state such precedents as appeared relative to the matter, he had done so; and all precedents in this Colony were opposed to the liability of Members or Officers of the Legislature being bound, during Session, personally to appear before any Court in civil cases. Now, every Summons from the Commissioners' Court, required such attendance, because no one might there appear as attorney. When the House referred the matter to him, he was not requested to look into the Acts of the Colonial Legislature, but merely to precedents; and he was till some days after, entirely anaware that by the 34th Section of the Act of 1844, all privilege of whatever description had been abolished. In his opinion, that Clause warranted the arrest of a Member at the door of the House while in Session. He saw a greater necessity for such alteration because by the Bill now before the House, the amount on which the Commissioners might adjudicate, had been more than doubled; and witnesses had been rendered liable to pay whatever damage might arise from their non-attendance; and a member might thus be dragged over the Island to attend as witness before half a dozen different Courts. His opinion had been and still was, that the service of any Summons or Subpœna during Session, should be legal; but that neither for eight days previous to the Session, nor during the Session, nor until eight days thereafter, should a member of the Legislature, or any of its principal officers be bound to attend on such citation. As a consequence of such exemption, he might be allowed to mention, that it would appear inconsistent, were Members to appear in such courts as plaintiffs, or Judges, or witnesses. He was not contending that members should be favoured. Favour was not the justifiable basis of privilege. But he was contending, that the public service should not be liable to interruption by members being bound to appear personally; when such attendance would be called for most probably with the view of occasioning inconvenience. When on the first meeting of the present House, he as Speaker, claimed their privileges, he used the words "in as large and ample form as had been accorded to any former House." Now it had been customary some years since to claim, not only "freedom from arrest," but also "*freedom from molestation*," and certainly a member would be molested, were he obliged either as witness or defendant to leave the House, and attend any Commissioners' Court throughout the Colony. But further, the honorable member, Mr. Pope, seemed also to have mistaken the scope of the Speakers observations on a former occasion, and the inferences to be legitimately drawn from them. On that occasion, he (the Speaker) had alluded to the departure of the British Parliament from the ancient privilege of not being liable to be sued during Session and had said, that it was a justifiable departure, because the position of members had been greatly changed from what they were some centuries since, when the privilege of freedom from suits was first established. The honorable member, Mr. Pope, interpreted this to be, that the power of the Sovereign and of his ministers to oppress members, was in ancient times great, and that privilege had been established to guard against that, and that as such power had ceased; therefore the Parliament had curtailed their privilege. But he (the Speaker) would put the case, that three or four centuries since a member, setting out from Herefordshire or Gloucestershire, to take his place in Parliament, had been sued by his neighbour for some alleged debt. What had the Sovereign or his ministers to do with that? Had his body-servant on such journey been arrested for debt, was that attributable to the Crown? The reality was that in those ancient times, Members of Parliament were not so apt to go abroad. The Crown occasionally exercised the power of preventing any member or any man of note from so doing. Now that power had ceased; commerce and habits of expense had greatly increased; and as to going abroad, very few men of fortune were to be found who had not visited the continent. It had, at last, become a practice with such members of either House, as desired to shun troublesome claims, to leave London a short time prior to the prorogation, and to visit Ireland or Scotland, or pass over to France. The great inconvenience and manifest injustice of such a state of things, were the causes which produced the Act, which abolished the freedom of Members of Parliament in Britain from suits during Session. But the freedom from arrest and from being obliged personally to appear before any Court in any cause not criminal, was still preserved there, but would cease in this Colony, unless the Legislature saw fit to alter the clause to which he (the Speaker) had referred.

Hon. Mr. POPE, could but marvel at the alteration in the hon. Speaker's opinion, even no longer since than yesterday; for he it was who was the chief cause of the Clerk of this House writing to the Commissioners, that the House would not permit the Assistant Clerk to obey the Summons. As to the power of other Courts over that of Parliament, he would like to see any officer come into the House and attempt to seize any Member except for Felony. He would soon find himself in uncomfortable quarters.

