APRIL 22

JOHNSON'S
NODYNE LINIMENT,
THE CURE OF
LDS, INFLUENZA,
Pain in the Sides or Breast, Rheu-
ach, Spitting of blood, and all Lung
by I. S. JOHNSON, Bangor, Maine.
ERICAN ANODYNE LINIMENT,
aration, prepared and intended for
ation.
rticle was in the constant practice
and by a long course of experiments
for which this Liniment is recom-
ly satisfied of its efficacy, and offers
e afflicted, as the result of his long

ndard medicine, and enjoys the sin-
wn and patronized by a large portion
herever it has been introduced.
that it is the best remedy of the pre-
for which it is recommended, the
ent to the Public, not doubting that
utation it has already acquired We
e is a cure for the ten thousand ills
et those who are afflicted with the
and we can assure them, they will

chia or Bronchitis, Rose Cold, Catarrh,
ng Cough, Hoarseness and common
in the Lungs, Stomach and Sides,
wise, Asthma, influenza, for Sore
or Chronic Diarrhœa, caused by Rheu-
Cramp in the Stomach, for Stranguary,
iles, &c.
the most happy effects, in all cases
would be used, especially for Rheu-
, Chapped Hands and Sore Lips; it
the bites of flies and other insects.
efficacy to this for Horses and Oxen
, bruised, strained or chafed by the
more than double the power of any

onchia or Bronchitis, for the cure of
nderfully successful. Those who had
have found permanent relief. S. D.
rt Street, Boston) who had a case of
kindly permitted us to refer to him
his valuable medicine; also in the case
d comes on when the flowers bloom in
till the leaves fall in Autumn—if this
in season, it ends in consumption.
cording to directions, and a cure will

nfusion in the head may be cured by
ment; drop one or two drops in each
bed, and take it internally according

yne Liniment is a well known remedy
Cough. The first symptoms should
latest difficulty will occur in the cure
ldren, half a teaspoon full of Liniment

for sore throat and weak lungs, that
ll countries, especially in this climate,
every case, a complete trial will be
ute success.
e Anodyne Liniment has in a great
e distressing disease, made permanent
taking the Liniment internally, ex-
e made.
uable medicine is rapidly increasing,
ay with confidence that he has been,
iving relief to thousands of the afflicted
tly solicits all who may be afflicted to
ent a fair trial, satisfied that if taken
to test its utility, they will find relief.

CATHARTIC PILLS.
ed, in Glass Bottles.
variety of Diseases, arising from the
, and Obstructions in the Organs of

l in all forms of Diseases, with the most
out fear of injury. Being of Vegetable
p or rack the delicate frame or weak
und particularly useful, by stimulating
ered parts into healthy action.
ale, and children of the tenderest age,
perfect safety, and the most salutary
g coated with pure White Sugar, pre-
which most persons have to ordinary
t the taste of sugar is apparent when

all circumstances, will find these Pills
, a mild cathartic.
inister these Pills is on going to bed
be taken at any time beneficially;
have a more general and universal
body; the mind, body and nervous
in a quiet state, gives the Pills an
ith the fullest effect upon the whole

rticle to be taken
pring of the Year,
nd give Tone to the System.
at advantage over other Sugar-coated
put up in GLASS BOTTLES, well
keep for any length of time without
d by damp weather.
Pills has spared no expense in getting
will meet the universal approbation of
ot doubt they will, when known, take
known and extensively appreciated
E LINIMENT.
ble in their composition, are peculiarly
ficient in their operation, and require
confinement while taking them. They
need no puffing to recommend them.

ecaries' Hall, and at the Drug Stores
W. Skinner, and sold at all the Stores
Persons wishing supplies of the above
ed at Proprietor's prices at the Drug

INNER,
General Agent for P. E. Island.

Insurance Company.
E COMPANY NOW
f Property, both in Town and Country,
EMIUM usually charged by Foreign
uring in this Company have their share
ount to above One Thousand Pounds
as been in operation, and the Interest
apital overpays the annual expense of
For all particulars, inquire at the Se-
Street, Charlottetown; W.B. AITKIN,
N HAZZARD, Esq., St. Eleanor's;
Summerside; STEPHEN WRIGHT,
W PARKER, Esq., Traveller's Rest;
q., Princetown Royalty; JEREMIAH
sh; JAMES PIDGEON, Esq. New Long
N, Esq., Tryon; GEORGE WIGGIN
W. S. MACGOWAN, Esq., Souris;
LL, Bay Fortune, or JOHN SUTHER-
Bay.
rch, 1856.—1s1

Saw Mill for Sale.
SCRIBER OFFERS
Mill for sale, situated at St. Marga
hip No. 44, in King's County. They
ost approved principle, being each
overshot water-wheel, and in a good

n on application to the subscriber,
otherwise, and also at this office.
JOHN DIXON.
e. 1, 1856.

r and Christian Witness,
HAZZARD, PUBLISHER.
e of Protestant Gentlemen. Terms:
vance; otherwise 15s. will be charged.
s inserted at the usual rates.

