To repairing Main Bridge, Burnt Point,	59	0	0
To repair Murray Harbor road to County Line,	6	0	0
" road from McLeod's mill to Little Sands,	10	0	0
To repair South River Bridge,	18	0	0
To pay balance due to Daniel McLeod for bridge on Murray Harbor road,	2	19	0
To repair new road south of Murray River,	5	0	0
To open and make road from Toronto settlement to Murray River road, provided right of way is given free,	9	11	0
	£127	0	0

Unexpended moneys of last year to be expended on South River Bridge.

District No. 11, comprising Georgetown, Common and Royalty, Reserved Lands, and Township No. 53, between the Cardigan and Brudnell Rivers.

To amount due Young and Landrigan,	9	10	0
" " Thomas Garland,	1	10	0
" " John McDonald,	0	10	0
" " William Gordon,	0	9	0
" " Robert Head,	1	10	0
" " Donald Stewart,	5	0	0
The above amounts to be paid to the order of the Road Commissioner,			
For Main Post road,	40	0	0
For swamp on Burnt Point road,	3	0	0
For road from Burnt Point road to north Royalty road, at Smith's gate,	9	0	0
For repairing road past A. McKinnon's Lots,	2	10	0
For extending the stoning of M'Aulay's road, north	6	0	0
For extending the road past L. C. Owen's Lots to join McAulay's road,	3	0	0
For repairing road from P. Ferguson's to Dr. Kaye's,	3	0	0
For road from Dr. Kaye's to Georgetown.	2	10	0
For repairing north Royalty road from Head's, Cross Roads east,	2	0	0
For repairing road from Brudnell wharf to Cardigan road,	10	0	0
For opening and finishing road from Cardigan road to new bridge,	15	0	0
For repairing north Royalty road from Head's Cross roads, towards Angus McAulay's,	6	0	0
For repairing road from Angus McAulay's, Cross road, towards the west boundary of District at New Church,	10	0	0
For cutting down the bank at Brudnell, at the end of McAulay's road, and to make landing efficient,	6	0	0
For repairing swamp near Burke's Lots,	2	0	0
To be laid out where most required,	11	11	0
	£150	0	0

Unexpended portion of last year's grant and commutation money to be laid out where most required.

RESOLVED, That the special grant for the service of Roads, Bridges and Wharfs in King's County be divided as follows—

1st Electoral District,	£100	0	0
2nd do. do.,	100	0	0
3rd do. do.,	250	0	0
4th do. do.,	150	0	0
Georgetown and Royalty,	50	0	0
	£650	0	0

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

SATURDAY, March 16.

Mr. BEER moved the House again into Committee of Supply. Debate on the road appropriation resumed.

Mr. CONROY wished to reply to a personal attack made upon him by the hon. member for Georgetown last evening, for complaining that the sum proposed for the road service was too small, and characterizing the amount spent in making preparations for the reception of the Prince of Wales as a lavish expenditure. That hon. member had remarked that if the large sums continued to be voted which were of late years, there would require to be an increase of taxation, and the sooner that was known the better. He (Mr. Conroy) remarked that he thought the duties and land tax were equal to the exigencies of the Colony, that if it were not for such sums as so much for repairing Government House, so much for the Volunteers, and so much for the reception of the Prince of Wales, the revenue would be found sufficient. Because he had spoken of the expenditure on the Prince's reception as being lavish' he was charged with disloyalty for his sentiments.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND said he did not use the term "disloyalty."

Mr. CONROY maintained that he was charged with disloyalty. He considered he had a legitimate right to speak of this expenditure, and call it lavish if he chose, for if the matter was not to be discussed why were the accounts placed on the table? He asked what he had done that he should thus be pointed at with the finger of scorn as being disloyal; he did not know what action of his life could justify such an allusion. He would have received the Prince of Wales with all the enthusiasm of a loyal subject, though he might be of opinion that this small Colony could not afford to expend so much on his reception. When the Government of Great Britain was charged by the members of Parliament with lavish expenditure in the case of the Russian war, were they charged with disloyalty? No; but it served the purpose of the hon. member for Georgetown to charge Nicholas Conroy with disloyalty.

Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN said the hon. member for Georgetown had also made remarks in allusion to him, and he had given him no occasion whatever. When £800 were to be taken to repair Government House—nearly one-seventh of the money proposed in the resolution for roads and bridges, it was high time to speak of the lavish expenditure of the Government.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND supposed that this double attack was made for the purpose of frightening him, but he could assure the two hon. members who had just spoken that he was not so easily scared. If they pursued an inconsistent course, they might expect to be shown up: and if they could not stand this, the sooner they retired from public life the better.

Hon. Col. GRAY said he had given a hint that the proper course to pursue would be to discuss each item of the estimates on its own merits; but the hon. member for Cardigan, and the hon. member for Murray Harbor, appeared to think it would be proper to take a portion of the sum named for Government House, and appropriate it to the road service. This, however, could only be a matter of opinion. If this Colony were independent of the Mother Country, the House might decide this case as they pleased; but he (Col. Gray) found by the Royal instructions that it was required there should be several rooms in Government House for public receptions, to be furnished at the public expense. If the Colony was required to furnish rooms for this purpose, it was evident that it must first provide a house in which the rooms should be. The Governor of this Island was the only Governor in these Colonies whose salary was paid by the Imperial Government; if then, His Excellency were to complain to the authorities at Home that the people here would not keep Government House in repair, a law might be passed there to compel this Colony to pay the Governor's salary—about £2000 annually. Lest the people here should be compelled to pay this amount, he (Col. Gray) thought it would be better to vote £800 at present to keep Government House in repair than give that sum additional to the amount proposed for roads and bridges. The house at first had been very loosely built, and had not even a proper cellar. In 1856, the sum of £1816 was voted for Government House premises, all of which, except £300 appropriated to the purchase of a piece of land, was expended upon the building and outhouses. Whether the hon. member for Tignish would call this a "lavish" expenditure or not, he (Col. Gray) could not say; but it was certainly strange that so soon after another grant should be required. [The hon. member here read a message from Governor Daly to the Legislature a short time before he left the Colony, setting forth the untenantable state of Government House.] Soon after this message was written Mr. Daly left the Colony, and the present Lieut. Governor arrived. The building at that time (summer of 1859) was slightly repaired with the small sum voted for that purpose, and in it in this condition his Excellency struggled through the succeeding winter. In the spring of 1860, it being known that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales purposed to visit the Colony, it was thought high time to put Government House in a state of repair; and to show that the Government, in taking this step, did nothing unusual or improper, he (Col. Gray) would refer to the expenditure on Government House at Fredericton, New Brunswick, in connection with the Prince's visit to that Colony. "Repairs and improvements on Government House, £1030; fitting up and furnishing rooms occupied by the Prince and his suite, £2469, &c."—the items in all amounting to £4500. Besides this, about £1337 were expended in fitting up a house for him at St. John. No doubt, New Brunswick was a wealthier Colony than this, but these were large sums compared with what was spent for a similar purpose here. Government House had been considerably fitted up internally in view of the Prince's visit, but much required to be done to put it and the outhouses in a good state of repair. And how much was asked for this? Only £600, for though £800 were given in the estimates, yet as £200 was the usual appropriation for Government House, the extra asked was only £600. If he (Col. Gray) had his desire, he would not vote a penny for the present Government House, but go for granting a sum to build a respectable brick house for the Governor's residence. He did not think that the hon. member for Tignish was justified in calling the expenditure in connection with the reception of the Prince of Wales a lavish one. The actual expense would only be about £2000, if all the furniture, &c., on hand was disposed of. This sum was not much to expend to give a reception to the son of their Sovereign. The Colony was bound to receive him in a proper manner, and could not plead that it was too poor to make any demonstration on the occasion. But the time this matter should be brought under consideration was not when the Committee were discussing the vote for roads and bridges. The reason that so small a sum had been set down for the Road Service, however, was chiefly on account of their having expended so much on the Prince's reception.

Hon. Mr. COLES—The Government had done so.

Hon. Col. GRAY said he was glad to take up that expression, the "Government had done so;" if they had not they would have been unfit for the position which they occupied. The sum expended would scarcely amount to 6d. stg for each individual in the Colony, and he was sure that if a person had been sent to travel the country he could have collected the amount by voluntary subscription without any difficulty. He thought that considering all the advantages which the people of this Colony received from the parent country, they ought not to complain of the amount expended on the reception of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. It was through her that we possessed the glorious privileges secured to British subjects by the Bill of Rights, and enjoyed all the liberties and advantages guaranteed under the Constitution of Great Britain.