Mr. THORNTON could not divest his mind of the opinion, that creditors should have redress. He had never heard of any one being prevented from attending his Parliamentary duties, why then the necessity of further legislation, or of what were they afraid of now.

Mr. CLARK said, if any Member refused to pay a just debt, it was most derogatory to claim his privilege; for he must do so when liberated from his parliamentary duties, it would be time enough to take up the question when there was any interference with their privileges, established by law and custom.

Mr. PALMER was of opinion, that a Member might be taken under an Execution, from the very door of the House; it was a very old clause, and in his (Mr. Palmer's) opinion, should not be altered. It is very well known, what are the privileges of the House of Commons; but we do not enjoy the same, they were swept from under our feet by the wording of the clause; and as long as that continues, there is no privilege. Members out of the House, could be taken at any time, and he was also of opinion, that they could also be taken from within, with impunity; and did time permit, he thought, on reference to the proper authorities, he could make out his opinion to be correct.

Hon. Mr. COLES was a loss to understand what privileges the Members enjoyed, if they and their servants were not free from arrest; and doubts being entertained on the point, the question had better be set at rest. He (Mr. Coles) remembered when one Member who had resisted, as he thought, an unjust claim, being served with a writ on the first day of the Session; but he easily obtained bail, if he could not have done so, look at the consequences.

Hon. Mr. POPE, the privileges are well understood; they had come to us from time to time, under the British Constitution, and no law was therefore required. He was not aware of any express law against taking a Judge from off the Bench for debt, but would any one be so mad as to attempt such a step. Every constituted Court has the power to protect itself from contempt. No Sir, they would not any more than they would to take a Member from his seat in this House. If such a proceeding took place, the House would not hesitate in sending the officer to jail, and would be fully justified in so doing. He (Mr. Pope), knew an instance when a person had been confined in jail for Eight years; his attendance was required here, and he was brought up by his, Mr. Pope's brother, then High Sheriff of the Island. An action was brought against him, under pretence of an escape; but it was not sustained on a trial before Judge Archibald, who was a most able judge. He (Mr. Pope) knew the opinion of Lord Brougham, in the case of Dr. Carson of Newfoundland, was not in accordance with that generally entertained by the Colonists. He hoped, he may not be considered contumacious in doubting such an high authority, but we all know that Lawyers have never been favourable to Parliamentary Privilege, and the case of Newfoundland, (whose Constitution was conferred by Act of Parliament) was quite different from the other Colonies. It is not singular, Sir, in me to doubt his Lordship's opinion, for in Canada, they have never considered their privilege endangered by that decision. The same privileges enjoyed by the British Parliament, were to be enforced by the Colonial Legislatures on all proper occasions, but this stand could not be maintained, and the sooner it was abandoned the better.

Mr. DAVIES would support the amendment of the Hon. Mr. Coles. Many Members were chosen by the people who did not enjoy independent property; they looked more to their business qualifications, in the free exercise of which, they ought to be protected, or their Constituents may not be represented.

Hon. Mr. WARBURTON fully agreed with what had fallen from the hon. member for Belfast, and said, if the privileges were not firmly secured, there was no knowing where the inconvenience might stop. What others enjoy in other Colonies, there is no feasible reason why we should not. He was not pleading for paupers; because there were none such in the composition of the House.

Mr. YEO (from what we could gather) said, the people were to blame; who from year to year returned representatives who were frightened at the Small Debts' Court.

Mr. THORNTON humorously observed, that if there was any such, the merchants ought not to give them credit, then protection would not be required, for it was only such that would be benefited, he (Mr. T.) had never heard of any interruption to members by law proceedings in any of the Colonies.

