THE EXAMINER:

A Weekly Journal of Politics, Literature, and News.

"This is true Liberty, when Freeborn Men, having to advise the Public, may speak free."---Euripides.

Vol. XV. Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Monday, May 29, 1865. New Series.---No. 26.

OLD STAND, KING SQUARE,
CHARLOTTETOWN.

Furniture Warerooms.

THE subscriber feels grateful for all past favors, and begs to intimate to his old customers and the public in general, that he has lately added to his Establishment

Machinery necessary to facilitate his Business in every branch ;

and those who wish to buy FURNITURE that is made for use, in the most fashionable styles, and of the best materials, will do well to call and select for themselves, before going elsewhere, from his present Stock, consisting of Walnut and Mahogany Drawing Room Setts, i. e, Oval and Round Centre Tables ; French, Easy, Fancy high-back, Drawing, Dining, Hall and Bed Room Chairs, Green Plush and Hair-cloth seated ; Mahogany Side Boards, Hall Tables, Hat and Umbrella Stands, extension Dining Tables, French and Grecian Sofas, Couches and Lounges (as low as thirty shillings,) Chests of Drawers and Chiffioneers, Bedsteads, Stretchers, Cots and Cradles, Looking Glasses and Music Stools, Toilet Tables, Wash Stands, Wardrobes, Mattrasses of every description ; large and small Folding Clothes-horse and Towel Stands, Boot-stands and Jacks, Clothes Wringers, and a variety of other articles for general household furnishing.

WASHING MACHINES with or without wringers, superior to any imported, and warrauted to give satisfaction, from 80s. to 130s.

Two very superior MAHOGANY BEDSTEADS, and several good articles of

Second-hand Furniture,

in Walnut and Mahogany.

The above articles will be sold cheap for cash.

☞ All orders promptly attended to in the Cabinet Making, Upholstering, Turning and Jig Sawing, &c, &c.

I very superior CABINET ORGAN for sale, quite new, in Ash and Walnut case, five octaves, double bellows, with two blow pedals, four stops, tremolo and knee swell, very cheap for cash.

MARK BUTCHER.

May 15, 1865. 4in

A CARD.

THE subscriber, in returning thanks to his friends and customers for the liberal patronage extended to him since his commencement in business, would intimate to them and the public generally that he is prepared to execute orders in the various branches connected with his trade, that is to say —

Carriage & Sleigh Painting,
House, Sign, and
ORNAMENTAL PAINTING,
Plain and Decorative
PAPER-HANGING.

Carriages and Sleighs always on hand for sale in season.

ALSO—A quantity of 10 x 10 WINDOW SASHES, with or without Glass, for Sale cheap for Cash or approved paper.

☞ *All orders from the country punctually attended to.*

EDWARD MARTIN.

Residence, Kent Street, nearly opposite JOHN SCOTT, Esq., Carriage builder.

Charlottetown, April 24, 1865. 3m

THE LONDON AND LANCASHIRE FIRE AND LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY,

HAVING A LARGE PAID UP CAPITAL,

ACCEPT ALL CLASSES OF RISKS,

At Reasonable Rates of Premium.

CHARLES YOUNG, Agent.

October 17, 1864.

NOTICE!

LANDS FOR SALE!

THE subscriber, as the Agent of Sir SAMUEL CUNARD, Bart., The Right Hon. LAURENCE SULLIVAN, and Mr. EDWARD CUNARD, has been directed to discontinue the system of LEASING LANDS—heretofore pursued. For the future these lands will be SOLD on the following terms :—A deposit of Twenty-five per cent. of the purchase money to be paid down at the time of signing the agreement, and the residue in ten years by equal instalments. The price will be from Twenty shillings (20s.) per acre upwards.

Further particulars made known at the Subscriber's office.

G. W. DEBLOIS.

Ch'town, May 15, 1865.

SPECIAL NOTICE!!

THE undersigned have appointed Mr. H. J. RICHARDSON, of Summerside, their AGENT, where TOBACCO can be had at the SAME RATE as in Charlottetown.

LOWDEN & RICHARDSON.

May 1, 1865. tf

RARE CHANCE.

FOR Sale, a very fast BLACK PONEY, 3½ years old, perfectly sound. ALSO, 1 set Poney Harness complete, 1 Riding Saddle and Bridle, 1 Halter, &c., &c. : 1 Box Sleigh, 1 Dog Cart, will be sold — a bargain. Apply to the Subscriber at the 'Examiner' Office.

F. W. HUGHES.

May 15, 1865.

STELLA COLAS.

Rimmel's Stella Colas Boquet, dedicated by permission to his talented Artiste

"Her beauty hangs upon the cheek of night,
As a rich jewel in an ethiop's ear,"

Perfumes for the Handkerchief:

Alexandra, Guards, Fragepane,
Prince of Wales, Rimmel's Lilly of the Valley,
Jockey Club, Wood Violet, Millefleur,
Essence Boquet, Patchouly, Violet,
West End, New Mown Hay, Love's Myrtle.

