

Abolition of the Legislative Council.

THE Bill to abolish the Legislative Council was, this afternoon, defeated by the casting vote of the President. Mr. Annear voted with the Opposition. Mr. Burns supported the Bill.

Our Finances.

WE return to-day to the consideration of the letter of Mr. L. H. Davies—the principal part of which we published yesterday. From all points of view this letter is discreditable to its author. The composition is bad, the figures are erroneous, and, as for argument, it contains none whatever. We would not, on any account, occupy our space with a review of this shallow and fallacious letter, were it not for the position formerly occupied by its writer in this Province.

Mr. Davies opens his letter by declaring that, "apart from the inquiry which Government has best husbanded or expended our revenue, the grand question is: are we making our receipts meet our expenditure, or are we running yearly in debt?" This, we admit, is a very proper question to ask, and we sincerely regret that Mr. Davies did not think of propounding it, seriously, to himself when Leader of the Government. Had he done so, and then acted the part of a prudent man, by cutting his garment according to the cloth, there would be much less occasion for the declarations of "sorrow" which he now makes, over what he is pleased to regard as the ruin of the country.

The gist of Mr. Davies' reference to the late election campaign, is, that the people were ignorant and easily "duped" by "designing politicians" and "loud-voiced demagogues." Hence the defeat of his Government. All this is very childish. Mr. Davies is not, we are well aware, given to understate his own abilities, and, as he had, during the contest, all the opportunities of enlightening the people that the "demagogues" had of deceiving them, he might as well gracefully admit that he was beaten because he had wasted the public funds, falsified the public accounts, and attempted to maintain himself in power by tampering with his political opponents after his former colleagues had withdrawn their confidence from him.

Before examining Mr. Davies' calculations in reference to the operations of 1879, we will briefly note what he says about his deficit in 1878. He says that he proved by a letter published by him in May last—

"That although the public accounts, ending December 31st, 1878, I showed an apparent deficit; that it was unfair to charge the Government of that day with it, or with any extravagance because the deficit did not arise from any excess of expenditure over the amount voted by the Legislature, but simply because a large part of the assessment for 1878 and the estimated receipts from the land office were not paid into the Treasury until after the accounts of the year 1878 closed. For this fact the Government of the day were not responsible, and the proof is now that almost the whole of that alleged deficiency on the receipts of 1878, was received at the Treasury in 1879 and credited to the receipts of the year."

We are sorry to say that this statement is utterly untrue, more particularly the part of it which Mr. Davies places in italics. Of arrears of taxes belonging to 1876, paid in 1877, there were \$12,864.32. Arrears of 1877, paid in 1878, \$4,601.18; arrears of 1878, payable in 1879, \$7,564.47. It thus appears that the arrears of taxes unpaid at the close of 1878 were less than the average of former years. The impudence that would claim any portion of the payments at the Land Office in 1879, as properly belonging to the receipts of 1878, can best be shown by the fact that the receipts at the Land Office, for the first quarter of 1879, fell nearly \$12,000.00 short of the amount received at the same department for the corresponding quarter of 1878. But while this model financier contends that amounts received at the Land Office in the first quarter of 1879 should be credited to 1878, he never dreams of applying the same rule in regard to payments made in the Land Office since the beginning of the present year. Any person, except it may be, a "designing politician" must admit that if the sum of \$8,900 received for land up to the 31st of March, 1879 should be credited, as arrears, to the receipts of 1878, then by the same rule the sum of \$11,000 received in the same way in 1880 should be credited to 1879. Mr. Davies applies this rule as he does all others, just where they will suit his purposes, and ignores or denies them where they will tell against him. Such unfairness, or, perhaps we should say dishonesty, is simply disgusting. We deny in toto that the deficit of 1878 was produced by a fall-

ing off in the receipts. Mr. Davies expended, in macadamizing certain roads, the sum of \$14,000 for which he had no vote, and had he paid the other liabilities which he incurred, he would still have had an enormous deficit, even if every cent of the estimated revenues had been realized. The plea, however, which he sets forth, of diminished receipts, contains his strongest condemnation. If he had the slightest qualification for the position he held, he would not have erred, as he now admits he did, to the amount of \$20,188.76 in two departments of revenue, neither of which are materially affected by the fluctuations of trade. The less Mr. Davies says about the deficit for 1878 the better for himself, as the following figures will show.