Hon. Mr. THORNTON wished to call attention to the statement of the hon. member who had just sat down, that it was owing to the *lavish*,—yes he (Mr Thornton) would call it the *lavish* expenditure of the Government on the occasion of the Prince's visit, that a larger sum could not be granted this year for roads and bridges.

Hon. Mr. M'AULAY said the Government had been assaulted by a severe bombardment; it commenced last evening, but it appeared as if the smoke would blow away and leave no damage behind. The hon. member for Murray Harbor, Mr. Wightman, suggested that the taxation should be increased to meet the necessary expenditure. With respect to the tax on land, which was the only direct taxation in this country, he (Mr. M'Aulay) could not consent that it should be increased. What did not the land support? It supported the merchant, the mechanic was supported by it.

Hon. Mr. COLES—And the parson was supported by it. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. M'AULAY—Yes, the parson was supported by it, and the schoolmaster was supported by it. Now, when so much was sustained by the land, was the tiller of the soil to be crushed by increased taxation? He would never consent to this crushing policy. The population of this Island was mixed, being composed of merchants, mechanics, &c., and it was unfair that all the direct taxation should be put upon the farmers. He thought the hon. member was scheming; he saw that the majority of the people in the country were satisfied with the party in power, and wished to deceive the Government into imposing a tax on land, that they might become unpopular. The hon. member for Cardigan, Mr Thornton, also wished to vote a larger sum for the road service, and when other items came up he would vote for them too, that the expenditure might be increased, and the Government rendered unpopular. The hon. member opposite, the new member for King's County, had also spoken on this question, and expressed his opinion that more should be done for the roads and bridges. With respect to that hon. gentleman, he might say that there was evidently a gale of hope among the ranks of the Opposition when he arrived in this House. He (Mr. M'Aulay) had met him before in political life, and judging from the courtesy which had hitherto passed between them, he had no doubt they would still be on friendly terms. This gentleman travelling in the eastern part of the country came to a bridge which he could not pass, but he (Mr. M'Aulay) had passed over it on the day following; however, he supposed his life was not so precious as that of a lawyer. The hon. member for East Point further stated that almost everywhere he travelled in that part, he found the bridges unfit to pass. Why, it was a wonder that a special vote of some £500 or £600 had not been asked for to enable the people of King's County to receive him with becoming honor, when he visited that part of the country, as in the case of the Prince of Wales coming to the Island! If the hon. gentleman wished to immortalize himself by his maiden speech in this House, he would advise him to have it printed, and published as an appendix to the next edition of Gulliver's Travels. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. COLES remarked that he supposed the hon. member for Georgetown wished to indulge in a little humor at the expense of a new member, but he (Mr. Coles) had yet to learn that the speech referred to was the maiden speech of the hon. member for East Point. The tax on land alluded to by the hon. member who had just sat down was for the purpose of Education, and should not be complained of. The hon. leader of the Government appeared to convey the impression that the whole increased expenditure for the past year was on account of the Prince's visit; but this was not the case, for independently of that altogether the expenditure for the year exceeded the revenue, and this too even after the sum paid for land was deducted. He (Mr. Coles) believed when the vote for the Prince's reception was made, that it would probably cost between £2000 and £3000. But though the whole affair cost this much, some hon. members might be of opinion that several of the items in the expenditure were extravagent. He thought as good an entertainment could have been got up for less; however, there was a considerable sum expended in improvements on Government House, which were much required. He would not complain of the expenditure in connection with the reception, as he believed the preparations gave general satisfaction. But the Government were not going to be allowed to make out that this expenditure was the only reason for the increase of the public debt, as the revenue would not have met the expenses of the year, leaving the reception out of consideration. The hon. leader of the Government referred to the amount voted for Government House and grounds in 1856, and seemed to say that the late Government had not expended the money judiciously. £300 of the sum were spent in the purchase of a piece of land, close to the Government House grounds, which was about to be taken for a purpose for which the Government thought it should not be allowed to be used. The rest of the money was expended in shingling the buildings, taking gas to it, and building a coach house. The instruction respecting Government House referred to by the hon. member, were not always carried out; Governor Smith lived for some time in the barracks. He (Mr. Coles), however agreed with the hon. member for Belfast, that large sums had been expended on the present Government House, and thought with him that perhaps a brick one should be built. In regard to the resolution before the Committee, perhaps £1000 additional as proposed by the hon. member, Mr. Wightman, would be too much; however, he (Mr. Coles) would support the amendment, and if it was lost, and £6000 was all that could be obtained for the road service, hon. members would have to use a little more economy than usual in distributing it.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH did not see that it was necessary to advert to Government House, when discussing the resolution for the road appropriation. A grand mistake was made when that house was built at first; it had been a difficulty to every Government that came into power. He thought the question was very fairly put by his hon. colleague, Col. Gray, in 1859, when he suggested whether it would not be better to apply a torch to the building. He (Mr. Longworth) was of opinion that his colleague was correct in saying that the money voted in 1856 was not judiciously expended, for had this been the case, the present Government when they came into power would not have found it in an almost untenantable condition. He did not, however, charge the late Government with any design in the matter, but feared that the men employed did not do their duty. There had been no special vote for Government House since 1856, and he thought there was nothing extravagant in the Government now asking £600 to put it in a state of repair. He considered it was a small matter for hon. members on the opposite side of the House to object to necessary appropriations like this. Allusion had also been made to the expenditure in connection with the visit of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. He thought if the accounts were examined it would be found that the Committee had acted most economically. As had been remarked by the hon. member, Col. Gray, upwards of £1000 had been spent at Fredericton alone for the Government House there.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—What was their revenue?