The Bard of Avon's Perfume, in a neat box ; Sydenham Eau de Cologne, Treble Lavender Water, Extract of Lavender Flowers, Verbena Water, Tercentenary Sachet, Perfumed Tercentenary Souvenir, Shakespeare Golden Scented Locket, Extract of Lime Juice and Glycerine, for making the Hair soft and glossy ; Rose Leaf Powder, an improvement on Violet Powder ; Bloom of Ninion, for the complexion ; Depilatory Powder, for removig superfluous hairs without injury to the skin —Napoleon Pomade, for fixing the Mustacheos, and instantaneous Hair Dye, for giving the Hair and whiskers a natural and permanent shade without trouble and danger.

Rimmel's Rose Water Crackers, a new and amusing device for evening parties.

WM. R. WATSON.

City Drug Store, Dec. 19, 1864.

COLONIAL LEGISLATURE.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

DESPATCHES—CONFEDERATION.

(Continued.)

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON : Your honors, when I consider all that has been said already within the walls of this building, as well as outside, on the highly important question of Confederation, I would not deem it necessary to extend my remarks on that subject to any great length. But on the other hand, the magnitude of the interests involved forbids my giving a silent vote on the Resolutions before this House. The conditions on which it is proposed that this Colony should enter into Confederation have been so thoroughly canvassed already, that the subject has become threadbare ; therefore my remarks and your honors' attention shall be chiefly directed to points that do not so directly lie within the trodden path as those already indicated. Confederation has received its *quietus*, for the present, in New Brunswick, but its friends among ourselves appear to be so captivated with some grand ideas connected with it, as to be willing to "compass both sea and land to make some proselytes" to this their favorite scheme. And as some of them attribute the opposition which that scheme has to encounter, here and elsewhere, to "ignorance and prejudice" on the part of anti-Unionists—assertions which it is their duty either to prove or retract—I, for one, will endeavor to prove the contrary to be the case. It is not only our undoubted right, but also our positive duty to ourselves and to our posterity to enquire as carefully as we can into the character and institutions of any people, whether great or small, with whom we are called upon to cast in our lot, "for better, for worse," before we permit any such compact to be consummated. One or two brief extracts from the history of Canada may serve as an index to that enquiry. "A division of the Province into Upper and Lower Canada was effected in 1791: Mr. Pitt, the Minister of the day, observing that there was no probability of re-uniting the jarring interests of the inhabitants but by giving them two separate Legislatures. For many years the experiment appeared to succeed. In 1837, however, a rebellion burst forth, headed by Papineau in Lower Canada, and McKenzie in Upper Canada." The historian adds : "Probably there never was an insurrection attempted with less reason or fewer grievances by which it might be justified." At length, after a suspension of the Canadian Constitution, and the dissolution of the two Legislatures, Lord Durham was sent out to assume the reins of Government. I suppose that all your honors know something of the events that followed—that the rebellion was crushed, order restored, and the present Union effected on the basis of an Act passed on the 23rd July, 1840, when Sir P. Thompson, afterwards Lord Sydenham, was Governor General—that some of the more hot-headed of the Montreal folks, several years afterwards, made the Parliament building too hot for their legislators, so that it was consumed to the ground with nearly all its contents. At a date still later, Royalty was so little respected in the same city, that the Governor General was perfumed with rotten eggs in its streets, and the "Stars and Stripes hoisted up to the breeze!" The population of Canada West have so outgrown the basis of their present Union as to have brought the Governmental affairs nearly to a dead-lock for several years past ; so that they had no fewer than five Administrations during the short space of two years. Then came to the rescue the coalition project as a provisional palliative rather than a permanent remedy for existing evils—an arrangement that may enable them to hold together while a sense of danger from without tends to keep internal differences in the back ground, and still further, while they are straining every nerve to secure Confederation as a sovereign remedy for all their difficulties, present and prospective. But in order, so far as I am concerned, to repel the charge of "ignorance," and to cast it back in the face of those who prefer it, I may state, at this point, that I resided in Canada from the latter end of October, 1838, until the first of August, 1848. During that time I was in positions to make fully as correct an estimate of Canadian affairs and character as that which some of our Delegates occupied during sojourn in that great Province in the month of October last. For, while they appear never to have looked beyond the sunny side of any question or prospect presented to them, I could and did examine facts and events, so to speak, from Griffinton, as well as from the lowly mountain ; from the lovely suburbs, as well as from the Quebec citadel. And well do I remember some of the more prominent scenes enacted in Griffinton during an election that came off in the year 1844. On that occasion the leading rowdies of that place attempted to carry all before them ; but when the 93rd Highlanders, then in garrison, were called out, they very soon compelled them to draw in their horns, but not until they had succeeded in thoroughly smashing the windows, etc., of a Wesleyan Chapel in that section of Montreal. These hints are calculated to give us a bird's eye view of Canadian politics and their general proclivities. The way being now clear this far, it may be asked was it not right that the able statesmen of Canada should seek a safe and suitable way of escape for that Province from its internal, and of defence against its external troubles? It is right that they should do all this, but we deny their right to seek or obtain our humble assistance for any such objects without our receiving good security for a fair and just equivalent in return. Does the Report of the