Deficit on face of accounts for 1878, \$21,448.95
Amount left unpaid for want of money, and to conceal deficit. See Public Accounts for 1879, page 110 60,071.95

Deficit for 1878 \$81,520.80

This deficit is only subject to a deduction on one ground, that being that some payments were made in 1878 which belonged to the previous year. The amount under this head could not be large, as teachers and officials were paid, in 1877, the amounts which fell due to them on the 31st December of that year. Allowing, however, that \$10,000.00 may have been carried forward, which is certainly in excess of the real amount, the actual deficit for 1878 is no less than \$71,520.80. We fearlessly challenge successful contradiction of the above figures, as we have given the Davies Administration the benefit of every doubt. We suppose that Mr. Davies cannot complain if we apply the same rules of calculation for the year 1878, which he applies to 1879. The following statement for the former year is precisely similar to the one given by Mr. Davies for 1879, we merely supplying the figures for 1878 from the Public Accounts:—

1878.	
CAPITAL ACCOUNT.	
DEB.	
"Paid on Lunatic Asylum,	\$40,654.10
CR.	
"Received at Land Office, \$54,379.42	
"Deduct amount which gov't have a right to credit to ordinary revenue as interest,	20,000.00
	34,379.42
"Spent on Capital account over and above the receipts,"	\$6,274.68
"This amount of \$6,274.68 the Government is fairly entitled to credit as ordinary receipts of the year."	
"How then would stand the year's account?"	
"Expenditure for the year 1878, 334,133.29	
Add amount as per page 110 of the Public Accounts of 1879, which the gov't had no money to pay, and leave as a legacy to 1879,"	60,071.95
	\$384,205.24
"Receipts for the year, \$275,299.61	
Add above amount Capital Account"	6,274.68
	\$281,574.29
"Actual Expenditure over and above receipts for the year 1878,"	\$112,630.95

It will thus be seen, by applying the same rules of comparison between revenue and expenditure for 1878, as Mr. Davies has applied to 1879, the deficit for 1878 amounts to the enormous sum of (\$112,630.) One hundred and twelve thousand six hundred and thirty dollars!!!

We challenge Mr. L. H. Davies to admit or deny the correctness of this calculation. If he denies it, then he proclaims himself a very small, shallow, and "designing politician" with all the desire to deceive but lacking the ability. If he admit it, then his condemnation is written with his own hand, inasmuch as in 1878, when the country was prosperous, he rolled up a deficit of \$112,630.95! The reader will please observe that this is not a calculation of ours. The rule of comparison is laid down by Mr. Davies. If the rule be right the calculation and results cannot be wrong.

The manner in which Mr. Davies quibbles about payment of teachers salaries is entirely unworthy of a man who has occupied the position of Premier in a British Colony. In 1877 he established the rule that the quarterly payment to teachers, which fell due on the 31st December, should be paid within the year; and he then placed a sum—in one of the Banks, credited to the Educational Department and charged against the Expenditure of 1877—sufficient to meet the teachers salaries falling due on the 31st Dec. In 1878 he violated his own rule by only paying three quarters salary to teachers, although he had provided in his estimates for the payment of the four quarters. In 1879 the present Government have paid four full quarters salary to teachers. More money by nearly \$12,000 than any previous Government had paid in one year for education. Does Mr. Davies think that the present Government should pay five quarters salary to teachers in 1879, while he only paid three in 1878?