Mr. Jas A. Gardiner

APRIL 29

# THE PROTECTOR
## AND CHRISTIAN WITNESS.

"RIGHTEOUSNESS EXALTETH A NATION: BUT SIN IS A REPROACH TO ANY PEOPLE."—Prov. xiv 34.

Vol. 1. Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Wednesday, April 29, 1857. No. 9.

The Protector and Christian Witness,
GEO. T. HAZZARD, PUBLISHER.
Edited by a Committee of Protestant Gentlemen. Terms: 12s. per annum, in advance; otherwise 15s. will be charged.
Advertisements inserted at the usual rates.

### THE THREE VOICES.

What saith the past to thee? *Weep!*
Truth is departed,
Beauty hath died like the dream of a sleep.
Love is faint-hearted;
Trifles of sense, the profoundly unreal,
Scare from our spirits God's holy ideal;
So, as the funeral-bell, slow and deep,
So tolls the past to thee. Weep!

How speaks the present hour? *Act!*
Walk, upward glancing.
So shall thy footsteps in glory be tracked,
Slow, but advancing.
Scorn not the smallness of daily endeavor.
Let the great meaning ennoble it ever.
Droop not o'er efforts expended in vain,
Work as believing that labor is gain.

What doth the Future say? *Hope!*
Turn thy face eastward,
Look where light fringes the far-rising slope,—
Day cometh onward.
Watch though so long be the twilight delaying,
Let the first sunbeam arise on thee praying;
Fear not! for greater is God by thy side
Than the armies of Satan against thee allied.

### TALK OF THE ROAD.

#### THE TWO BIBLES.

Well, a few days after Jemmy Brannan made up his mind to speak to the Rev. Mr. Owens, it happened that Jemmy and Pat Dolan were working together for a farmer; and they were filling a cart out of some manure-heaps that lay on the road side. And, as they were working, who should come up the road but Mr. Owens himself. Now, Mr. Owens seldom passed people by without saying a word; for he was a pleasant spoken man, and Irishmen like a gentleman that speaks free and pleasant. So Mr. Owens said, "It's a fine day for the work boys: thanks be to God for it."

"A fine day, your reverence, God be praised," said Jem, very well pleased to have Mr. Owens to speak to that day.

"It would be bad farming without the dung, boys," said Mr. Owens.

"Sure enough, your reverence, that would be bad work," said Pat; "but there's a deal of poor creatures has little dung to put on it since the praties went."

"And without the spade or the plough the dung is not much good," said the parson.

"I'm thinking both spade and plough will have to go deeper these times," said Jem.

"Did you ever hear of Jesus Christ digging and dunging?" said Mr. Owens.

"No, your reverence," said both the men, dropping their spades in great amazement.

"Why, did you never read that in the Bible," said Mr. Owens.

"No, your reverence," said Jem, "I never did."

"What Bible is it in, your reverence?" said Pat; "is it in the Protestant Bible or the Catholic Bible?"

"And which of these do you read?" said Mr. Owens. Pat did not like to say he never read a word of either in his life, so he said nothing, and Mr. Owens went on, "I believe it is just the same in both, as I could show you if I had the books."

"Well, your reverence," said Jem, "that is just what I would like to see."

"What!" said Mr. Owens.

"The differ between the two books," said Jem.

"Well, if that's all you want to see," said Mr. Owens, "it is not much; for the 'differ' is so small you will hardly see it at all; but what makes you wish for it?"

So Jem was fairly in for the very thing he wanted; and so he said, "Your reverence, I can't make out why reading the Bible should put people astray, and make them leave the Catholic Church."

"Nor I neither," said Mr. Owens. "How could it do that? It comes to us from God himself, that made the Church, and knows what is best for it."

"But sure, your reverence," said Pat, "don't we know that they that gives us the Bible always wants us to leave the Catholic Church?"

"Were the blessed Apostles good Catholics—St. Peter, and St. Paul, and St. Matthew, and all the rest of them?" said Mr. Owens.

"Surely they were, your reverence," said Jem,"

"And how would their writings, that they wrote to all the people that they made Catholics, how would those writings turn any man away from the Catholic Church?"