Quebec Conference secure to this Colony anything like justice in view of our peculiar position and circumstances? Let any one who may be able to do it with impartiality, fairly weigh the sweeping powers which the new constitution would place in the hands of the Federal Government, for the imposition of high tariffs and every description of taxes, and then, as a true patriot, affirm if he dare, that the terms of the Quebec Report are "just and liberal to Prince Edward Island." Some of our most ardent Unionists do acknowledge that the Quebec scheme "offers to us nothing that could, with any show of reason, be refused to us ;" but they say that, on the other hand, we would derive so many indirect advantages from the Union as would more than make up for the disadvantages complained of. Now, your honours, in this single admission and its appendix, which is but a sample of the many negatives in circulation, we have a clear proof that the more positive and substantial arguments in favor of Confederation, as far as Prince Edward Island is concerned, are as few and far between as the indirect benefits which that scheme would confer upon us would be. Had the Conference given any positive proof of a disposition to make any due allowance, in a financial point of view, for our insular position, as they did for Newfoundland — I, for one, would look upon the whole scheme in a very different light. But when the very reverse of this is the case, what conclusion can we come to but that, while Newfoundland was to be virtually purchased, we were to be as virtually sold, and made a mere convenience of for the Canadians. The Hon. George Brown, of Toronto, in one of his speeches delivered at Halifax, I believe, affirmed, in most emphatic terms, that it was not their own political necessities that induced them to desire a Federal Union. Let any one compare Mr. Brown's speech with the speeches of the Hon. Mr. Galt and the Hon. Mr. McGee delivered since, in Canada, on the same subject, and they will, I think, fail to discover any harmony between the former and the two latter. The New Brunswickers have given a most emphatic verdict against confederation. This is very extraordinary, in view of all the advantages they would derive from the Intercolonial Railway. It would enhance the value of every acre of their land. The price of every horse would be increased, as well as the demand for manual labour of every description. In fact, if any general advantages were ever to flow from the contemplated Union, which would extend beyond the Canadian boundaries, New Brunswick would be the very first to participate in them. Now, if it be still admitted that in this the New Brunswick people have not acted contrary to sound reason, I ask would it not be perfect madness in us, with all our disadvantages, to accept the terms offered? But I suspect that the following extract called "Correspondence relating to the Intercolonial Railway," will throw some light upon the subject. In a letter from Governor Gordon to the Governor General of Canada, the following occurs : "If a solemn agreement, deliberately made with two other Provinces, calmly considered, voluntarily entered into, confirmed by your Excellency's approved signature, is to be regarded as a thing of no weight, *what Provincial obligation may be looked upon as secure?* I cannot suppose your Excellency's advisers can be insensible to the responsibility attaching to the assumption of such a position ; nor will I believe the people of Canada—even those who disapprove of the engagement of 1862—desire to see it overthrown at the risk of spreading abroad a suspicion which, even if unjust, cannot fail to be generally injurious—*that, in that country important interests of a permanent character are lightly dealt with, and grave questions of inter-Colonial policy decided, not on their own merits, or in accordance with any fixed principle, but are taken up, trifled with, and abandoned, to suit the political exigencies of the passing hour.*" The plain fact is that the people of New Brunswick have no confidence in the politicians of Canada. And when to this is added the anti-British haste with which it was attempted to force this scheme upon these Colonies, which saw no immediate necessity for so radical a change in their constitution, as it was natural for them, their suspicions were aroused to no ordinary degree. I would remark here that the antagonism to the wishes, and I would say to the best interests, of their own constituents, maintained by some of our own politicians, reminds me of what a shrewd thinker said as illustrative of ingratitude. It was to this effect : "when you hand a ladder to a man to go up, he immediately turns his back upon you." If I were asked to describe a consistent representative in few words, I would say that he should be a miniature of his constituents ; or, in other words, that he should reflect the lawful, constitutional, and well ascertained wishes of his people. It is true that, in these times, important changes take place in the course of a few short years which materially changes public opinion, as well as the aspects of public affairs ; but still, under such a contingency, the politician's path of duty is a patient one. He should use the best means in his power to convince his supporters that his views are right, and conducive to their best interests ; or failing in that, he should either keep his own views practically in abeyance or leave it optional with his supporters to choose another representative. The "glory argument," as it is termed, is largely dwelt upon by our Unionists to a man, in pressing the claims of their hobby. That argument has been well answered by his honor the Attorney General, in his address lately delivered in the Temperance Hall, in which he showed that, with an independent gentleman from England as our Governor, our young men of talent and education find a more direct and sure path to recommendation and promotion than they would under Confederation, when their chances would be, at the very best, but equal to 5 in 194. In fact, those who lay undue stress upon such arguments in so far as I am concerned, may just as well try to make us believe that Jonah's gourd at Nineveh was superior to the palm trees of Palestine. Now, your honors, I must confess that when the "glory argument" as it is laced by a few of our Unionists, and their other tactics are taken together, they bring to my recollection the kite in the fable, which reads as follows :