Hon. Mr. WARBURTON said, if proceedings were instituted against any member in the Small Debts Court, and whether the debt was just or unjust, one of two things must happen, either to neglect his public business, or be mulcted in debt and costs, no substitutes being allowed to plead for him; the public business must be carried on, and the public protected through the protection of their members.

Hon. G. COLES again urged the necessity of protection, because if the proceeded against failed to attend, the Commissioners may say, it was no valid excuse, as they ought to have attended.

Mr. HAVILAND did not see that the striking out of the clause would have the effect contemplated, neither did he see any sound reason, why witnesses should not be compelled to attend to give evidence in the Small Debts Court, as well as in the Supreme.

Mr. CLARK could not support the amendment, he could only go so far as protection from arrest; no one hon. member seems to be able to define what privileges the House enjoy, but he should say, if any one of that body should be subpœnead, his proper course to take would be to inform the commissioners that he was attending to his Parliamentary business, and could not attend.

Several hon. members briefly addressed the Committee, when progress was reported, and leave asked to sit again. And the nthe House adjourned till 3 o'clock.

Saturday, 7th February.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS. Hon. Mr. COLES submitted a classified statement of the Public Accounts for the past year; and, in doing so, the hon. member observed that, by an inspection of those Accounts, hon. members would find that the revenue of the last year had been very nearly equal to the expenditure; for the excess of expenditure over the revenue was only £1200, and that excess would appear still smaller when they took into consideration that in the expenditure of 1851 was included nearly the whole of the amount which ought to have been disbursed on account of 1850, in consequence of the stoppage of the supplies. And he had the satisfaction of being able further to state, that the Government had reduced the Public Debt nearly £11,000 since the present House was elected.

The House having met this day between three and four o'clock, several hours were occupied in presenting and receiving Petitions, some in reference to the opening and repairing of Roads, but the chief part of them on the subject of Education, praying for the establishment of the contemplated free system, and favoring the imposition of an additional tax on land for that purpose. The petitions were severally referred to the Committees appointed in respect to Roads and Education.

Additional Land Assessment.

Mr. MOONEY. Seeing the members of the Government in their places, he wished to ask whether it was their intention to introduce a Bill, this Session, for the levying of additional Assessment on all Lands in this Island, when held by one person to any greater amount than Five hundred acres.

Hon. Mr. COLES. If the hon. member for the Second District of Queen's County (Mr. Mooney) had any wish to bring in such a Bill, there was nothing to prevent his doing so; and he had better give notice of his intention to do so.

Mr. MOONEY. If the Government were afraid to introduce such a Bill, he himself would assume the responsibility of its introduction; and he, therefore, begged leave to give notice that he would, on Thursday next, introduce such a Bill.

Hon. Mr. Whelan's Bill for the Equalization and Extension of the Elective Franchise.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN rose to move the second reading of the Bill introduced by him for the Equalization and Extension of the Elective Franchise; and, in doing so clearly explained the object and principles of the Bill, in a short speech to the following effect: The object, he said, was to extend to every holder, in the use and occupation of premises of the annual value of Forty Shillings, and who had been so, for twelve months previous to any Election, for the Town and Royalty, or Electoral District in which he held such property, of a member or members to serve in the Lower House of the Legislature, the right to exercise the Elective Franchise at such election. It was one of those measures for the extension of public rights, which, if well considered, would carry conviction of their equity into the minds of all on both sides of the House. In Nova Scotia, a step towards the practical recognition of this equitable principle was taken, by the Legislature of that province, last year, by the admission to the exercise of the Elective Franchise, of all persons rateable for public taxes or burthens; the object being to allow to labour and industry their due share of legislative representation. The principle was one which had now recommended itself to the public mind in every enlightened country in the world; and he knew not why there should be any longer kept, upon our Statute Book, a law so unequal, anomalous and unjust, as that which withholds, from all resident within the bounds and limits of our towns and royalties, the right to exercise the elective franchise, save and excepting such as occupy premises of the annual value of £10 and upwards, whilst to every man, not resident within those bounds or limits, and who was in the occupation of premises of the annual value of Forty Shillings, was extended the exercise of it. There could be no just reason for so unfair a distinction between the inhabitants of towns and those of the country. It was indeed high time that so invidious a distinction should be done away with. He was quite sure that the House would acknowledge the just and equitable principle on which the Bill was based; and that, by its adoption, they would declare it was due to the labouring classes, as well as to the wealthy, to have a voice in the legislature of the country: equally due to those whose labour and industry were the source of a country's wealth, as to those who happened to be the actual possessors of that wealth. The man of sinew, labour, and untiring industry was surely, in the eyes of common sense and common justice, as much entitled to have his interests cared for, by legislation, as the owner of real estate; and, consequently, had as clear a right to an equal voice in the choosing of the people's legislative representatives.