"That's just What I want to know, your reverence," said Jem; and I heard tell that it was the Protestant Bible that did it, and that the Catholic Bible would not do it at all; and that's the reason I wanted to see the differ."

"I can't show you the 'differ' without the books," said Mr. Owens; "but if you and your neighbor here will come down to my house some evening, I'll put one book in your hand and the other in his, and you can read turn about, and compare them, and see the differ."

"And when will we come down, your reverence," said Jem.

"This evening if you like, when you leave off work," said Mr. Owens.

"With God's blessing, then, I'll go," said Jem.

So Mr. Owens had to leave them, for he had to see a sick man; and when he was gone, Jem asked Pat to go with him that evening; and Pat was not willing at first; so Jem said to him, "Sure you shall hold the Catholic Bible yourself, and you may as well come and see the end of it."

So that evening they both went up to Mr. Owens's; and he brought them both into his study, and got down the two books; and first he opened the Douay Bible, and showed them what was printed in the first page—

"Approbation.—This new edition of the English version of the Bible, printed, with our permission, by Richard Coyne, 4 Capel-street, carefully collated, by our direction, with the Clementine Vulgate; likewise, with the Douay version of the Old Testament of 1509,* and with the Rhemish version of the New Testament of 1580, and with other approved English versions—We, by our authority, approve. And We declare that the same may be used, with great spiritual profit, by the faithful; provided it be read with due reverence, and the proper dispositions.—Given at Dublin, 23 September, 1829."

And then Mr. Owens showed them that this approbation was signed by "Daniel Murray, D. D." the late Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin; and he showed them this added to it—"We concur with the above approbation," signed by 24 of the Irish Roman Catholic Bishops. So Jem and Pat were both satisfied that this was the right book; and Pat was more easy in his mind, for after this he thought it could be no harm for him to look into it; and so he kept this book in his hand, and Mr. Owens handed the other to Jem.

"Now, where would you like to read?" said Mr. Owens.

"Oh, your reverence can choose better than we can," said Jem.

So Mr. Owens opened the Church of England Bible at the first Epistle of Timothy, chap. ii., v. 5, and Jem read as follows—"For there is one God, one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

"Holy Kitty!" exclaimed Jem.

"Stop a minute, my friend," said the parson, laying his hand on Jem's arm; "Who was Kitty?"

"Why, then, indeed, your reverence," said Jem, "I don't know, barrin' she might be one of the saints."

"And you will swear by you don't know who? Do you know what our Saviour says about swearing?" said the parson.

"I suppose 'Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain,'" said Jem; "but what harm is it to swear by Holy Kitty?"

"Is it not harm to do what Christ commands us not to do?" said Mr. Owens.

"Surely," said Jem, "there's no denying that."

"Well," said Mr. Owens, "listen to the words of Christ himself, in his own sermon on the Mount (Matthew v. 34). '*I say to you, not to swear at all*,' and in v. 37, '*Let your speech be yea, yea; no, no: and that which is over and above these is of evil.*' And the Apostle St. James, in his epistle, says (chapter v. 12), 'But, above all things, my brethren, swear not; neither by heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath; but let your speech be yea, yea; no, no; that ye fall not under judgment.' "Now, I ask you my friends," said the parson, "can it be safe for us to swear by any oath, when we have such directions from God about our talk?"

"Surely not, your reverence," said Jem.

"And if God has given us such directions, ought we not to keep them? and can we keep them without knowing them? Now, did you ever know this before, that Christ had given us orders not to swear by any oath?"

"I never heard it before," said Jem.

"You see then," said Mr. Owens, "what need we have to study God's Word, in order that we may know what God commands us to do or not to do. If we do not know his Word, we may be continually doing the very things that make him angry. But come back to the verse you read, Jem; it seemed to strike you forcibly."

"Holy Virgin!" exclaimed Jem.

"Stop again, my friend," said the parson; "are you not doing again the very thing that your Saviour bid you not do!"

"I am, your reverence," said Jem; "but it's so hard for a man to quit, in a moment, what he was used to all his life."

"You see, then," said the parson, "what need we have to study Christ's words, and to learn them carefully, that we may keep them. That is the reason that we teach the Bible to our children, that they may learn to avoid habits that are so displeasing to God, and so hard to get rid of. The Jews were told to teach them to their children; and why not to Christian children; And St. Paul praised Timothy for knowing them from a child. And you see now what need there is that the Church should teach Christ's words carefully to people; for it is not once hearing them that will do; we must read and study them again and again, to learn to keep them. And this is why we teach the Bible so much."

"But, your reverence," said Pat, "I hear Protestants swear betimes; and how comes that, if they get such instruction?"