"Once on a time a paper kite
Was mounted to a wonderous height,
When, giddy with its elevation,
It thus expressed self admiration :
'See how you crowd of gazing people
Admire my flight above the steeple ;
How would they wonder if they knew
All that a kite like me can do ?
Were I but freed I'd take a flight,
And pierce the clouds beyond their sight,
But, ah ! like a poor prisoner bound,
My string confines me to the ground ;
I'd brave the eagle's towering wing,
Might I but fly without a string.'
It tugged and pulled while thus it spoke,
To break the string—at last it broke.
Deprived at once of all its stay,
In vain it tried to soar away ;
Unable its own weight to bear,
It fluttered downward through the air ;
Unable its own course to guide,
The winds soon plunged it in the tide.
Ah ! foolish kite, thou hadst no wing,
How couldst thou fly without a string"

The elevating "string" in those lines I take to signify the people's suffrages, which will not bear every degree of violent force without snapping asunder ; but if it should be a cap that will fit no one, I will be all the better pleased. The defence question is the next that calls for serious attention ; and on that also the Unionists and I are at issue. For while, like their prototypes in Canada, they represent our American neighbours as prepared to "gulp us up" at an early date—unlike Canadians in regard to Canada—they discourage our local efforts for self defence. Whether that is true patriotism I will leave it for this House to judge. But time forbids my entering largely into the subject. It may be remarked, however, that in view of what the Government of Canada have lately done, and what they are still doing, to strengthen friendly intercourse between the two countres, we may reasonably conclude that, if any serious differences should unfortunately arise, it will be occasioned by disputes about points of international law or policy between England and the United States. In that case, England herself will not shrink from taking her proper place in the quarrel, and these Colonies would do their best by her side. Whatever the British Government may advise us to do to strengthen the many ties which bind us to old England, and to her noble flag which has, for a "thousand years, braved the battle and the breeze," I trust that we shall do it in a way worthy of our origin, and of our present advantages. These being an outline of my views and sentiments, how could I do otherwise than give my hearty support to the Resolution before the House?

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON : I do not intend to detain your honors long, but this is a question of such vital importance to the future well-being of this Colony, that I cannot give a silent vote upon it. I think it would be very imprudent for us to go into the proposed union upon the terms which are offered to us. What could we gain by it? As far as I can see, there is no chance of gaining anything, but there are many chances to lose. I think the offer is something like this : if we will give up one-half of our revenue to the Canadians, and allow them to tax us as much as they please, they would then take charge of us. We fought hard and contended long for Responsible Government, and are we now going to give up our constitution and say we are not able to govern ourselves? I do not think that any man or any body of men in Canada can know the wishes and wants of the people of this Island as well as we do ourselves. And are the people of this Island, which is marked out by the great Finger of Nature to be a separate Colony—parted from the other Provinces by an arm of the sea—and bound up by ice for a great part of the year, are we, I say to be called upon to assist in building every mile of their Railway, and contribute to the opening up of their Canals, which are more than a thousand miles away from us, and which can never be any benefit to us? If we had been told that they would not ask us to contribute towards their Railroads and Canals, and for opening up the communications to the North West Territory, but that they would expect us to contribute to the general defences of the Colonies, the scheme would be looked upon in a much more favorable light. I, for one, would not be so much opposed to it. I heard some of the friends of union say that, if the Colonies were united, all productions of, and articles manufactured in, the neighbering Provinces would be admitted here free of duty, and that, they thought, would be an advantage ; but if it would, why could we not admit them free now, without going into the Union? Can we not have free trade without giving up our independence? Look at New Brunswick, which stands in a far more favorable position for going into the Union, and would derive many advantages from it which we would not, being bounded by Canada, they can carry on their commerce and intercourse by railroad, in winter as well as in summer—the question has been brought fairly before the people, and, as far as we have heard the result of the elections, they are decidedly against going into the Union. Some of the most popular men in the Province have been rejected. Why, then, should we go into the Union when they, to whom it would be a much greater advantage, are opposed to it? We had better act cautiously, and not take a step in haste which we might regret for years, and which might be a misfortune to those who will come after us.