This is just what he contends for, but he is too cunning to say it in so many words. Throughout the whole of his letter he charges the year 1879 with amounts outstanding for teachers salaries and other purposes at the close of the next year, but gives no credit for the sum of \$60,071.95 which, according to the Public Accounts for 1879, page 110, were paid in that year, belonging to the expenditure of the previous year. Such jag-handled "financing" is too unfair to deceive anybody. After this it is not hard to believe that Mr. Davies has so much faith in "Demagogue" arts. For our own part, we have unbounded faith in the intelligence and love of fair play of our people, and we believe they will turn from Mr. Louis Henry Davies' spurious figures and unfair calculations as they did from his loud-mouthed defence of a bad cause in March and April last, with feelings of loathing and disgust.

With characteristic unfairness he denounces the policy of the present Government in appropriating a refund for revenue purposes but says not one word about his own action in appropriating a similar amount in a precisely similar manner in 1878. We never objected to the refund of 1878, although not one dollar of it was for the purpose of reimbursing the Provincial Government for expenditures incurred in 1878. The money was legitimately drawn in both cases, and appropriated for the very purpose for which it was set aside by the Terms of Union in 1873. We only refer to this subject for the purpose of protesting against the unfairness of raising a howl over the refund of 1879, without including that of 1878, in the same condemnation. There can, in fact, be only one opinion on the subject; viz., that the money was fairly and properly drawn in both cases. We challenge Mr. Davies to the proof of the correctness of his statement that the late Government adopted some suggestion of Mr. Hyndman's, to the effect that the "amount to be credited to current receipts as interest would be \$20,000 per annum. If he will turn to page 216 of the Journals of the House of Assembly for 1878, he will find that his administration adopted the report of the Committee on Public Accounts, in which they decided that the sum of \$5,000 should be credited to current receipts at the Land office, as interest paid. Every person knows that the payment of interest at the Land office in proportion to payments on capital is greater now than it was two years ago. In reducing the sum to be credited as current receipts from \$35,000 to \$20,000, Mr. Davies shows how thoroughly unscrupulous he is, and how little he is restrained by considerations of justice.

In speaking of the cents and duty bonds, Mr. Davies says that they "were assets carried forward from the year 1873, when we entered Confederation. To charge them, therefore, against 1878 was unfair and absurd." We are not aware that the present Government have ever in any way whatever charged the cents and duty bonds against the year 1878, and further, we believe that Mr. Davies is well aware that they have not done so. No man at all conversant with figures can fail to regard Mr. Davies' letter as a grossly unfair one, and deeply insulting to the intelligence of the people of Prince Edward Island. We shall recapitulate a few of the points in which the ex-Premier's unfairness is most apparent:—

1st. He claims that unpaid Assessments and arrears at the Land Office for 1878, should be credited to that year, without allowing similar credits for 1879!

2. He charges the year 1879 with five quarters salary to teachers, while he only charges three to 1878!

3rd. He only allows \$20,000, being interest received at Land Office in 1879, as ordinary revenue, while he claimed \$35,000 in the same way in 1878; while every person knows that the amount received in this way in 1879, is greater than in 1878!

4th. He hews over the refund of \$39,000 made in 1879 to reimburse the Local Treasury for expenses incurred under the Land Purchase Act, while he does not say one word about the refund of \$38,000 made in 1878, on account of Railway damages!!

5th. He charges the year 1879 with an amount outstanding, to be paid in 1880, and gives no credit for the much larger sum outstanding in 1878, and paid in 1879!!

When we characterize this unfairness as simply disgusting, we know the public will not accuse us of using terms too strong. The extreme impudence which Messrs. Louis Henry Davies and William Dunbar Stewart show to create an unfavorable impression against the present Government, in regard to the finances of 1879, is very far from creditable to them, and will furnish the people with another good reason why these gentlemen should be kept in private life. The people have not forgotten that those men spent in the two months of 1879, during which they held office, the enormous sum of \$80,000, or nearly one third of our total revenue for the year, and that they left an immense

amount of debt for their successors to pay. It must also be borne in mind that the new Civil Service Act only came into operation on the 1st of July. That in fact the present Government is only fairly responsible for the expenditure, for one half the year. Mr. L. H. Davies knows all this right well, and still he endeavors by foul means to score a point against his opponents.