"And many," said Mr. Owens, "that heard our Saviour teach, and his Apostles too, were never the better, but the worse of what they heard. Very likely that some that heard that Sermon on the Mount went on swearing; but that was no fault of the teaching. The Church ought to teach Christ's words, whether men will hear them and do them or not. But come back to our verse; what were you going to say of it Jem?"

"I was going to say, your reverence," said Jem (and he didn't swear this time), "if them isn't the very words that made Johnny Conner the sexton to the chapel, turn Protestant. Sure I heard him myself, when Father John taxed him in the chapel, forenent the people, with reading, and wanted to take his Bible, but Johnny wouldn't give it. 'And what do you find in it,' says Father John, 'that you won't give it up?' 'I find in it,' says Johnny, 'that there is one Mediator between God and men.' I mind the words well "Now Pat," said Jem, turning sharp round on Pat as he spoke, "look at your book, man, and see if the words is there, and then we will see which book set Johnny Connor astray."

"Read it again in your own book first," said the parson, "and then we will see the 'differ' exactly."

So Jem read again, "*For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the Man Jesus Christ.*"

"Now," said the parson, "which Bible set Johnny Connor astray?"

"Well, that's plain anyway," said Jem; "there's but one Mediator; and the one book is as good as the other for that."

"What would you like to have next," said Mr. Owens. So both told him to choose, for they were at a loss.

"Can you say the commandments?" said Mr. Owens.

"Yes, your reverence," said both of them.

So Mr. Owens turned to Jem, "Say the first commandment;" so Jem said, "Thou shalt have no other gods but me." Then Mr. Owens turned to Pat, and said, "Say the second commandment." So Pat repeated, "Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain."

"Is there nothing else between the two" said Mr Owens.

"No, your reverence," said both Pat and Jem together.

"Were you never taught that something was left out?" said Mr. Owens.

"No, your reverence," said they both. So Mr. Owens opened the two Bibles, and made them read what was left out in their catechisms; and Jem read first out of the Protestant book—"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in the heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth: thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them; for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments." And then Pat read out of the Roman Catholic Bible—"Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven thing, nor the likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or in the earth beneath, nor of those things that are in the waters under the earth. Thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them. I am the Lord thy God, mighty, jealous, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands to them that love me, and keep my commandments."—Exodus xx, 4, 5, 6, (Douay Bible.)

"I don't see 'images' in the Catholic Bible, your reverence," said Pat.

"And what can a graven thing mean but a graven image?" said Mr. Owens.

"Never mind that, your reverence," said Jem. "I see the word '*likeness*' in *both books*; and if we must not make a '*likeness*' of anything in heaven, how can we make an image of it?"

"Now then," said Mr. Owens, "you see what God said in his commandments, and you never knew that before."

"Well, that beats all, your reverence," said Jem; "the two Bibles is like enough; and the Catholic Bible that we *don't* see, and the Catholic catechism that we *do* see and learn, is not like at all."

"And that too," said Mr. Owens, "in the matter, of God's own commandments, that he spoke himself. And how shall we know how to serve God if we do not know his own commandments?" And here Mr. Owens showed them in the Douay Bible, the words just before the ten commandments of God—"And the Lord spoke all these words." "Now, if God spoke all these words in giving his commandments, should not we learn them all, when we learn the commandments? And here, you see, we should not put our trust in any church or man to teach us God's commandments, but we should look in the Bible, to see what God commanded. But it's getting late," said Mr. Owens; "maybe you would come to some other night?"

"Indeed, as we will," said Jem; "but I'd like to have the book at home."

"Which book?" said Mr. Owens. So then Pat and Jem began debating; for Pat wanted the Catholic book, for he was still afraid the Protestant book might set him astray; so at last they agreed that Jem should take the Protestant Bible, and Pat the Douay Bible, and read them together, verse about in the evenings, till they found all the 'differ;' and so Jem asked the price of his book. "A shilling," said the parson; so Jem paid it, well pleased. And then Pat pulled out his shilling.

"Oh," said Mr. Owens, "the book is four and sixpence."

"Four and sixpence, your reverence!" said Pat; "and sure Jem's is the purtiest book for it has a real leather cover on it, and this is only paper, and Jem's is only a shilling."

"I can't help that," said Mr. Owens; we can't get this book for less."

"I see now, your reverence," said Jem, "it's the Protestants that want the poor to have the Bible anyway, when they make it cheap." And so the parson agreed to give Pat his book for two and sixpence, and to take it at sixpence a week; and when they were going out, Mr. Owens said—"I hope, boys, you don't think that I set you astray."

