I thought this measure would benefit the tenantry of this Island I would be among the first of its supporters; but I must confess I do not think so. But, in the meantime, and before we embark in the scheme of borrowing money, we should know that it will be required,—we should have an offer from the proprietors stating on what terms they would sell their lands; but where we do not see our way before us, do not let us go on blindly. As to the Bill now before us, let us see how it is to be worked, if passed: The freholder is taxed to make the leaseholder independent like himself; this is not fair. If there is to be any taxation, and I am convinced this measure cannot be carried out without taxation,—then let the leaseholder be taxed for his own benefit and not the freholder. Now let us see how the Worrell Estate stands, for we must see how this affair has been managed before we can form any certain conclusion how other affairs of a similar nature will be managed: There are, it is true, figures and statements enough; but made in such way as would puzzle a Philadelphia Lawyer to understand. I never saw anything so blind, as the manner in which these statements leaves us to proceed; but I will never lend myself as a party to any project that is calculated to make things worse than they are.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—I rise to order. There is no objection to refer the public accounts to a Special Committee; but this is not the proper time to take them up.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—It is all very well for the Hon. Col. Secretary to express his willingness to have the Public Accounts investigated; but they have virtually refused such investigation. It is stated that the accounts were before the House and ample opportunity given for examination; but sir, instead of being submitted at the commencement of the session it was one month from the time the House met before they were handed in,—after being pretty well cooked up, I suppose. I say, sir, it is unfair, when a desire is manifested by any portion of the House to investigate the public accounts that they should be refused. I need not say that I am opposed to this Loan Bill. I need not state reasons for my opposition, as the hon. member from Princetown (Mr. Haviland) has shown as clearly as figures can go to affirm that this will be a losing speculation. This ought to be a guiding impulse to make us pursue such a course no longer; that an affair of this kind cannot be made to pay for itself. It is only a species of sinking fund, and if we continue it in an increased proportion the whole will be sunk by and by, and the country ruined. The principle is unsound. It is unfair to tax one part of the people to benefit another,—it is doubly unfair to enter into a speculation when none of the parties will be benefited and all (for it must come out of the people) and all distressed. I will not, for one, lend my voice.—I will not help to carry out such a measure, with such disastrous consequences stamped upon the very face of it. Although the accounts of Lot 11 may appear favorable,

and may lead to the conclusion that other estates can be worked as well in the hands of the Government; still I would warn not to be too hasty in coming to such a conclusion, when it is considered that it has only had a trial of one year. Besides, look at the amount of land tax that is annually lost on this land; and then there is an immense tract of swamp which is of no manner of service in an agricultural or any other point of view, and therefore unsaleable. The fact is, the Government have tried to put the best face on the public accounts, with a view to deceive themselves and the public (Hon. Col. Secretary—I hope the hon. member will not impute motives to the members of the Government.) Still, I must say that I certainly think the measure cannot be justified by equity or fairness, were the first and second instalments on the Public Lands are eaten up by the expenses, and no sophistry can cover or smooth over the defects of this system.

Hon. T. H. HAVILAND.—One reason why I doubt the correctness of the accounts of the Commissioner of Public Lands is, that he makes the balance due on the Worrell Estate and Lot 11 £10,000, while the Auditors of Public Accounts make it only £2,208 7s. 5d. Does not the Commissioner give deeds to all who make instalments?