NEWS BY TELEGRAPH.

Special Dispatch to the Examiner.

OTTAWA, March 22.

The House met at 3 o'clock. Tupper introduced a Bill to confirm the purchase, by the Dominion, of a portion of the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mackenzie asked when the Welland Canal would be opened.

Tupper said not before the first of May. In answer to a question Tilley said the Government would issue more of the fractional currency if it was found the country could not do without it. Whatever was issued would form a part of twenty millions of dollars of Dominion notes.

The motion of McDonnell about the Fishery Award being referred to, Tilley asked the Hon. member to allow it to stand.

McDonnell refused to do so, and spoke for some time upon the importance of the question to the Maritime Province.

McIsaac seconded the motion. Richey perfectly agreed with McDonnell as to the importance of the question, but moved the adjournment of the debate on the ground that the Finance Minister had stated that important papers needed for the debate, were not laid before the House.

Daly seconded the motion. Flynn expressed his surprise at the amendment moved and seconded by the members from Halifax, and spoke against the award remaining in the Dominion Treasury.

Killam thought the House and the country ought to know without delay, what was the policy of the Government respecting the Fishery Award.

Daly said he would be second to no man in urging upon the Government to adopt a wise and beneficial policy, but he did not think that any friend of the fishermen and of the Maritime Provinces, would urge on the discussion when the Government declared there were important papers wanted.

Robertson and Yeo deprecated further delay, and urged that there should be full discussion.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the Chair.

After recess the debate on Richey's motion to adjourn was continued by Yeo, McDonnell, Nuttall, Daly, Hackett, Tupper, Anglin and Brecken.

Both ministers said they had no desire to burk the question, but they believed it could be better discussed after the papers were brought down.

The House divided upon Richey's amendment, the votes being 141 to 48.

CONDENSED DESPATCHES.

At the Sand Lots on Sunday Kearney denounced the Police Judge, the Prosecuting Attorney and principal citizens.

Bob Wallace, an ex-convict, has been arrested on the charge of murdering Supt. Daily, of Blackwell's Island.

James Brown, a negro, brutally murdered a three-year old boy of Mr. Hillard's, near New Market, Friday. The citizens captured the negro and hung him.

Parnell arrived at Queenstown on Sunday, on the SS. Baltic. He was enthusiastically received and dined by the farmer's club. A procession accompanied Parnell to the station on his departure for Dublin. The demonstration was much smaller than was anticipated.

Ayoub Khan has undoubtedly commenced to negotiate with Persia.

An envoy from the Shah has reached Herat with in escort of 300 cavalry.

As Russia is about to renew negotiations in the Kuldja question only, thought the Russian Charge d'Affaires at Peking, it is likely that the visit to St. Petersburg of the Chinese Ambassador will be fruitless.

A Californian named Guerrero won the six days walking match in San Francisco—score 500 miles.

The Oxford crew won the University race by two lengths at Putney yesterday, time 21 min 25 sec.

I HAVE had much experience among athletics, ball players, gymnasts, etc., and can testify to the virtues of Giles' Iodine Ammonia Liniment for Discoloration, Bruises, and Soreness of the Muscles and Cords after violent exercise. WILLIAM MACMAHON, Argyle Rooms, Sixth Avenue, Cor. 30th St., N. Y. GILES' PILLS cure Flatulency.

POTATOES.

I WILL buy a limited quantity of well picked Potatoes, must be delivered at once opposite Merchants' Bank, Water Street.

H. COOMBS.

March 23, 1880—6i

COAL. COAL.

FOR SALE a large quantity of Cow Bay SLACK COAL. A first rate article for house use at \$2 per ton, cash.

WM. KOUGHAN.

Ch'town, March 23, 1880.—3i eod.