"And does your reverence not want us to leave the Catholic Church?" said Pat.

"If St. Peter or St. Paul was to preach to-morrow," said Mr. Owens, "would you listen to them? or if they wrote you a letter would you read it?"

"Surely, your reverence," said Pat "I would."

"And would that make you leave the Catholic Church?" said Mr. Owens.

"It couldn't, your reverence," said Pat.

"Well," said Mr. Owens. "I give you the letters they wrote to you and to all. If I saw St. Peter or St. Paul I would not ask them to leave the Catholic Church: and no more would I ask you: I want you to be such Catholics as St. Peter and St. Paul were—no more, and no less; and for that I give you their writings to read. Judge for yourselves, my friends, for you have common sense, like most Irishmen, whether they who give you St. Peter and St. Paul's writings, or they who keep them from you, are most in earnest in wanting you to be such Catholics as St. Paul and St. Peter were."

So they left Mr. Owens for that night; and if we hear of anything more, it won't be lost.

* This date, 1829, must be a misprint, for the Douay version of the Old Testament was published for the *first time* in the year 1609.

## COLONIAL LEGISLATURE.

### SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS.

SATURDAY, APRIL 11.

THE FISHERY CONVENTION.

The Hon. the SPEAKER presented a Memorial from the citizens of Charlottetown, on the subject of the Convention recently entered into between the Governments of Great Britain and France, making certain important concessions to the latter nation, which concessions are deemed highly prejudicial to the interests of Newfoundland and the other British North American Colonies.—Referred to the Committee appointed to report on the several communications received from the Speaker of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland on that subject.

INDEPENDENCE OF THE LEGISLATURE.

The Hon. Mr. Palmer moved that the House do go into the Order of the Day, for the second reading of the Bill to secure the independence of the House of Assembly, by the exclusion of office-holders therefrom.

The Hon Colonial Secretary said the measure was of so sweeping a character, that it would strike at the very root of Responsible Government. Such a measure, he thought, was not desired by the country. They had had a long battle to fight, in order to obtain the present system of Government; and nothing had yet been shown to prove that that system had not worked advantageously. He (Mr. Coles) thought that the contrary could easily be shown to be the result. Why then disturb a system that had worked advantageously for the Colony? The measure now proposed would strike at the rights of the people; and deeming it inexpedient to occupy the time of the House in its consideration, he moved, that the House do go into the Order of the Day "this day three months." . . . The Hon. Mr. Haviland did not concur with the Hon. Col. Secretary in his opinion of the sweeping nature of the Bill under discussion. He thought, however, that there were certain office-holders who ought not to hold seats in the House of Assembly. . . . . The Hon. Mr. Palmer said that as it was quite evident that hon. members in the majority were still as hostile to the proposed measure as they were last year, it was not his intention to enter at any length into the consideration of its policy or expediency on the present occasion. In answer to the objection of the Col. Secretary, that the present Bill was of too sweeping a nature, he remarked that the great objection formerly raised to a measure of this sort was, that it was not sufficiently sweeping in its character. It was exceedingly difficult to ascertain what would please certain honorable members. Feeling, therefore, that it was useless to attempt this, he should content himself by thus far discharging a duty which had been imposed upon him by a portion of his constituents. Mr. Palmer denied that there was any connection between the prosperity of the country and the introduction of Responsible Government, as alleged by the Hon. Col. Secretary. He (Mr. Palmer) did not think that circumstance had produced the slightest effect either one way or the other. Neither did he believe that the Government of the country had been conducted any cheaper or more efficiently since the change than before its introduction. . . . . The Hon. Mr. Wightman said the House had nothing before them to warrant their taking up a measure of this sort. No petition had been presented to the House on the subject; and he mentioned it as a significant fact, that every member who had accepted office under our present Constitution, had been re-elected by his constituents. . . . . Mr. Cooper did not think the change proposed would answer in this Colony. He did not approve of offices descending from father to son; and he thought it was too soon to introduce the change proposed by the present Bill. The Colony had long laboured under a corrupt system; and the only party that had done anything for the good of the country was the party at present in power. At the same time he was of opinion that there ought not to be more than two or three office-holders on the floor of the Assembly. . . . . The House then divided on the question:—For Mr. Coles' motion, 16. Against it, Hon. Mr. Palmer, Mr. Yeo, Hon. Mr. Haviland, Hon. Mr. Montgomery, Hon. Mr. Longworth, Mr. Heath Haviland—8. So the Bill was lost.

ELECTIVE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Mr. Heath Haviland moved, that the Bill to extend the elective principle to the Legislative Council be read a second time.