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—The hon. member knows as well as I do how this seeming discrepancy took place. The Commissioner of Crown Lands would not make out a deed until a deposit of ten per cent. was made to him. The reason why deeds were not given in all instances where deposits were made, is because they could not be made out at the moment. It is impossible that five hundred deeds could be made out at once. The reason, then, for the difference between the report of the Auditors and that of the Commissioner of Crown Lands is, that the former only had reference to the deeds which were actually made out, while the latter had reference to the deeds not yet made out; but for which a deposit, as a guarantee, had been made. As to these circumstances, which might seem to implicate the Commissioner of Public Lands, it is important that they should not go unexplained. It is necessary to have the deposit paid down by the purchaser, before the deed is made out. If, however, a purchaser deposits a certain sum as a guarantee, and afterwards does not fulfil the terms of his deed, the land will be sold again,—so it will be seen that the Government are safe in the expectation of being paid for every acre of land they dispose of. The Auditors, to fulfil their duty properly, should have gone into the minutiae of all the accounts, and report accordingly; but what have they done? They go into the Commissioner's Office, examine his report, and certify to its correctness, without looking over the books, examining the items therein, and comparing them with the report. I must confess I was surprised when I heard these facts, and condemned their proceedings strongly. Their duty, as Auditors, was plain before them, and why did they not perform it? If, then, the public Auditors acted after this manner, what reason is there to cast the blame on the Commissioner or the Government? The hon. member for Charlottetown (Mr. Longworth) said the Public Accounts did not come in till a late day in the Session. Well, if they were not submitted till the 26th of March, ample time has been given since then to examine them, and if there could be found any thing in them to take hold on, we should very soon hear of it. It was also a matter of great outcry on the part of the minority, that a member of their party had not been appointed on the Committee of Public Accounts. But the majority have learned by experience that if they appointed a member from that side of the House on this committee, we should hear, as it was the case last year, a variety of false and undigested statements made in their organ, the *Islander*. Sir, we have had enough of such false statements to make us wary in leaving the slightest vestige of an opportunity for a repetition of the like. As to the Public Accounts, whether they inquired into them or not, I defy them to say a word, or make a statement to prove any incorrectness on the part of the present Commissioner of Public Lands. The hon. member from Princetown (Mr. Haviland) said the Public Accounts were an *ignis fatuus* an attempt to hoodwink this House, and then labored through a statement tending to show the ruinous consequences to be entailed upon the country by the Public Lands. But in this garbled statement he forgot to say that there were £10,000 due on that estate bearing interest. Of course he did not notice this fact, as it would render his calculation of no effect. The hon. member also stated that if we make the loan under consideration it would entail an interest of £15,000 a year on this country. But as has been often stated we do not intend to draw but a small part of the amount at a time, and as occasion requires. While the hon. member makes such a statement he forgets to mention any good that will be derived from such a measure. In making such a statement as he does, I must confess, the hon. member goes further than I thought he would or in reason could. It is possible that he was actuated by motives of regard for the welfare of the Colony—it is probable he was not. Great stress is laid on the apparent discrepancy between the report of the Auditors and the statement of the Commissioners of Public Lands, and this I think I have shown before was owing to the fact of the Auditors not examining the Accounts properly. But what is the case with regard to the dealings of the individuals from whom the Worrell Estate was purchased. When the books were handed over to the Commissioner he was told that they had received no payment from persons who purchased their lands; but it was found that one of the parties had received a sum of £50 a few days before. In fact they received various sums of money which do not appear on the books, as the people (purchasers) have proved by producing receipts for money paid. (Hon. Mr. Palmer—how much money has been received of which there is no account? £300 or upwards. I would now ask, is Government expected to pay over that money again to Pope & Co? Or can they compel the farmers to pay again for land they have already purchased? Then there were some doubtful settlers on the Estate, whom it was considered would not attend, and it was agreed that the lands of all such persons should be taken back from the Government. Government agreed to pay them £2,000 of the balance of the £6000 upon their taking back a deed of Lot 65, and leaving the balance, until the whole of the deficiency of land was settled as they request payment for St. Peter's Bay, roads, Sand Hills, &c. When this arrangement could be made Government were to pay then the £2000 in debentures, on Saturday. They (the Government) were to receive the deeds and title of Lot 65 the same day; but it was found impossible to sign the debentures and have them all prepared before Monday. The deed was, however, signed by the Commissioner, the Lieut. Governor, and three of the parties, viz.—Messrs. Pope, Desbrisay and Fairbanks, and witnessed by the Attorney General and handed over, with the understanding that the debentures were to be delivered to them on Monday; but to the astonishment of the Government on Monday they repudiated their Act, in reference to the signing of the deed on Saturday, under the pretext of the Government not having the power to sell more than 300 acres of land, under the Land Purchase Bill:—therefore the Government refused to pay the £2000 as agreed upon, and so the matter rests, with the exception of the Surveyor General spending nearly two months, with Mr. McLean, examining his survey of the deficiency of land, and which surveys, I am informed, have proved correct. The hon. member from Princetown (Hon. T. H. Haviland) in going over the Public Accounts, did not take up the Accounts of Lot 11. In Lot 11 land has already been sold nearly to the full amount paid for that property, while there remain in the hands of the Government, a considerable amount of land yet undisposed of. The hon. member for Charlottetown (Mr. Longworth) seemed to exult in the circumstance of so much swamp-land being in Lot 11, which he said the Government will find a dead letter on their hands; but I would tell that hon. gentleman that Government did not purchase the swamp lands in Lot 11. The swamp was disposed of by the former proprietor for the Land Tax. There is besides 9000 acres of good land left, which will I have no doubt, command a ready sale. What is there then to frighten the hon. member, or his party? I am aware that it would be a hopeless task to try and convince them that all will yet be well. Never, until the affairs of the Worrell Estate is wound up will they be convinced of their error. But we shall have to wait until that time before we can properly demonstrate to them such a consummation. It is impossible, as the thing at present stands to come to any decisive conclusion, for we will have to wait until the expiration of the ten years before we can expect a final settlement from the purchaser of Public Lands. The hon. member Mr. Longworth is not correct in saying that the Government have refused an investigation of the Public Accounts. The Government are willing, nay even anxious to have them investigated; but this is not the proper time.