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—The revenue had nothing to do with the matter. He believed that the Home Government would scarcely credit the statement if informed that the whole sum expended on the Prince's reception here, amounted to only £2000. He would repeat again that he thought it unfair for hon. members of the Opposition to object to the amount set down in the estimates for Government House. To keep it in a state of repair was a duty which they owed to His Excellency, and a duty which they owed to their country. The late Government spent £4000 upon the place while they were in power, and they had very little to show for the money. The present Government had so far only expended the usual appropriation of £200, as it was unfair to include in their amount the the sum required to fit up the house at the time of the Prince's visit. There would have been no occasion to refer to these subjects at present, had it not been to reply to statements made by hon. members on the other side of the House.

Mr. DAVIES said that in the debate last evening he had expressed his opinion that £6000 would be sufficient for the Road Service, and notwithstanding all that had been said he thought so still. The debate had taken a wide range, and reference had been made to Government House; and as he was a member of the Committee to attend to the fitting up of the building in 1859, he might be permitted to offer a remark on this point. He had said then that he thought it would be better to burn the house, and build another in which Her Majesty's Representative might live with some comfort. He thought it would be a saving to the Colony instead of voting so much every year to keep up the present building, to appropriate at once as much as would be required to erect a new one. Some £700 or £800 had been expended upon it in procuring furniture, &c., in view of the Prince's visit. He believed that the different articles purchased at that time were procured as cheaply as possible; several of them he knew were imported by Mr. Brenan and himself, and no commission was charged upon them. About £800 more it was thought would put the building in a complete state of repair, and as this sum was all that was asked for by the Government, he thought the House should not object to it. It appeared that this Colony was the only one in which the salary of the Governor was paid by the Imperial Government. The people here, then, ought not to be backward in keeping Government House in repair, lest they should be required to pay the Governor's salary.

Mr. SINCLAIR was in favor of keeping the expenditure within the revenue. He would be so disposed were he one of the members of the majority, and he considered it his duty to act in the same manner in the position which he occupied. Rather than that the country should be brought to a state of bankruptcy, he would vote for the sum which had come down in the estimates. But though the Government were economical in regard to the Road Service, they were not so with respect to the public offices. He thought also that the House should not be called upon to spend £800 for Government House, when only seven times that sum could be spent for roads and bridges. If more furniture had been procured for Government House at the time of the Prince's visit than was required there now, let it be sold, and the proceeds taken to repair the building. He (Mr. Sinclair) was not going to object to the sum expended in giving a loyal reception to the son of their Sovereign. It was common when any vote came up for the members of the majority to attempt to show that it did not exceed the expenditure of the late Government. He believed that it was chiefly on account of the extravagance of the late Government that they became unpopular, and he could not see that their conduct was any argument to support extravagant expenditure on the part of the present Government. Adjourned till 3 o'clock.

D. LAIRD, Reporter.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

Hon. Col. GRAY, by command of His Excellency, presented to the House the copy of a despatch of Governor Dundas to the Duke of Newcastle, with enclosures, containing statements of the Attorney General in relation to the objects of two Bills, viz: An Act to authorize grants of the shores of this Island;—and an Act to give effect to the Report of the Commissioners to be appointed on the Land Question.