Hon. Mr. MCLAREN : This, your honors, is an all-important question, but it has been so thoroughly discussed that it is one reason why it is unnecessary to say much upon it at the present time. Another reason is, that we happen, for this once, to be all of the same opinion. It is well known to your honors what brought this question before us. There was a delegation authorized by the Legislature last session, to confer with delegates from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick upon the subject of a Legislative Union of the Maritime Provinces, and out of that sprung this question now before us—a union with Canada. A delegation was asked for by the Governor General of Canada to confer upon the subject of a Federal Union of the Colonies, and that request was granted by the Government of this Island. There are some who blame the Government for taking this step without the consent of the Legislature ; but I cannot see that they did anything improper. Before those who are inclined to censure the Government would say much, they should apply the golden rule, and ask themselves what they would do if they were placed in similar circumstances. There are very few, I believe, who would not have acted upon the same principle I must confess that I am not favorable to Confederation, but, at the same time, I would not be very hot against it. I would take the subject into cool and calm consideration, and weigh it without bias, and with a desire to do justice to advance the interests of all parties. The Convention was held in Quebec, in October, and the result is before us in this Report. It is an able and statesman-like document, and is worthy of recommendation, as far as those who drew it up are concerned. I do not think it is right to censure those gentlemen who represented this Colony in that Convention. I cannot accuse them of any intention to injure this Island ; but on the other hand, I believe they did their duty so far that they obtained the best terms for this Colony that they could get from the Canadians. But even supposing they could get more, or could get better terms—suppose they could get double as much for giving up our Constitution and revenue to Canada—I would not consent to it, for it would simply be selling ourselves for a larger sum, and I would not consent to sell ourselves at all. We have a good Constitution, and let us maintain it. Our revenue is increasing at the rate of upwards of £3,000 a year ; but if we enter Confederation we would have a certain fixed sum —a sum which would not increase, no matter how much our revenue might increase. That sum would not be sufficient for our necessities and we would have to resort to direct taxation. I oppose Confederation on the basis of the Quebec Report because I believe it is unjust to this Island. In the first place, representation based on population is an unjust thing to this Colony, because it is a small country which, in the course of a few years, will not be capable of increasing in population as it does at present ; but Canada has a large unoccupied territory, and will probably increase for ages to come. Now, I find in one article of the Report that the representation is to be readjusted every ten years, and in the course of a few years we would probably lose one of our representatives, then another, and another, till, in course of time, we might lose them all. I have heard it argued by a good politician, or rather one who I thought till now was a good politician, that five representatives were as good for us as fifteen ; but I cannot see the propriety of this argument. If five are as good as fifteen, then two are as good as five, therefore this reasoning is false. I would oppose Confederation on the proposed plan, because while it might be a benefit to a few, it would be an injury to many, and we are bound in justice to support such measures as would be a benefit to the great masses of the people, and let the few do for themselves. It might be a benefit to the few who would get into office, but it would be an injury to those who would have to pay taxes to support them. Therefore I would oppose Confederation on that ground. In regard to the tariff and taxation, we would be put upon the same footing as Canada ; and we know that from the circumstances of the people it would bear very heavily upon them—that it would be injurious—and not only so but positively ruinous. It would also be unjust, for it would be taxing our people for large public works from which we would derive no benefit. Those railways perhaps be a little indirect benefit, but not such as to induce us to support them to the extent which we would be called upon to do. And besides those large defensive works would cost millions of dollars, but they would be a benefit to themselves, for the works would be going on, and the money expended among themselves, while we would receive no benefit from them in that way. Therefore I believe that, while we are in a prosperous way we should try to keep so, and not jump into Confederation, which we would repent all our days, and our children after us. I do not like to give a silent vote upon this question, though I do not profess to go through the whole subject in all its bearings as some do ; neither do I think it is necessary to go minutely into the financial part of the scheme again, as that part of the question has been so well explained by your honors who preceded me.