The Hon. Colonial Secretary said, if this Bill had been introduced at an earlier period of the session he might have given it his support. But he thought that hon. members would not now feel inclined to give it that attention which it merited. He (Mr. Coles) was, however, favorable to a moderate change in the constitution of the Legislative Council. He thought that if all the members composing that hon. body were to go out of office at once, it would not be found to work well. He then referred to the recent change in the Constitution of the Legislative Council of Canada, and after stating what changes he deemed it advisable to introduce into the Constitution of that body in this Island, he went on to say that he was sorry that some of his friends were not in favor of any alteration in the Constitution of the Legislative Council, and would therefore move that the Bill be read a second time "this day three months"—not because he was personally opposed to the measure, but because he thought hon. members were anxious to return to their homes. . . . Mr. Cooper would be glad if the Hon. Col. Secretary would embody his views in the present Bill. He thought it would be advisable to go into Committee; after which, the further consideration of the Bill might be deferred until next session; and in the meantime it could be published for general information, as they had already dealt with two other important Bills this session. Such a Bill as the one under consideration ought undoubtedly to be placed before the people some time prior to definite action being taken thereon. . . . . Hon. Mr. Montgomery was about to make a similar observation to that which had just fallen from the hon. member for King's County (Mr. Cooper). He thought the session was now too far advanced to take up a Bill of this nature, as, if they did so, it would create a good deal of discussion. He had no doubt, however, that the principle embodied in the Bill would, ere long, be adopted by all the Colonies of Great Britain. The better course, he thought, would be, as it was but a short Bill, to publish it for general information. They could then take it up, at an early day, next session. The country is, in his opinion, decidedly in favor of a measure of this kind. . . . The Hon. Mr. Whelan believed that the public opinion of the Island was quite indifferent as to the matter. In short, he did not believe that there was a single constituency in P. E. Island—no, nor even ten individuals in any constituency—who were in favor of a measure of this nature. If any were in favor of the proposed change, they would, at least, have petitioned the House on the subject. No such petitions had yet been presented. He contended that it was not the province of the House of Assembly to interfere with the Constitution of the other branch of the Legislature. What would hon. members say, were a message received from the other end of the building, to the effect that their Honors had passed a Bill to alter the Constitution of the House of Assembly? Would they treat such a message with respect? Would they not rather treat it with contempt? He (Mr. Whelan) thought this attempt to tinker with the Constitution of the Legislative Council—a body to which they were indebted for the preservation, in most difficult times, of their Constitutional rights—came with a very bad grace from the House of Assembly. Mr. Whelan then proceeded, at some length, to point out what would, in his opinion, be the effect of making that body elective, contending that if they did so, it would place the Council in exactly the same position as the House of Assembly—dependent entirely upon the popular will. The natural consequence of which would be, that the upper branch of the Legislature would be swayed by the popular will just as much as the lower branch. If they represented the same class of constituents, they would merely be a reflex of the House of Assembly; and if so, where was the use of them at all? If they were sent to represent a different constituency, the consequence would be, that parties would be sent to the other branch representing a different class of opinions from those entertained by the Lower House. A clash, in such case, would be inevitable. Besides which, being an elective body, they would expect to have the fingering of the purse strings, over which, it was more than probable, they would claim an exclusive control. From the proposed change he could foresee no other results. He was perfectly satisfied with the working of the two branches under the present system; and expressed his astonishment at the remarks offered by the honorable Colonial Secretary (Mr. Coles), particularly those referring to the difficulty likely to occur, should the present majority exchange places with the minority. Mr. Whelan thought it was not the duty of the majority to legislate for the minority. Such observations came with a very bad grace from any honorable member on his side of the House. . . . . Mr. Heath Haviland said that he did not anticipate, when he entered the House that afternoon, being so soon engaged in debate on the Elective Legislative Council Bill; but he was glad to find it had, at least, made one convert (the hon. Col. Secretary). It appeared, however, that the Queen's Printer (the Hon. Mr. Whelan) was just as much opposed to it. He expressed his surprise especially at one observation which had fallen from the latter, whom he designated "the mouth-piece of Responsible Government," namely, that the House of Assembly had no right to tinker with the Constitution of the Legislative Council, and also at the assertion, that there were not ten persons in any constituency in P. E Island who were in favor of the proposed change. His (Mr. Haviland's) constituency were all advocates of a responsible Council, and he appealed to the Hon. Mr. Wightman, in proof of his assertion: but "a change had come over the spirit of his (Mr. Wightman's) dream." In reply to Mr. Whelan's denial of the right of the House of