Hon. Mr. COLES moved that these papers be committed to a Committee of the whole House on Thursday next, which was agreed to.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND moved the third reading of the Bill to give summary protection to persons engaged in the publication of Parliamentary papers. The Bill was then read and passed.

The House again resolved itself into a Committee of the whole on supply.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND said some hon. members had harped much concerning the amount in which the Government had run the country in debt; but he would take the estimates and read the items seriatim, and tell them that had they been in their places instead of being in the gloomy shades of the Opposition, that the public debt would have been as large if not larger. The Educational expenditure was increasing, for in 1859 the increase over the previous year was £578 11s 8d; and in 1860 the increase over 1858 was nearly £2000, and he was willing to go to any reasonable constituency and justify their conduct in placing that sum against the Colony. Further, the present Government were charged with £47 for desks for the additional number of members made by the late Government, also balance of interest on the Worrell Estate £333; on Lot 11, £55; also with the balance of £500 on an old account of the late Queen's Printer; expenditure on account of the unfortunate Hughes case, £240; —it could be shown that they had not wilfully spent the public money, but only expended such sums as were necessary to maintain the credit of the Colony. When the late Government was in power, you would think, to hear some hon. members now, that they had not spent any money on Government House at all; but in 1851 they expended on it £348; in '52, £361; for '53, there are no Journals, so the amount is not known; in '54, £567; in '55, £1500 odd, and one would have thought after making these large outlays, nothing would be now needed for that object. In '56, £556 were expended on Government House, and so on to the end of the chaper. He (Mr. Haviland) fully agreed with some hon. members, that if these sums had been faithfully spent such a large expenditure would not have been required to make extensive repairs last summer. He could not see what was to be seen for the £1500 expended in 1855.

Hon. Mr. COLES—Look at the Gas fittings, £300; and the Coach House, £500.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—The Coach House is a mere shell; any public contractor would put up one as good for £200; and admitting these sums to be correct, they come far short of £1500.

Hon. Mr. COLES said the present Government should have given them credit for one half year's revenue. The late Government retired in April, and they gave up all the revenue to the present Government, to January following; that he believed £5000 were paid into the Treasury since the financial year closed. He understood they had received nearly £4000 from the Worrell Estate since they came into power, and £650 from Lot 11. Again, there were many hundreds of pounds paid on jails by the late Government for which they should have received credit. It was very fine to saddle them with the additional pay to members. That was what was called his hon. friend's 'Good Friday Bill,' to which he (Mr. Coles) was somewhat opposed at the time it was introduced. The late Government spent from £8000 to £9000 a year on roads and bridges, when in power. The present Government said they had been saddled with £5000 more for Education, but that was not the fault of the late Administration, but was owing to their own management. The hon. member from Georgetown could not see what they did with the £1500, spent on Government House in 1855, but he mentioned the expenditure for Gas fittings and a Coach House, which amounted to £800, the sum in the Estimates of the present year. In addition, there were carpets purchased; and the drawing room was ornamented with pier-glasses. These items amount to £1000. Other things were mentioned also, the expenditures on the whole making £1500. Further, the late Government had a Guard stationed at Government House at an expense of £120 or £130—four men doing actual service. The present Government kept one there, and paid him £56.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN next addressed the Committee at considerable length, and spoke as follows:—On entering the House, I heard from a stentorian voice '£500 for the Queen's Printer.' About the time of the change of Government, April 1850, only half of the Financial year had expired. The present Government may be compelled to retire at the expiration of one half of the Financial year, and if so, the Government which succeeds will be obliged to pay the debts which were contracted by them when in power. The late Government, of which I was a member, came into power in April 1851. At that period, J. D. Hazard was Queen's Printer, and held his office till August following, during which time he received £539 as Queen's Printer, and that amount was charged against the Liberal Government which then came into power; so the one case was a fair set off against the other. Allusion was made to the Bill which I introduced, called the 'Good Friday Bill,' the object of which was to change the number of Representatives in the Assembly from 24 to 30, and in introducing the measure, I may say that I was not under the control of any one, but spoke in its favor in opposition to the views of my hon. friend, Mr. Coles. He frequently expressed himself to the effect that "the time had not arrived" for making the change which the Bill contemplated. I must coincide with hon. members who have spoken on this side of the House, respecting the inadequacy of the amount voted for the road service for the current year. In the years '56, '57, and '58, when the Revenue was not so large as at present, and when the resources of the country were not so fully developed, we find from the Journals that much larger sums were voted for this particular service. Within the last four or five years, too, the number of important public works has been augmented, which require a larger, and increasing, annual expenditure. Our population, too, is increasing, and the extension of commerce demands a larger outlay to afford greater facilities for travelling. The sum which was sufficient ten years ago is not now adequate for this particular service. It will not do to offer the excuse that there are no means, and that it is impossible to give more. It was the duty of the government to have provided means to meet the public inquirements. If the public debt is not too large, the majority, not the minority, are responsible for its increase. They may tell us they have practiced economy but the records furnish a convincing refutation to that statement. Some observations fell from my friend from Tignish in reference to this subject, and some remarks came from the other side of the House about his being out of order, in bringing in matters considered irrelevant. If he sinned in doing so, his sin was not half so great as that of some hon. members who have followed since. I not only coincide with his observations in reference to the branch of the subject which he characterized as lavish in the extreme, but I will go further, and say it was excessively so, and leaves not the slightest ground for justification. I may be visited by a supposed castigation similar to that which was inflicted by the hon. member from Georgetown on my friend from Tignish, when he indulged in a species of frenzied declamation—which sometimes comes upon him like a fit—during which time he endeavored to overwhelm him; but I am used to his thunder, and shall not be under any apprehension on that ground. Let me ask that hon. member a question—supposing his constituents came with an application addressed to the House for the construction of a new bridge, would that hon. member or his colleagues venture to rise and say—'We cannot give you the money for that object, for we had to spend £1000 on Government House last year, and we want £800 more this year to make further repairs for the convenience of Her Majesty's representative?'—Dare they make an excuse of that kind? I fancy a smile of scorn would appear on the lip of any intelligent constituent, if asked to listen to any such excuse. Neither wharfs nor bridges can be built because we spent so much on the occasion of the visit of the Prince of Wales. Our resources were so diminished in regaling a few hundred individuals, chiefly from Queen's County, who happened to flock to this small city on the occasion of the visit of His Royal Highness, that not one pound more can be voted for the service of roads and bridges. Allow me to say first that I fully endorse the remarks made by the hon. member from Tignish, and repeat his words and say the expenditure was most lavish