They still lay on the table indisposed of, and when there is a proper opportunity I have not the slightest objection to their being referred to a Special Committee. T. KIRWAN, Rep.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY said, the Hon. Colonial Secretary said that the reason the resolution was voted against was, because it was an amendment to the Bill. He asked the Speaker, in his official capacity, was it moved as an amendment to the Bill? He maintained it was not moved as an amendment to the Bill; but it was moved in order to put off the consideration of the question till Saturday, for the benefit of hon. members. They were well aware that not a member of the minority of the House had been allowed to be put on the Committee of Public Accounts; that was refused, and it appeared to him that it was the determination of the opposite side of the House not to allow any of the minority to be on any important Committee. Again, the Hon. Col. Secretary wished it to go forth to the country that the reason for voting against the resolution was, that it was an amendment to the Bill. He would merely ask the Speaker, as the organ of the House, if that was the case; and he thought he had a right to a reply. [Hon. the Speaker.—The resolution will speak for itself.] The question had been alluded to by the Hon. Col. Secretary, and he said it was moved as an amendment to do away with the Bill; but he (Hon. Mr. Montgomery) contended that it was nothing of the kind; it was merely moved with the view of postponing the consideration of the Bill till Saturday; but that was denied the minority. The majority knew very well that a motion of that kind could be put then. So much for the resolution. As to the Bill before the House, he did not intend to give it his support. He considered it was a measure that was not for the general benefit of the Colony, and that it would serve to benefit but a few of its inhabitants. He considered also that there was a large majority of the freeholders and tenants in the Island, who would not be benefited by the Bill. If all the proprietors were to sell their lands, their tenants might derive benefit from the Bill; but he was convinced that such would not be the case. Besides, some lands were not fit for agricultural purposes, and those would not be sold. Therefore, the measure would not give that general satisfaction which the people of the Colony desired.

Hon. Mr. MOONEY had not thought the hon. member would oppose the Bill before he heard him speak on the subject as he had just done, yet he did not appear to be very decided in his hostility to the measure, as he was thinking shortly to offer himself as a candidate for a country district. It was very singular that the other hon. member for Princetown, Hon. T. H. Haviland, who had taken a very active part in the matter, should also be opposed to the measure; for after dropping some crocodile tears, he had moved that the Bill be agreed to that day three months. Well, he ventured to say it was not for him to add to the words of that hon. gentleman; but it was singular that there was so much dread exhibited about the poor tenantry. The present measure was formerly never dreamt of, nor the purchase of the Worrell Estate for the benefit of leaseholders. That purchase had been effected for the benefit of those who were desirous of becoming freeholders, as many had done. He knew one individual who had sold a leasehold farm, and with the price of it had been enabled to purchase six or seven hundred acres of land in the district where the Worrell Estate was situated, because the purchase of that estate, by the Government, had lowered the price of land. He would ask, would that hon. gentleman be quite consistent though he should agree to the measure that day three months? Was it not singular that those accounts had been before the House six or eight days, and yet the members of the opposition were only beginning now to see a loop-hole, and to ask for the appointment of a Committee to investigate them. He ventured to say that though they got a Committee and examined every figure of the account, they would not detect errors in them. But they were keeping it for what he would call in common phrase a nest-egg; and when the House was just going into Committee on the Bill, up springs a new one. Now, it was just a nest-egg. Then if they obtained a Committee, and found any defect in the accounts, they would advise the Government for acting against their own acts. The majority of the people were desirous that the present measure should become law; and let those who were desirous of voting against it, do so; and if they were condemned in the eyes of the public, let them bear their condemnation. He was prepared to support the motion for going into Committee.