Mr. PALMER objected to the House's proceeding to take the Bill then into consideration in Committee, that he had not heard the Bill read, not having been in the house at the time of its first reading; that there was not a full House, and that it would not be fair to attempt any further progress, with respect to so very important a measure, in the absence of hon. members, the political interests of whose constituents the Bill was calculated to affect in a very serious manner. He besides objected that the Bill had not been introduced according to established parliamentary usage, with respect to all measures calculated to affect the elective franchise. Such measures could properly be based only on Resolutions previously agreed to in a Committee of the whole House, in which the principles and objects recognized and set forth in such Resolutions had been thoroughly discussed. The Bill then before the House would strike at the very foundation of the Election Law as it at present stood; and yet it was not demanded by means even of a single Petition, nor had even a solitary individual complained to the House, of the operation of the Law in its present state. If the people were dissatisfied with the present Law, it was very extraordinary that—so capable as they were of complaining when they had cause to do so, and so much pains as had, of late, been taken to agitate them with respect to real or imagined grievances—no complaints had been preferred against the Election Law, if they felt themselves agrieved by its operation. It was certainly wrong to attempt to carry so important a measure through the House, in the absence of any expression of public sentiment with respect to it, and before any opportunity had been afforded for such expression; for he believed that scarcely a dozen electors out of the House knew any thing about it. He himself required, and he thought other members of the House also would require more time to consider the nature of the Bill than had yet been afforded. He would, therefore, move, That the second reading of the Bill be made the order of the day for Wednesday next.

HON. MR. WHELAN. The hon. member for Charlottetown appeared to have forgotten that the House, towards the close of the last Session, appointed a Committee, to report, next Session, by Bill or otherwise, touching the question of an Extension of the Elective Franchise. A reference to the Journals of that Session would shew that the introduction of the Bill before the House, had been perfectly in accordance with the established rules of the House, with respect to such measures; for it was simply in pursuance of a Resolution of the House that the measure had been brought forward. But, the truth was, the opposition of the hon. member arose from his attachment to the old doctrine of delay, the fallacy of which, it appeared, he was not yet sufficiently enlightened to acknowledge. Are we, asked the hon. member, (Mr. Whelan,) never to introduce a measure for the public benefit, unless we shall have been previously called upon by the masses to do so? Such stand-still policy might suit the hon. member for Charlottetown and those who usually acted with him; but he (Mr. W.) would tell them that he conceived it would be highly derogatory to the wisdom and dignity of any legislative body, in Christendom, to delay the introduction of measures of public utility, until urged or driven to their adoption by the pressure from without.

HON. MR. WARBURTON observed, that owing to the irregular attendance of several hon. members, the progress of the business of the Session was much retarded. There were, just then, six or seven members absent; and it might be that on the day to which the hon. member for Charlottetown wished to postpone the further consideration of the Bill, the number of absentees might be eight or ten; so that no good end would be served by the delay. He (Hon. Mr. W.) would shortly submit a Resolution, which, if adopted, would be very likely to secure a more regular attendance on the part of hon. members.