Assembly to interfere with the Constitution of the Legislative Council, Mr. Haviland remarked, that the House of Commons were the sole judges of the constitution of their own body; but he denied that the same usage could be pleaded for the Legislative Council of P. E. Island. And with reference to Mr. Whelan's assertion, that the public business could not be carried on if both branches of the Legislature were dependent upon the popular voice, the politicians of Canada, he said, had arrived at quite an opposite opinion on that point. In their petition to the Queen they stated, that they had come to the conclusion that it was impossible to work Responsible Government with a nominated chamber or hereditary councillors. Who were the Legislative Council? They were merely the nominees of the Government of the day. And no matter how selected, they could not possibly attain the same amount of influence which they would possess were they elected by the people. There were only two systems upon which they could be founded. They must be either an hereditary or an elective body. He gave the Col. Secretary credit for more enlightened views on this subject than Her Majesty's printer. He confessed that the former hon. member had looked upon the question in the proper light, and he thought that if all the other hon. members on his side of the house looked upon it in the same light, they would go into committee on the Bill. If they could only get half a loaf, it would be better to agree to that. With reference to the debt of gratitude which, it was alleged, was due to the Council, for having stood by the House of Assembly in troublous times, he trusted the hon. member (Mr. Whelan) would bring that matter forward next session, when he hoped the Assembly would be able to do something towards discharging that enormous debt of gratitude! . . . . Mr. Cooper said the House of Lords were chiefly hereditary. But by whom he asked, are our Legislative Councillors appointed? By two or three individuals! The members of that branch of the Legislature having accepted pay from the people, they were, in his opinion, no longer the independent body they once were. . . . . Mr. Yeo thought that nineteen out of every twenty of the people of this Island were in favor of an elective Council. He said the present Council occupied the same position, with reference to the Assembly, as the clerk did to the minister: they could only say "Amen." Of what use were they? In his opinion, they were not of the slightest service. . . . . Hon. Mr. Wightman, in reply to Mr. Haviland's remarks, said that the petition from the inhabitants of Georgetown, &c. in favor of an elective Council, formerly presented to the House, had been printed in Charlottetown, and had not been signed by more than thirty persons; and he would tell that hon. member that not one-half of his constituents were in favor of the measure. He (Mr. Wightman) saw no necessity, at the present time, for any alteration in the Constitution of the Legislative Council. If the constitution of that body were altered, they would claim the privilege of interfering with the management of the public purse. In short, they would assert the same privileges, with regard to that matter, as the House now possessed. Seeing no necessity for any change, therefore, he would support the motion of the hon. the Colonial Secretary (Mr. Coles). . . . . Hon. Mr. Mooney thought the citizens of Georgetown must be very ungrateful people, as they had rejected their former representative (Mr. Macaulay), the father of this scheme of an elective Council, which Mr. Mooney designated "the forlorn hope" of the minority, who having lost the votes of the people at so many elections, wished to place an aristocracy in the other end of the building. . . . Mr. McIntosh had been favorable to an elective Council since the year 1848. The reason why no petitions in favor of the proposed change had been presented during the present session was this: the people believed the measure would be favorably entertained by the House of Assembly. He was well aware of the opinion of the people of his district on this question. Their wish is to have an elective Council. He had been instructed by his constituents, last year, to support this measure; and they had reminded him of the same thing this year. He was only surprised that the question had not been brought forward at an earlier period of the session; and, after administering a little gentle castigation to the hon. member for the Second District of King's County (Mr. Whelan), said he would support the motion to go into committee on the Bill. . . . . Hon. Mr. Coles replied at some length to the objections raised by the Hon. Mr. Whelan. . . . . Hon. Mr. Lord was not exactly decided on this subject; but if they went into committee on the Bill, he thought he would support the proposition of the Leader of the Government (Mr. Coles). . . . . Hon. Mr. Whelan again rose to address the House, but was met with loud cries of "Spoken, spoken!" Mr. Whelan said he had a motion to make, and persisted in addressing the House. The Hon. the Speaker then rose, and said that the hon. member must put his motion before the House before he attempted to speak to it. Mr. Whelan resumed his seat. . . . . The Hon. Mr. Palmer thought that were they to analyze the principles put forth by hon. members in the course of this debate, they must come to the conclusion that, at present, we have no second branch of the Legislature—that the Council was neither more nor less than, so to speak, the hump on the dromedary's back. They had been told that the Council should harmonize with the House of Assembly—that the two branches should work in perfect unison. If so, where was the necessity for that body at all? One individual in the other end of the building, to receive and record the Bills, would answer all purposes just as well. The hon. member for St. Peter's (Mr. Whelan) had asserted, that the House of Assembly possessed no right to interfere with