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—I have no doubt you will use the same words.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—Yes; and if the hon. member from Georgetown will supply me with stronger words I will use them.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—They are sufficiently strong

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—The details will prove the justice of his observation. Much of the £3000 expended on the occasion of the visit of the Prince was unnecessary, as I trust I shall prove satisfactorily. The hon. member from Georgetown referred to Prince County as being the only one to raise objections to this expenditure. I look upon that as an indication of the manly spirit and daring of the people, who, though one of their representatives, stand up here and censure the Government, and say the outlay was lavish Let the details be submitted to the other Counties and they will lift their voices as strongly against the extravagance as did the hon. member from Tignish. I may be told by the hon. member from Georgetown that all this is a poor indication of being animated by a loyal spirit. No doubt I am open to the same imputation, for he hinted in his reply to the hon. member from Tignish, that his loyalty was of a doubtful character because, he did not justify the expenditure occasioned by the visit of the Prince of Wales. But such imputations cast upon me would not alter the convictions of my mind. Loyalty with me is not a blind sentiment. I regard it as a sentiment of duty due by the subject to his Sovereign for services done by that Sovereign. Nor would any man of ordinary intelligence, who possesses this sentiment, bow down in the dust to any earthly potentate. The sentiment which springs from a mutual return of advantages is the loyalty which should animate the breast of every man. It is that which we owe to that Sovereign who rules over us and other people in her vast dominions, with so much acceptance. And on this occasion I will pay a slight tribute to the loyalty of the people of P. E. Island. I believe there is not any portion of Her Majesty's dominions where the spirit of more genuine loyalty animates the breasts of her subjects. We have many proofs of this in the spirit of contentment manifested by the people in times past, and exhibited through Her Majesty's Representative in this Colony, in the ready obedience always given to the dictates of the Sovereign whom he represented—in the ready submission to the decrees propounded from time to time by that Sovereign, —and in the sympathy evinced in that important struggle which agitated the public mind throughout the world a few years ago, when our fellow countrymen of the British Isles, and our fellow colonists, too, went to the bleak shores of the Crimea in defence of universal liberty, of which England is supposed to be the guiding spirit. We remember that momentous struggle, the result of which brought so much honor to the British name, when many of our fellow countrymen died in the contest, and left their bones on the bleak shores of the Crimea. We remember, too, the conduct of the Legislature when suffering humanity appealed to our sympathising hearts for relief; that relief was granted to our fellow countrymen and fellow country women who survived that momentous struggle. The people of this Island responded, and spontaneously contributed their means for the relief of those who survived the conflict; and the House of Assembly did not disown the appeal, for out of their limited resources no less a sum than £2000 was voted for the same praiseworty object, on which occasion I had the honor of recording my vote in its favor. I said on that occasion there was an opportunity afforded for evoking the spirit of loyalty, if it really existed in any man's breast. But it is a far different thing to be called upon to waste the public money in entertaining, not the Sovereign herself, but her son. I say, Sir, P. E. Island has generally exhibited much more loyalty than, under the circumstances of the case, she was, perhaps, justified in showing. I do not mean now to disparage or diminish the respect which is due to our illustrious Queen: far from it. But in showing that respect I am not to be called upon to bow down my head in submission to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales. I think the people of this country have shown feelings much more loyal than all the circumstances of the case called upon them to exhibit. (Hear, hear.) Yes! I will tell him so and his hon. colleague who descanted on the glorious privileges of British subjects, on the Bill of Rights, and the Constitution of Great Britain. I will not join issue with the gallant Colonel on this point, but will ask him and his hon. colleague from Georgetown, who were eulogizing so highly the Bill of Rights and the British Constitution, if the people of P. E. Island enjoy all the privileges which that Bill of Rights confers, or all the privileges of the British Constitution?—I say we do not. We are little better, I say, than the veriest serfs, under the greatest despot that ever existed.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—About equal to the Italians!