The Hon. the Speaker then put the question on the motion of Mr. Palmer, on which the House divided:

AYES—Messrs. Palmer, Douse. Wightman, Haviland, and Yeo—5.

NAYS—Honorables E. Whelan, J. Jardine, J. Warburton, J. Pope, and G. Coles, and Messrs. Beaton, Flynn, Laird, Mooney—10.

So the motion was lost.

MR. PALMER. It had been stated, by the hon. member, (Mr. Whelan) who had introduced the Bill, that it had originated in the appointment of a Committee, last Session, to report concerning the expediency or inexpediency of such a measure, and that, therefore, the Bill had been properly introduced. The inference was fallacious. The appointment of that Committee—which was, he supposed, merely, in consequence of a motion of the hon. member (Mr. Whelan) for such a Committee—did not at all alter the case; nor, in any way, remove the objection, he (Mr. P.) had advanced with respect to the irregularity in introducing the Bill. The hon. member who introduced the Bill, thought proper to remark, that he had an interest in seeking to confine the exercise of the elective franchise, in the towns and royalties, to those holding or renting premises of the annual value of £10 or upwards; but, he was not influenced by any consideration of his own personal interests or those of others, as likely to be affected by the measure; but simply by a desire to keep the House from deviating from the rule wisely prescribed and established with respect to so grave a matter as an alteration of the elective franchise. But he might as well say in reply that the proposed alteration was to suit the convenience of the hon. member who had introduced the Bill. And, indeed, it might very well suit the views of that hon. member and others to have the qualification of voters reduced to Forty Shillings, or, in fact, to nothing, and to have the qualifications of electors altogether abolished; and it could not be otherwise than most probable, that the representatives of such electors would be pledged to the introduction of a further measure in the same direction; that they would be positively pledged to the introduction of Universal Suffrage: and he believed that was the object in view. The hon. and learned member then declared, that as he clearly saw it was the intention of the majority to carry the measure through the House with a high hand, he would take no part in any further deliberations upon it; he deemed it wholly unavailing; and to suggest any alteration or amendment, predetermined as the majority appeared to carry the measure.