the Constitution of the Legislative Council—that it was not the province of the House to "tinker" with it. The Hon. Col. Secretary, however, had admitted that there was some cause to tinker with it; and circumstances might yet arise when it would, even in Mr. Whelan's opinion, be necessary to tinker with it. ("No!" from Mr. Whelan.) Then that hon. member must imagine the Council to be infallible. But if, nevertheless, such a contingency should arise, who were to be the tinkers? Ought the Council to pass the law themselves, and was such a law to go into operation, without the concurrence of the lower branch of the Legislature? No! the tinkering must be completed by the whole Legislature, and in neither branch could the initiatory steps be more properly taken than in the House of Assembly. Were the House to wait till the Council thought fit to move in the matter, they would, he feared, have to wait a very long time indeed. Was the change to be effected by the Imperial Government? ("Yes!" from Mr. Whelan.) Some persons imagined that the people of this colony possessed the powers of self-government. This, it would appear, was not the case, for if they wished to effect an alteration in the Constitution of their Legislative Council they must, according to Mr. Whelan, apply to the Imperial Government to do it for them. In his (Mr. Palmer's) opinion they might just as well apply to the Imperial Government to alter the constitution of the House of Assembly. They might as well surrender their civil and political rights at once—for, on such a supposition, their boasted self-government was a mere fantasy! Were they to apply to the House of Commons? Having been favoured with self-government,—or that which we take to be self-government,—Mr. Palmer was of opinion that the power to effect all necessary reforms in our local institutions was vested not in the House of Commons, but in our own House of Assembly; and he really did suppose that the hon. member (Mr. Whelan) would have exhibited more shrewdness than to assert, that it is out of the province of the lower branch to alter the constitution of the Council. One principal advantage resulting from the proposed change would, in Mr. Palmer's opinion, be this: the members of the Council could exercise their rights with some semblance of independence—which was not the case at present. With reference to the objection, that no petitions had been presented in favor of this measure during the present session, an Act was passed, not long since, he said, to increase the number of representatives in the House of Assembly from twenty-four to thirty, although no petitions had ever been presented in favor thereof. Nevertheless, the House took it upon itself to say to the people, that if they did not like it they ought to do so, for it was good for them! That must be his argument in this case. An hon. member (Mr. Mooney) had remarked, that pay had been offered to the Council in 1848, but that this attempt to bribe that hon. body had failed. He should, however, have gone on to say, that a similar attempt had not failed in 1855, when the bribe was offered by the present House. The members of the Council—now that they were paid for their services from the public purse—ought certainly to submit themselves to the popular will. The hon. member for Queen's County (Mr. Mooney) thought that hon. members on his (Mr. Palmer's) side of the House wished to fill the Council with an aristocracy. This would, no doubt, be a dreadful shock to that hon. member's feelings. Nothing could give him greater offence than to see gentlemen of independent means—persons who were under no necessity of resorting to dishonorable measures for the accomplishment of their purposes—occupying seats in the Legislative Council. Were the members of that body placed there by the suffrages of the people, he (Mr. Palmer) would be perfectly satisfied. The country ought to see that they were possessed of a more independent spirit. And now that pay has been granted to them, it was the more necessary that they should be elected. In making this statement he had no wish to detract from their merits as individuals; but he did not scruple to pronounce the Council, as at present constituted, a perfectly useless body. He possessed no hostile feelings towards them individually; but he confessed that, looking upon them as a body, he could not help viewing them with superlative contempt; and the country at large, he thought, also looked upon them in the same light. Mr. Palmer had arrived at his present opinions, with respect to the Council, by very slow degrees, for at one time he was strongly in favor of allowing the constitution of that body to remain, as nearly as possible, a copy of that of the Upper House in England. Experience, however, had since shown him that Colonial Governors generally had no disposition to take upon themselves one grain of responsibility more than they were obliged to do—that they were continually shirking the responsibility which they ought to assume—and were but too much inclined to surrender everything to party. When he reflected upon these things, he could not but admit that a change in the constitution of the Council was imperatively demanded. . . . Mr. Laird said the question of an elective Council was no new thing, and that, consequently, hon. members had already made up their minds on the subject. He thought there was a majority in favor of the principle of the Bill, and that the general impression was, that as the members of the Council were now paid for their services, they ought to be responsible to the people. He would support the Bill. . . . . The Hon. Colonial Secretary would only add a few words in reply to what had fallen from hon. members. If we had not a second branch, he said, they would soon find that many of the acts passed by the Assembly could not be worked. He differed from the Hon. Mr. Wightman as to the right of the House of Assembly to interfere with the Constitution of the Legislative Council.