Hon. Mr. LORD : For my part I am not prepared to make a speech, nor do I think it is necessary, for there has been such a great deal said already both for and against this scheme. However, I will support the resolution before the House ; but still, though I have heard a great deal said, and a great many calculations made, I consider a great many of them to be visionary ; for instance, the expenses of supporting the Federal Government. The calculations respecting those expenses are mere supposition. The best statesmen in England could not make such calculations with any degree of certainty. It is all well, however, to keep on the safe side. A great deal has been said about the heavy taxation of Canada ; but see what they have to show for it. It is not a few bad roads and rotten bridges. None of the British Colonies have improved as much as Canada has within the last few years. If they are heavily taxed it is for the purpose of local improvement. I have a brother in Canada, and he does not complain of paying heavy taxes or assessment. He says the advantages of the climate make up for all their disadvantages in that respect. I merely allude to this to show that there are none of the Colonies which can compare with the Canadas in permanent and solid improvements. What was Canada a few years ago? Why, before the railroads were opened up, and the communication on the lakes, it would cost emigrants more to go from Quebec to Canada West than it would cost them to come from Germany, or wherever they came from ; but now they can go from Quebec to London, Canada West, without moving their luggage from the car. There is not a word now about the debt of this Colony—no, people's minds are drawn away from that ; but I maintain that, according to population, the people of this Colony are taxed as high as they are in Canada, including the rent. And where is the money expended? In Canada they have many noble public works to show for their heavy taxes. We hear a great deal about the Canadian politicians being a corrupt set of men ; but I just let these assertions go for nothing. I am not afraid to assert that the morals of the leading statesmen of Canada will compare favorably with those of the statesmen of Prince Edward Island. I am willing to let that statement go abroad. But with all this I am not prepared to go for the Union. It was not the delegates who made the great mistake, but it was us who voted for that resolution last year to authorize the appointment of a delegation. Give those men an inch and they will be sure to take a yard. What has the delegation done for us? It has cost the country upwards of £1400. Those gentlemen pocketed a nice sum of money out of the public funds. I have not examined the public accounts very minutely, but I suppose they had six or eight dollars a day besides their expenses. However, though I do not approve of the delegation, I will support the resolution.

Hon. Mr. BEER : I think it is a pity that his honor would vote for the resolution after speaking the other way.

Hon. Mr. LORD : I did not speak in favor of confederation, but I spoke against those gentlemen who make assertions and allusions without foundation. The subject has been forced upon us by those famous delegates, but if they had to put their hands in their own pockets to pay their expenses they would not have gone to Canada.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON : Your honors I have no desire to act the part of a resurrectionist by exhuming anything that should be allowed to rest in oblivion ; nor that of an "Old Mortality" in chiseling afresh the memorials of painful events any further than to deduce from them the lessons of caution and instruction which they are well calculated to impress, in regard to present and future duty. But if his honor from Prince County (Mr. Lord) chooses to question the correctness of my remarks in regard to Canadian politicians and their proclivities, I beg to assure him that I have more facts in store than I intend to parade this evening. I may be told that "those who live in glass houses should not be the first to throw stones." I admit the axiom in all its force, but would add in reply, that the less we multiply such political "glass houses," the more we will increase the general safety. We all know that party Governments have often a hard task in striving to steer the ship of state safely between the "whirlpool and the rock," and so much is this sometimes the case that a piece of doubtful expediency has to take the place of sound and fixed principles. But for any one to turn round, because lesser points are yielded under great pressure, and justify extensive corruption, is just as much as to say that "the end sanctifies the means!" The Canadian Government have lately been charged with the bribing of their own press to a large extent ; and some of its own members or supporters are represented as defending, and even justifying the conduct of that Government. If all this is true, the conclusion is, that the less we have to do with them the better for ourselves.

Hon. Mr. LORD : His honor takes exception to the remarks which I made relative to the good moral standing of the Canadian statesmen, but there is nothing which will prove their good standing better than the fact that their credit is good. When five or six years ago they required a loan of half a million of dollars for Victoria Bridge, though it cost a million and a half, it was loaned by capitalists in England ; and let me see that the like of that has been done in any other part of the British Colonies. If those men were as corrupt as they are represented to be their credit would not be worth a rap in England. People in England know the standing of those men better than we do. They have borrowed about two millions of dollars for public works, and pay four per cent. interest for it. That does not look like losing their credit. Let poor Prince Edward Island ask for a small loan, and the answer would be an emphatic no !

The House was then resumed and progress reported.

The Militia bill, and a bill to authorize the appointment of Clerks to Justices of the Peace and to regulate proceedings had before them, were read the third time and passed.

On motion, a bill in further amendment of an act to incorporate the Royal Agricultural Society was read a second time, committed, and reported agreed to without amendment.

Adjourned till Monday next at ten o'clock.

MONDAY, April 3.

APPROPRIATION BILL.

Hon. Mr. LORD : I object to the appropriation of £60 for wharfage for the Mail Steamers. Those gentlemen are very accommodating to themselves, indeed. One of the public wharves was reserved for the mail service, and now, because certain changes have taken place, the Government must pay this large sum for their accommodation. I consider it one of those party jobs which are too apt to take place at present. You will also find charges in the accounts for travelling to inspect the building of one of the steamboats. What have the public to do with the inspection of a boat for a private company? I have travelled on a similar service myself for the benefit of the country, and I never received a shilling for it, nor looked for it.

Hon. Mr. BEER : There has been a grant of £40 for wharfage for the Mail service for years past. Now there is additional accommodation for them, and, therefore, the sum of £20 additional is granted. The wharf which the steamers occupy now is more central, and they require additional accommodation, for they are running more frequently than they did formerly. Those steamers are a great advantage to the farmers in sending their produce to market, as well as to the people generally, and I do not think we should grudge this small additional sum for wharf accommodation. It is a credit to the Colony to have those boats owned here.