HON. MR. POPE. He maintained that there had been no infraction of any parliamentary rule, by the manner in which the Bill had been introduced. The Committee, appointed last session to report concerning the expediency of a further extension of the elective franchise, had been perfectly competent to report to the House by Bill, as they had done through their chairman. He had been about twenty-two years a member of the Assembly; and, he presumed, the experience which he had acquired, during that period, concerning parliamentary rules and practice, was sufficient to enable him to form a pretty correct judgment, as to the conformity or non-conformity with parliamentary usage of any proceeding of the House. It was very true that parliamentary usage required that any measure, affecting the elective franchise, should be based on some Resolution or Resolutions of the whole House in Committee; but it was by no means necessary, according to such usage, that a Committee having been appointed to report concerning any such measure, should first have to ask for a Committee of the whole House, before they could introduce a Bill, if authorised to report by Bill or otherwise. There was no disposition on the part of any who were favorable to the Bill, to have it hurried through the House; and, if the hon. member for Charlottetown had asked, as a matter of courtesy, that the second reading of the Bill should be postponed until Wednesday next, he was very sure his request would have been readily complied with. The hon. member (Mr. Palmer) had complained that there was too thin a House for the proper consideration of the measure, and that he had not heard the Bill read on its introduction. To these objections, it might be replied that a House, composed of seventeen members out of twenty-four, could not with much propriety be accounted a thin house; and that, if he had not heard the first reading of the Bill, the fault lay with himself, in not having been in his place at the time. For his own part, he (Mr. Pope) wished that every member of the House might have an opportunity to express his opinions concerning the object and principles of the Bill. The equity of the measure would secure its passage. But that was not all that would be conceded to the people; for he was glad to be able to say—how much soever such an event might grieve the hon. member for Charlottetown—that there was good reason to believe that the day was not far distant when the property qualification of candidates would be completely done away with. Her Majestys prime minister had it now in contemplation to abolish it in England; as it was no guarantee for respectability, and was notoriously evaded. In Scotland it does not exist. And surely no one would say that the representatives of Scotland, chosen independently of any consideration of property qualification, were not men of as great integrity and abilities, as their fellow legislators, whose primary qualification was nearly fictitious. Wealth could not confer ability, neither did it make the man. Here, all were, comparatively speaking, upon a greater footing of equality; where it was scarcely worth the toss up of a farthing to be at liberty to choose between the poor man and the comparatively wealthy one; where he who was working his way through the forest to distinction, was often as worthy as he who had already attained it, the sooner such a property qualification as that which now existed should be abandoned, the better. Such extensions of popular privileges were now no longer dreaded as formerly. Every trial, in the way of such concessions, had shewn that no danger was to be apprehended from the poor, when put in possession of them. At the late Exhibition in London the case was perfectly in point where millions were assembled in and about the city, it had not been found that, on that account, the metropolitan authorities had had to deal with more cases of crime, or depredation. The losses sustained in the crystal palace were chiefly on the half-crown days, when the wealthier visitors were admitted; and not on the shilling days, when it was opened to the poorer classes. Wealth could not confer either ability or integrity; and it was unreasonable and unjust that it should any longer be allowed to constitute the only qualification for the enjoyment of any of the political privileges of freemen. With respect to the qualifications of electors, it was most absurd that, within certain bounds and limits, there should be a £10 qualification; and, a foot beyond, a 40s. one; and it was equally at variance with reason, that a man, in possession of a farm for which he did not pay 20s. yearly rent, but which, by skill and industry, he rendered much more valuable and productive than that of some lazy fellow who was liable to pay a rent of £5 per annum, should be debarred the exercise of the elective franchise, whilst his less worthy neighbour enjoyed it.

Mr. WIGHTMAN. The Bill was a most important one; and he was anxious that it should receive the fullest consideration of the House. He had voted for the motion of the hon. and learned member for Charlottetown not because he was opposed to the Bill; but merely because he wished that every member of the House should have a fair opportunity to inform himself correctly concerning the object and principles of the Bill. So far from being hostile to the measure, he would most cheerfully have gone with it, had it proposed a much greater extension of the elective franchise than that which it contemplated. Had it proposed universal suffrage, it would have had his hearty cancurrence and support. The poor man was, in his (Mr. Ws.) opinion, as much entitled to a free exercise of the elective franchise, as the possessor of thousands of pounds.

Mr. PALMER. The inception of the Bill last session was a positive infringement of an established parliamentary rule. The Bill was not based, as it ought to have been, on Resolutions previously agreed to in a Committee of the whole House; and it mattered not whether the wrong inception was in the last session, or ten sessions before; it could not make its introduction, in the present session, right, independently of such previous Resolutions. With respect to the revelation of his opinions, concerning the right of exercising the elective franchise, with which the hon. member from Bedeque had just favored the House, he (Mr. Palmer) would merely observe, that they differed very widely from those which he entertained at the time of the passing of the present Election Law. A mighty change, indeed, had, since that time, come over the spirit of his dream, with respect to the extent to which the elective franchise should be carried. The present Act sprung from a Bill, introduced under the auspices of that hon. member when, perhaps, he had influence enough to reduce the qualification of electors as low at least as it was now proposed to do, if not actually to nothing, had he been so minded. But, in those days, with that hon. member, there were big fish and little fish; and it was, in his opinion, the privilege of the big fish to devour the little ones. It had been said, by the hon. member from Bedeque, that he (Mr. Palmer) might have asked for the postponement of the second reading of the Bill, as a matter of courtesy. To that, he would merely reply, that it was not likely that he should ask for any postponement as a favor to himself touching a measure which was not confined alone to, although probably directed against, the interests he represented.