(To be continued.)

The Examiner.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., JUNE 15, 1857.

THE person who writes the political articles for the *Protector* office, and publishes them in the Supplement to that sanctified journal, called the *Monitor*—appears to know the mind of the Lieutenant Governor not only better than His Excellency's advisers, but better than His Excellency himself, in reference to our public affairs; and having become wearied of writing out garbled speeches for members of the Legislature, and prosy harangues at so-called religious meetings—he has betaken himself to the more agreeable pastime of writing out speeches for His Excellency. In his paper of the 10th instant he gives us the report of a speech said to have been delivered by the Governor at a meeting of the Executive Council, in which His Excellency is represented as urging upon his advisers the necessity of a speedy dissolution of the Assembly. The theory that a Governor and Council must agree upon a uniform course of procedure, so long as they continue to work together, would seem, from the *Monitor's* report, to be a very absurd delusion; and equally absurd is the opinion we have always entertained, that outside barbarians are prevented from listening to the discussions in the Executive Council. It was left, however, for James Barrett Cooper to upset all our preconceived notions regarding the secrecy of Executive proceedings, and to show that the commander of the ship of state and his subordinate officers are in a state of mutiny, and struggling to steer their barque in contrary directions. The only opinion we shall venture to express is, that Mr. J. B. Cooper's report of Council proceedings is about as reliable as the speeches which the great Samuel Johnson manufactured for the members of the House of Commons, without stirring beyond the precincts of his own garret, with this trifling difference, that the great lexicographer gave his heroes the credit of uttering brilliant and ingenious conceits, whilst the veracious reporter of the *Protector* office has a fancy for concealing the most stupid ones.

The *Monitor* states that "the only constitutional and honourable course now open to the Government," is to dissolve the Assembly. Why such a proceeding as this should be deemed necessary at this particular juncture, we are at a loss to determine. The Government were well and triumphantly sustained during the late Session—had a majority of about five in their favour on every party division, and were enabled to make a handsome provision for every branch of the public service. The law provides that the House of Assembly shall not be dissolved within a period of four years from the time of its election, unless the Governor shall see fit to exercise the Royal prerogative, and dissolve it sooner; but the Governor

would not be justified in resorting to such a proceeding, unless there happened to be some great neglect of duty on the part of the existing Assembly, and an overwhelming outcry of the Colonists against its continuance. Now, only three years have elapsed since the present Assembly was elected—it has therefore another year to run,—it has passed every measure which the Government sought to have passed,—and we have reason to believe that it is as high in popular favour as it was three years ago. Why, therefore, should there be a dissolution? Not, certainly, because the bigots, fools and fanatics of the third district of Prince County have preferred J. C. Pope, Esq., to the Hon. W. W. Lord. We shall regret the absence of Mr. Lord from the Assembly; but neither himself nor any body else ever supposed that his presence was absolutely necessary to the existence of the Government. As for Mr. Pope, he may be a very nice young man in his own way, but in the ranks of the minority he will find sufficient room for the exercise of his senatorial skill and prowess; and he will perceive that the majority is still strong enough to smile at his puny attacks upon them, should he venture upon so hazardous an enterprise.