Hon. Mr. LORD : I know some would like to bolster up a transaction of this sort, but I, for one, will not do so. There were great charges against the late Government for extravagence in every sense of the word ; but now, the very men who made those charges will stand up here and make an aplogy for such transactions. It is not the amount we are to look at so much as the principle.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL : I wish to call attention to the improper way in which the appropriation Bill is taken up. Your honors know that this is a very important Bill, and it is commonly taken up so late in the Session that members of this House have not time or opportunity to let their views go to the country. Your honors cannot expect us to support every item in that Bill. Many items in it would be considered objectionable by the country if they were seen in their true light ; but the want of time prevents us from exposing such items of expenditure as we think are not called for. I merely call attention to this so that a different method may be adopted at a future Session.

Hon. the PRESIDENT : If your honors think the time is too short, I will notify His Excellency that we will not be prepared to be prorogued this evening. Your honors may discuss this Bill till Saturday night if you like ; therefore it is unfair to throw any reflection on the House of Assembly, for they cannot be prorogued till we are prepared. The item which is objected to is very small. Formerly there were £40 given when there was only one steamer ; now there are two, and a portion of the wharf is nearly all the time occupied by them. When we compare the business done at the wharf now with what it was a few years ago, I do not think it is an unreasonable increase.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY : It is only the difference between £40 and £60, and I do not think it is worth while to occupy time in discussing it. I am apprehensive that there are items in the Bill to which we will have stronger objections, but we can only express an opinion upon them. We must either take the Bill as a whole or reject the whole.

Hon Mr. DINGWELL : It is very well for those who receive the benefit of those large grants to support them, but I represent a people who receive no benefit from those grants for steam communication, and there is no compensation made to them in the shape of grants for roads, bridges, or wharves. I do not think it is fair ; those who receive no benefit from the grants to the Mail steamers, should receive an equivalent in grants for roads and bridges, or for some other service.

Hon. Mr LORD : The next item is £20 for wharfage at Point Brule. What right have the inhabitants of this country to pay for wharfage in Nova Scotia? We have no right to pay that item ; and this House will have to take a stand against sending up the appropriation Bill in this shape. Why not send it up in separate resolutions, as they do in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? I presume that there is independence enough in this House to take a stand against this Bill coming up in this manner. Here is the Revenue Bill coming up at the eleventh hour, and it is unfair to have it sent up in this way. There are many objectionable items in it. There are hundreds of pounds going into pockets where it should not go. It will be cast up to us bye and bye, that we are corrupt like the Canadian Government.

Hon. the PRESIDENT : The steamers must have wharf accommodation, and if the public do not pay the wharfage, the owners of the boats must pay it themselves, which, I think, would be a great hardship. To say that we should not pay for the use of the wharf at Brule, because it is in Nova Scotia, is absurd.

Hon. Mr. LORD : Then, by the same rule, we should pay the disbursements of the steamers. I say the public have not a right to pay that wharfage. I suppose we will have a bill sent in, bye and bye, for brandy and wine for those steamers.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY : His honor says we should make a stand against the Appropriation Bill being sent up in this shape, but it came in the same way when the late Government was in power, and I would ask him why they did not make a stand then?