Mr. DOUSE. Hon. members ought to exercise common prudence and common justice with respect to the matter. It was nothing but right that such hon. members as were absent, and might disapprove of the measure, should have an opportunity to express their disapprobation of it. He, for one, would tell the friends of the Bill in a way not to be misunderstood, that he was decidedly hostile to so sweeping a measure, and very much questioned the motives and intentions of those with whom it had originated.

The House then went into COMMITTEE on the Bill: MR. WIGHTMAN in the Chair.

The first clause having been read, the HON. MR. COLES rose, and, in speaking in support of the Bill, observed that he had remarked one great absurdity in the operation of the present Act, which was, that the owner of a house of the yearly value of £10, after having mortgaged the property and reduced his actual annual interest therein to 40s., was entitled to vote just as if the full interest were vested in himself. Some hon. members had said they would be willing to go the length of universal suffrage and vote by ballot; but he was of opinion that it would be safer to confine themselves to the extension of the elective franchise as limited in the Bill; for were they to introduce a principle not yet admitted in any part of the British empire, they would very much endanger the ultimate success of the measure. It ought, he thought, to be held sufficient for the present, for it would extend the franchise to all but a very few hundreds.

The HON. the SPEAKER was of opinion that, as it was supposed the extension of the franchise contemplated by the Bill, would go so far as to exclude only a few hundreds from the privilege; it might be better to go the full length of universal suffrage; as, by that means, they would get rid of a very troublesome portion of the machinery of the Election Law: he meant the swearing of electors: it was hateful and embarrassing to candidates, and productive of much bad feeling.

HON. MR. COLES said that if they were to attempt to establish universal suffrage, it was very probable that powerful influences would be exerted to prevent the allowance of the measure, as had been done with respect to the one-ninth Bill.

MR. DAVIES, MR. LAIRD, and MR. MOONEY severally expressed their hearty satisfaction with the Bill, and the great pleasure which its introduction afforded them. The latter hon. member also declared his detestation of the practice of swearing electors, and set forth some of the evils and inconveniences which it occasioned; adding that he himself had never been concerned in causing the oath to be administered to any one. He besides pointed out, by means of two or three striking examples, the injustice and absurdity of the distinctions made by the present election law.

After the several clauses of the Bill, as submitted, had been gone through, and agreed to without any amendments, the HON. MR. WHELAN rose and read the following, which he said he would, at a proper time, submit as amendments to be incorporated with the Bill:

1. Whereas it is equitable and expedient that Representation should be, as nearly as practicable, based upon the principle of population. And whereas the representation of Princetown and Royalty is vastly disproportionate to that of any other Town or District in the Island. And whereas it is just and necessary that some alteration should be made, with the view of equalizing the representation of the First and Second Districts of Prince County, in order that it may be proportionate to the population of both respectively, and likewise that the representation of Princetown and Royalty may be put upon a wider basis: Be it therefore resolved, as the opinion of this Committee, the First District of Prince County shall comprise and include the following Townships, viz: Nos. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 & 17. And be it further resolved, that there shall be added to, or included in the representation of Princetown and Royalty, Township No. 18, together with the Islands situate in Richmond Bay.

2. *Resolved*, That the Law of Election be amended in conformity with the foregoing Resolution, and that the polling divisions as set forth in the 4th and 5th Sections of the Act, be altered therewith.

3. Whereas the latter part of the 42d Section of the Election Law appears to be ambiguous, inasmuch as doubt has arisen therefrom, and is likely to arise, as to whether a Presiding Officer may enter upon a scrutiny of any other objected votes than those which have been polled more than once, or polled out of their proper polling division. For the removal of all such doubt and ambiguity, Be it resolved, That the aforesaid Section shall be so amended, as to give in the clearest manner, full power to any Presiding Officer to scrutinize any objected votes, when such scrutiny may be demanded, that may have been objected to on any other grounds than that of being polled more than once, or polled out of their proper polling division.