FOR SALE

ON the premises of the Subscriber, a large quantity of English Hawthorn Quicks, of the best quality, suitable either for Ground Hedges or Dykes.

JAMES B. MCKENNA.

Spring Park Cottage, Malpeque Road.

March 22, 1880—2w

POWNAI WHARF.

SEALED TENDERS will be received at the Mayor's Office until noon of MONDAY, the 29th Day of March, for leasing Pownal Wharf for a term not less than five years, nor exceeding ten years. Rent to be paid quarterly. Lessee will have privilege of removing at expiration of term, all buildings erected by him, or the City will purchase them at a valuation. The location and number of buildings subject to approval of Council. Further particulars can be ascertained from the City Clerk. Tenders will also be received until the same date from persons wishing to purchase the said wharf, stating terms and manner of payment.

The names of two good and sufficient sureties to accompany each Tender. The Council do not bind themselves to accept the lowest or any Tender.

EDWARD DAVY, Chairman Wharf Committee.

Charlottetown, 23rd Feb. 1880.

March 18, 1880.—s tu th sat—ne pat 2i

PRESSED HAY.

ON hand Fourteen Tons which will be sold cheap to an immediate purchaser.

JOHN H. CATHRAE.

Ch'town, March 22, 1880.—1w

DAIRY SALT.

AT the THIRD ANNUAL MEETING of the "Dairymen's Convention," held at London, Ontario, February, 1880, the Committee of Judges awarded the

FIRST PRIZE

Coleman & Gouinlock's

FINE DAIRY, over all other Canadian and English Salt exhibited.

Wholesale Agent for P. E. Island, JOHN H. CATHRAE, Charlottetown, March 11, '80.—1m

LONG CREEK!

A PUBLIC MEETING will be held at the New Dominion School House, on WEDNESDAY, the 24th inst., at 7 o'clock, p. m., to discuss the wants of the District and also local politics. Representatives of the District are invited to attend. New Dominion, Lot 65, March 19, '80.—pat ar

New Seeds. New Seeds.

JUST RECEIVED AT RANKIN'S DRUG STORE, All Varieties of Well-known Flower and Garden Seeds,

including some very new and choice kinds. Having been imported from one of the most reliable houses in the trade, the subscriber warrants them to give satisfaction.

C. D. RANKIN.

Ch'town, March 20, '80.—12i

SUPERIOR EXTRA!

STRONG BAKERS' FLOUR. SPRING EXTRA

A Choice Lot Cheap for Cash, WHOLESALE AND RETAIL.

B. BALDERSTON.

Queen Street, March 3, '80.—4w 2aw

E. G. HUNTER,

Manufacturer & Dealer in

MONUMENTS

Tablets, Headstones, &c.,

in variety, at LOWEST PRICES. BEST STOCK. Superior Workmanship.

SATISFACTION GUARANTEED TO PATRONS

N. B.—Farm Produce taken at market rates, in payment, during shipping season.

Kent Street, Charlottetown, P. E. I.

Please call and examine Designs & Prices. Mar. 20, 1880.—w d—tu sa 6m

Wants, Lost, Found, &c.

WANTED—As Clerk in a Grocery Store, a young man who has had some experience in the business. Must be well recommended, and capable of writing a good hand. Apply at EXAMINER Office. [m 19]

TO LET—On or about the first April, the House now occupied by Mr. Benjamin Davies, jnr., fronting on Water Street. For information apply to W. W. CLARKE. [m 18 tf]

HORSES WANTED—Two horses suitable for express driving. Apply at this Office. [march 18, 3i]

TO LET—A good HOUSE on Bayfield Street, containing 9 rooms; good stable and coach house. Rent moderate. Enquire at this office. [mar 15, 1w]

TO LET—To let, the first of May next, that new House now occupied by Mr. Bailey, nearly opposite the residence of E. J. Hodgson, Esq., Weymouth Street, near Hillsborough Square. Apply at the office of SULLIVAN & MONSON. [m 11]