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—Far, far worse! (Hear! hear!) No man who ever saw the soil of Italy can go to Downing Street and frustrate the Acts of the Legislature like the absentee proprietors of this Island. Talk about the glorious privileges of the British Constitution! We live under a Constitution of Despatches, dictated according to the caprice of absentee Land proprietors. Who can deny we are governed by Despatches from the Colonial Minister. Ask the people of Nova Scotia or New Brunswick if they are governed by a junto around the Colonial Office, who poison the mind of the Colonial Minister, who writes Despatches for the government of this Colony. Ask the people of Canada who enjoy the privileges of the Bill of Rights, if they would submit to be governed by a few paltry individuals in such a manner as this Island is governed by a few such persons, who never saw it, and care not if they never see it, so long as they secure the money claimed for their rented lands;—ask any of the people of these Colonies if they would submit to the tyranny practised on us, when, at the same time, we are told we live under the shadow of the glorious Bill of Rights and privileges of the British Constitution. It is a mockery, —a snare and a delusion to which I shall never submit, (Hear, hear.)

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—Did the Duke of York do any injury to Nova Scotia?

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—If he did, that is no reason why the Duke of Newcastle should inflict an injury upon us. The only instance of tyranny being practised against that Province was in monopolizing its mines and minerals.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—But you said such instances did not occur in that Province.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—Not since the introduction of Responsible Government;—it is well known that injustice was never done to other Provinces as was done to this Colony when the public lands were granted away in one day, yet we are bound to submit because our influence is small. Look at the condition of the tenantry of this Colony!—Who will say they enjoy the privileges which belong to British subjects? True, it may be said they have the right to petition—but what does that mean? If the petitions affect the rights of proprietors, they go for so much waste paper. The leases of the tenantry range from 20 to 999 years; but, if they happen to fall into arrears of rent, and are unable to pay, they must leave the results of their years of labor for the benefit of their task-masters. It may be said they have the right of trial by jury, but the opinion is prevalent that a tenant at Court, in opposition to a proprietor, has a small chance of receiving justice. And what other privileges have we but to be the victims of the land proprietors, to submit to what they please to suggest to the Colonial Minister, and to the laws made by this Legislature, and these, too often inspired by proprietary influence. Concerning the sentiment, already discanted upon, I wish to make one or two remarks. I do not disparage, nor do I derogate from the respect which is due to the Prince of Wales, but I must distinguish between the Queen herself and her son. I think hon. gentlemen on both sides will concur with me, and join with me in giving expression to the hope that many years may elapse before the Prince of Wales ascends the British throne, for we are not yet weary of his illustrious mother. If forty years hence he should be crowned King of Great Britain, it is not likely he will retain very vivid recollections of his hasty visit to this Colony; and if he should, of what avail would they be to the inhabitants of this Province, or how could they conduce to the interests of our children? Like the predecessors of his illustrious mother, he will be under the control of a Ministry altogether unknown to us. The fact that he is the Prince of Wales is not a sufficient reason why the interests of the people in doing him honor should have been sacrificed. We know some of the Sovereigns of Britain were the greatest fools and despots who ever disgraced a throne; and the Prince of Wales has no patent right—no claim superior to any other British subject, and he is as likely to become as great a fool or despot as any of his predecessors, the Princes of Wales, that ever existed. I do not now speak thus of the young gentleman who visited us last summer; but because he happens to be the Prince of Wales, that is no reason why we should be taunted with a want of loyalty, because we did not concur with what my hon. friend from Tignish character ized as a lavish expenditure. My idea of loyalty does not depend on a display of flags, fireworks, or any tantaroonie of this description. These may do in times of peace; but if an army from France or the United States appeared to take possession of this Island, we would not be very likely to show display or enthusiasm. The loyalty of many gentlemen who exhibited themselves to the gaze of the admiring multitude on that occasion, was, I doubt not much like the Champagne which made a very fine appearance on the supper table, fizzing and bubbling, like the enthusiasm of the moment, but, after standing awhile, it becomes flat and worthless.