4. Whereas it is expedient and necessary for the due and impartial administration of justice, that Judges of the Supreme Court should be kept aloof from the heated conflicts incident to an Election: Be it resolved, therefore, that the 72d Section of the Election Law be so amended, as to include in its restriction all Judges and Justices of the Supreme Court.

HASZARD'S GAZETTE EXTRA.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY, 12, 1852.

The Mail has not yet arrived as was expected; we have therefore, to meet the Out-going Mails, struck off our EXTRA, to lay before our readers the Debates in the House of Assembly which had been prepared.

Charlottetown Markets.

xchange 50 per cent. on Sterling. SATURDAY, Feb. 7, 1852.

	FROM		TO			FROM		TO	
Beef, (small) pr lb.	0	2½	0	4½	Wool,	1	0	1	4
do. by quarter,	0	2½	0	4	Ham,	0	0	0	0
Pork,	0	2½	0	3½	Barley, per bushel,	2	6	2	9
do. (small)	0	3	0	5	Oats,	1	4	1	7
Mutton,	0	2½	0	4½	Wheat,	0	0	0	0
Lamb, per lb.,	0	0	0	0	Timothy Seed,	0	0	0	0
Veal, per lb.,	0	3	0	4½	Potatoes,	1	6	1	9
Butter, (fresh)	0	10	1	0	Turnips,	0	0	0	10
do. by the tub,	0	8	0	10	Carrots, per bush.	0	0	0	0
Cheese,	0	3	0	6	Turkeys, each	3	0	5	0
Flour, per lb.,	0	1½	0	2½	Fowls,	0	9	1	0
Oatmeal, per lb.,	0	1½	0	1½	Eggs, per dozen,	0	10	1	0
Pearl Barley, per lb.	0	1½	0	0	Hay, per ton,	35	0	45	6
Sausages, per lb.	0	8	0	0	Straw, per cwt.	0	10	1	0
Tallow,	0	8	0	10	Codfish, per qtl.,	12	0	15	0
Lard,	0	8	0	0	Homespun, per yd.,	3	0	3	6
Ducks, each	0	0	0	0	Chickens, per pair,	0	0	0	0
Partridges,	0	6	0	9	Apples, per bush.	0	0	0	0
Geese,	2	0	2	6	Rabbits,	0	4	0	5
Beets, per bush.	0	0	4	0					

GEORGE LEWIS, Market Clerk.

LONDON TIMES.

A Person having the above PERIODICAL, sent to him regularly by Mail, is disposed to sell it at a reduced price.—Apply at the office of this Paper.

Charlottetown, Feb. 11.

Ready made Clothes and Cloths.

JUST received at the "*London House*," a large assortment of ready made CLOTHES, of every kind, of superior make, very cheap; also a great variety of CLOTHS; Pilot Whitneys, Beaver and Broad Cloths, Doeskins, Serges, Blankets, Carpeting, Hassocks, Mats, print and plaid Dresses very cheap; Worsted and Oil Table Covers, and a variety of other GOODS.

—ALSO—

ON CONSIGNMENT,

200 Bolts of CANVASS,

in all numbers, 1000 lbs. Sail Twine, a quantity of Bolt Rope, all of which will be sold as cheap as it can be imported.

H. HASZARD.

Great George Street, Feb. 11, 1852.

LABRADOR HERRINGS.

FOR SALE, One Hundred Barrels of Labrador HERRINGS, for which Produce or Firewood will be taken in payment.

Feb. 12, 1852. THOMAS DODD.

Freehold Property in Charlottetown.

THE Subscriber offers for Sale his Premises, situated in Grafton Street, opposite that of John McNeill, Esq., School Visitor, comprising one whole Town Lot No. 47, third hundred, with two convenient Dwelling Houses, Stable, Workshop, &c. For further particulars apply to

WILLIAM CUTCLIFF.

Grafton Street, February 7, 1852.