The old Obstructive faction never made a greater mistake than to suppose, as they do, that a majority of the constituencies are likely to follow the bad example of the third district of Prince County. It is this supposition which gives them such an intense longing for a general election. As affairs now stand, they have no chance of getting into office. An election may brighten their prospects—it cannot make them darker. It is useless to ask, what measures have they to bring forward in the Legislature for the improvement of the country, should they succeed in getting a majority? They had a long tenure of office before the establishment of Responsible Government, and we know of no one really useful measure which distinguished it, while the record of a great many bad ones could be easily traced. They had a short tenure of office after the establishment of Responsible Government, and they so recklessly set about destroying the constitution of the Colony, and uprooting the liberties of the people, that the Colony, from one end of it to the other, implored the then Governor to dissolve the Assembly, so that their evil courses might be stayed. The dissolution which took place in conformity with the popular demand was the means of driving them from office; and we are quite sure that the people have not so readily forgotten their transgressions as to wish them back. Certainly, beyond the third district of Prince County, we have no indication of popular feeling in their favour—no well authenticated complaints against the ruling party—no clamours for a change—no petitions for a dissolution; and as for the third district—which has now the distinguished honor of being represented by a man who says he belongs to no party, and with the keen instinct of a fence-straddler, is therefore ready to sell himself to whosoever will give the highest price—it always had strong proclivities to Toryism—was exclusively represented by members of the Tory party for many years; but since the commencement of the Bible mania a few months ago, it does not appear to have any well defined notions of political affairs, but may be easily influenced by strong doses of rum and religion.

Liberals are censured for being office-holders, and seekers after office. Now, what do their adversaries want but to render themselves liable to a similar censure? If the Liberals will only quietly go out of office, of course, nobody will take their places. The Tories are all too rich and independent to become placemen. Of course, Mr. Haviland, senior, would never think of going into the Secretary's Office again,—nor would Mr. Palmer condescend to become Attorney General,—nor would Mr. Longworth suspend his extensive farming operations for a snug chair in the Treasury Office,—nor would Mr. Wright relieve Mr. Ball from the duties of the Surveyor Generalship,—and the Excise Office, the Land Office, the Registrar's Office, the Solicitor Generalship, the Queen's Printership, and all the other ships—could never, of course, expect to find a solitary individual amongst the Tory crew to man them. Obstructives are admirable authorities on questions of this kind,—their long experience teaches them to declare that there is neither honesty nor independence in office;—and claiming, as they do, to be possessed of more virtue than other men, how could they be expected to go into office? And, as the public service cannot be conducted without office holders, the whole community really ought to—as we have no doubt they do—feel grateful towards those gentlemen in public situations, for so patriotic and lofty holding those positions wherein their conduct and motives are so likely to be impugned.

Let not the *Monitor* man give himself any fanciful airs, and say that an editorial article of such and such a length has appeared in the *Examiner* in reply to his observations on the question of a dissolution. We had nearly forgotten him in following the current of our own thoughts; but if he is particularly ambitious of notice, we shall hold him up to the gaze of our admiring readers for a moment or two, and explain the motives which have induced him to say his say in favour of a dissolution. J. B. Cooper was Clerk Assistant to the House of Assembly during the existence of one Parliament. As such, it was his duty to transcribe the Journal of the Assembly into a book kept for that purpose. He was paid handsomely for doing this duty; and in order to give him ample opportunity for performing it, was allowed to take the books and records of the Assembly to his own private residence during the recess. Time passed— for time will not wait for an Assembly's Clerk any more than it will wait for the tide,—the party who gave Mr. Cooper his situation lost their influence, and he lost his Clerkship. He left his country, if for its good, certainly not for the benefit of his reputation as a public servant, for the House of Assembly in 1854 discovered that Mr. Cooper was a delinquent,—that is, that he had not done the work for which he was paid—that, in short, he had received money under a false pretence—the pretence of doing work which he did not do,—and the fact is recorded on the Journal of the Assembly as follows:—

"Mr. Speaker called the attention of the House to the state of the Manuscript Journals, which had been brought by the Messenger, since the opening of the Session, from the residence of the late Clerk Assistant, James B. Cooper, Esquire, whereby it was discovered, that he had neglected the duty of transcribing or engraving the same, since the 10th day of April, 1851, and for which he has been paid, it was thereupon

Ordered, That the Clerk do perform or employ a competent person to perform the work, and to be paid by the House; and that the Government be requested to proceed against James B. Cooper, Esquire, for the expense incurred."—*Assembly's Journal*, Oct. 3, 1854, p. 16.

Why the Government did not "proceed," as requested, is explained by the fact, that Mr. Cooper prudently remained out of the country until some time last year. At the commencement of the late session, he had the courage to exhibit himself to the House in the capacity of Reporter to the *Protector*, and had the modesty to apply for special accommodation on the Magistrates' Bench, which the House refused.