Hon. Mr. LORD : Well, I can tell his honor that "two wrongs will never make a right;" and if the late Government did wrong, that is no reason that we should do wrong, too. I was in the other branch of the Legislature then, and this Council was nominative. It was crammed up with the friends of a party, but it is not so now. We are here to represent the people, not a party. I do not say that this House should have control over the appropriation, but I would have this Bill sent up in separate resolutions, and then have it framed in the House of Assembly in accordance with those resolutions.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL : I do not rise, your honors, for the purpose of pronouncing an opinion on the items to which objection has been taken ; but in reference to the small appropriation for the use of the wharf at Brule, I think it may be fairly justified on the ground that it is advisable to encourage intercourse that way. It is a benefit to the Island to have communication by that route, and perhaps we would not have the accommodation of a wharf if we did not pay for it. I do not think it would be good policy to question that item. But there is another item which calls for an expression of opinion, and I must say that there is great force in the remarks of his honor from Prince County (Mr. Lord), that it would be an improvement if the Appropriation Bill, instead of being sent up as it is at present, were sent up in separate or classified items. It has fallen on me to speak on this question before, when this house was not elected, and the people had no control over it. During that period of our political history, it was, perhaps, well to advocate and adhere to the principle of the House of Assembly having control over the expenditure of the public money. At that time it was, perhaps, right ; but there is great cause for consideration now, when the members of this House are sent here by the people. It now becomes a question whether it is right that this branch of the Legislature should have some control over the expenditure of the Colony, because, when we are sent here by the people, they will reasonably expect that we will exercise some control over the appropriation, otherwise there would be no check upon the expenditure of money which the country may think unjustifiable. As it stands at present, it is useless for us to seek to check the evil, and I do not wait to canvass the propriety of certain items, for the principle is of ten thousand times more importance to the Colony. I think it is a very proper time to express our opinions upon this subject. The House should wake up to a consideration of its rights and privileges. But the remedy does not lie with ourselves ; it is with the people. I think it is a fair subject for them to consider between this and the next election, whether they would trust us with the exercise of a reasonable and salutary check over the expenditure of the Colony. If it were fairly and fully brought before the people, I do not think they would withhold that power from this House. The only remedy is to have it brought to the notice of the people at the next election, and call for such a modification of the constitution as would remove the obstruction complained of. I did not rise to find fault with any particular item in the Bill, for I really do not know what items it contains ; but I think it is a fair and proper time to have this question discussed. Now, when this House is differently constituted, and possesses a different power from what it formerly did — a power emanating directly from the people—I think it is time that a different rule from that which has long been acted upon in this Colony, with regard to money bills, should prevail. If we are to do nothing more than to vote for, and approve of, every measure which is sent up here, let it be known, and I for one would not desire to have a seat here again after another election. But if we are sent here to exercise a calm and deliberate judgment upon what concerns the interests of the people, let it be understood. Therefore, I would have the question thoroughly agitated through the country, and I would not fear the result. If it were explained to the people, I feel assured that they would not hesitate to confide to this branch of the Legislature liberty to have some control over those items separately ; because, as the elective franchise is now constituted, I would have confidence that no gentlemen would be returned to this House who would be so thoroughly carried away by party feeling as to vote for merely party purposes.

Hon. Mr. LORD : I am glad to hear the sentiments of his honor the Attorney General upon this question. It has always been a source of annoyance to me, since I had a seat here, to have the Appropriation Bill sent up here in this way ; and I hope that, if we are spared to meet here again, that we will take up the question and make a determined stand against having this Bill sent here in this manner. If it were sent up as it is in Nova Scotia, I would not complain.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL : As it is a question of principle, I think it is well for every member of the House to express his opinion ; but at the same time I do not think it is necessary to say much upon it, and I would merely say that I agree with the sentiments expressed by his honor the Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON : I always thought this House should have more control over the appropriation of the public money, and now, as we are an elective body, I think we should have the same power as the House of Assembly.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON : This is a matter of principle, and no party or Government question, and I think I am fully justified in affirming that, all things considered, there is as little of the partizan displayed by this House as by any legislative body in North America. I think we are desirous of answering the purpose for which we were sent here, if the people will only give us power ; but it is folly for them to expect "bricks" from us unless they give us "straw." We have no power to reject any item at present, except by means which would be more injurious to the people than the misappropriation of any item, that is, the rejection of the whole Bill. When the present discussion goes to the country they will see our position, and they will not expect that from us which we have not the power to accomplish. The people should consider whether it is an advantage to them to have us an elective body, and at the same time to have no power to check the expenditure of any items which we may think extravagant. It is vain for us to seek to exercise power which we have not obtained from the people, and if they wish us to have the power they must take the constitutional way to obtain it for us.

Item agreed to.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY : I observe that there are £2,500 granted for a model farm. Now, that is a large amount, and I think we have already had a fair trial of a model farm, which proved an entire failure, and was a great loss to the country. We are now appropriating this large sum to try the experiment again, and it is a question in my mind whether the country will receive a corresponding benefit from it. I am of opinion that they will not ; and I am also of opinion that if you go through some parts of the country in the month of June—Crapaud, Tryon, and Bedeque—you will find as well laid off farms as the model farm will be. I am persuaded that Judge Peters' pamphlet has done more to establish well conducted farms in the country than the old model farm did, or the next model farm will do. It might possibly be some advantage in the rearing of improved stock, but I would ask your honors if you cannot fall upon a cheaper plan to raise stock which would answer equally as well? A few days ago I was in conversation with a gentleman not far from this town, who took me to see his stock, and I venture to say that the model farm will not produce finer stock for some years to come. He told me that he had orders coming from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick for stock by almost every mail, more than he could supply. Now, I am of opinion that all the model farm is calculated to do for the benefit of the country is, to raise improved stock, and I think that if you would encourage the gentleman to whom I have alluded, he would raise stock which would answer equally as well, and at a far less cost. Perhaps your honors will think it strange in me, being a farmer myself, to oppose this grant, but I do so because I believe it will be little or no benefit to the country. What has the old model farm, which cost the country so much, done? Go, for instance, six or eight miles out the Malpeque road, and you will see that the great majority of the farms are not in a more pros-