

Province in enabling the local Government to meet every necessary charge of collection and management may be considered an ample guarantee against any endeavour on the part of the House to create the apprehended embarrassments.

Eighth. Sir A. Campbell and Mr. Street concur in objecting to the enactment, in the same Session, of the fifth clause of the Civil List Bill and of the Act passed to restrain the provisions of that clause. It is certainly not to be denied that there is an apparent if not a real incongruity and contradiction between the two Statutes, and that it is desirable to avoid such a departure from the ordinary mode of legislation. But this is rather a question of style and composition than a substantial difficulty. The meaning is perfectly simple. The second Statute qualifies the general rule laid down in the first; but the first Bill contains no words anticipating the subsequent restriction. This objection may be removed, either by transferring the fifth clause to the second Bill, of which it might form the commencement, or by adding to that clause in the present Bill a few words declaring that it is to be subject to such qualification as may thereafter be enacted.

Ninthly. Sir A. Campbell objected to the Bill for restraining the fifth clause of the Civil List Act, because "it assumes to the House a right to take the whole control and management of the Crown Lands out of the hands of the Governor and Executive Council, and to regulate the prices, quantities and proportions to Military Officers and all the other minutiae in the disposal thereof by Legislative enactment, thereby taking from the King all His Royal Prerogative Rights in the disposal of the Crown Lands and Forests in the Province." After reading the Bill with great attention, I am unable to subscribe to this opinion. The Bill appears to me designed and calculated not to narrow but to enlarge the powers which by the Civil List Bill are reserved to the Executive Government, nor do I perceive any objection to the provisions which it contains.

Tenthly. It was objected to the second Bill that it was passed only for two years. I acknowledge the justice of this objection, and shall be happy if on a review of the subject, the Assembly shall be disposed to render the two Bills of equal duration. If however they shall persist in limiting the second to a period of two years, I do not think the limitation so objectionable as to afford a sufficient ground for the rejection of that measure.

As it appears that both the Bills have been lost by the closing of the Session without the Governor's assent having been given to them, it will be your first duty on assuming the administration of the Government to convene the Legislature, and you will transmit to the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly copies of this Despatch, acquainting the Assembly that I have received His Majesty's commands to address to them this communication, as comprising the answer which His Majesty has been graciously pleased to return to that part of their Address which relates to the proceedings of the House of Assembly and the Lieutenant Governor respecting the Bills in question. To that portion of the Address which adverts to the composition of the Executive Council, I am to offer in reply the following observations.

In my Despatch No. 35, of the 5th of last September, Sir A. Campbell was directed with reference to the desire of the Assembly for the increase of that body,
to