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—Like loyalty!

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—Yes; the loyalty which like Champagne, springs to the head, but leaves no impression on the heart.

Mr. Whelan closed his remarks by referring to the dilapidated state of Government House when the late Government came into power, to the purchase of Lot 54, and to the inadequacy of the grant of the current year to meet the requirements of the Road Service.

(To be continued.)

Correspondence.

FOR THE EXAMINER.

MR. EDITOR,—The last *Islander* contains a complimentary address from some of the good folks of New London and *vicinity* to His Excellency the Lieut. Governor. By the way, the number of signatures to the New London does not amount to a fourth of that appended to the famous Belfast address. The New Londoners are of course at liberty to compliment whom they please, but they ought—if they do not wish to be thought ironical — to be a little more careful how they dispense their soft commodities. It may be very well to tell the Governor that they have a very high esteem for him—that they are penetrated with feelings of the most unshakeable loyalty for his Royal Mistress—to lament that their beautiful, extensive and flourishing settlement has not been honoured with the guberratorial presence — to express the most unbounded confidence in the impartiality of His Excellency's administration and in the integrity of his character. They may, with comparative innocence, rise into raptures in praise of the whole house of Dundas, and declare it to be both a moral and a physical impossibility that such a thing as a knave or a fool could by any chance find his way into the humblest and remotest branch of that illustrious house. All this, I say—though mawkish enough, but surely not New Londonish—might be said without raising a suspicion in the reader's mind that any sting lay concealed beneath all these flaunting flowers of compliment, but to laud His Excellency for the part that he has taken in *settling* the land question, appears to me to be the most effective mode of censuring him and his advisers for their share in the attempted *settlement* of that to us most momentous question.

If His Excellency and his Government had spent the best part of their days in toasting their shins before the fires of the great Circumlocution Office in Downing Street, and expended their energies in learning how not to do it, they could not be greater adepts in the arts of lingering, hindering, twisting and delaying than they have proved themselves to be, by their manner of originating and conducting this same Land Commission affair. From the sending home the crude and ill-digested resolutions of Col. Gray — to be sent back again altered and amended to suit the tastes and serve the interests of the proprietors — to the delaying of the Act to give effect to the award of the Commissioners, nothing is to be seen but blundering, shuffling and humbugging. The Government — for it is impossible to separate the acts of the Governor from those of his advisers — take great credit to themselves for securing the aid of a talented and popular statesman as Commissioner on behalf of the tenantry, and for employing able counsel to plead the cause of that suffering class. But so imperfect was their knowledge of the nature and powers of the machine that they had been at such pains to construct, or to get constructed, that they could not tell, until they got information from the great Circumlocution Office, what it could or could not do. When the Commission was sitting we heard that its powers were unlimited, and that it extended over the whole of the proprietary body. The Commissioners said so, the counsel for the tenantry said so, members of the Government said so, and the people believed it to be so; but it turns out that the rod of our political physician has been extended to every important and nourish-