

Mr. T. H. HAVILAND did not care whether the Commissioner were a liberal or "what-not." He only wished to see that the Commissioner was justified, and if so, in what way, in employing his own team in preference to others. But he thought the present way, was like Cæsar appealing to Cæsar.

Hon. COL. TREASURER opposed the motion of Hon. Mr. Palmer, and cited some incidents to prove how much more efficiently the road work was done by the present Commissioner than by former ones.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH was opposed to the method pursued by Mr. Williams employing his own team, not because he supposed there was any sleight-of-hand dealing in the matter, but upon the principle, which he considered was wrong.

Mr. CLARK thought if two competent men as Commissioners could be obtained who would do the work, without trusting to contractors, it would be better. In extenuation of what was charged against Mr. Williams for employing his own team, he (Mr. C.) said it was a difficult thing to get trucks or teams at all times, when required. The hon. member also bore testimony to the excellency of Mr. Williams, management, and improvements on the streets of Charlottetown and the Royalty Roads.

Mr. T. H. HAVILAND said that Mr. Clark's idea might be a good one after all. If there were two Commissioners they could watch each other.

Hon. Mr. MOONEY said that there were never good roads until Mr. Williams was made Commissioner. He did not think it just or manly for the minority to persecute one individual because of his political creed—to make him the scape-goat for all offenders.

Mr. PERRY thought ten shillings a day very high to charge; as, in the country a team could be had for six shillings per day; but in Charlottetown the case might be different. He did not think Mr. Williams was so much to blame for employing his own team; perhaps he could get no other at the time.

Mr. MACINTOSH said it was not Mr. Williams, but the system that should be persecuted,—a system which, if carried out, would, he thought, be establishing a wrong precedent. He hoped the public money would be better applied in future.

Mr. COOPER agreed with the remarks made by Mr. Macintosh.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY defended the conduct of the Commissioner at some length, and showed plainly that Mr. Williams was justified in employing his own team.

Mr. LAIRD thought the resolution was unnecessary.

Hon. Mr. PALMER said he would not press it.

And so the motion was withdrawn. T. KIRWAN, Rep.

After Hon. Col. Secretary had made a few remarks respecting a small deficiency in the accounts, resulting he considered from a mistake of £3 in some place, Mr. Macdonald moved that the Speaker take the chair, and the chairman report the report of the Special Committee agreed to with certain amendments. The Speaker then took the chair, and the report of the chairman was agreed to by the House.

Hon. Mr. Palmer moved that the resolution which he had submitted in Committee be added to the report. [See debates of Thursday, evening, April 9th, for Mr. Palmer's Resolution.]

Hon. T. H. HAVILAND seconded the motion. He considered the resolution of very great importance; because if the loan were effected which had been agreed to by the House, the Commissioner of Crown Lands would have a large sum of money in his hands; and other cases might arise similar to those which had already occurred; and therefore he thought that the law on the subject should be strictly adhered to.

Hon. Mr. LORD said, as he had stated before, that it was impossible for the Commissioner of Crown Lands, in going to the country, to employ men there, unless he paid them at the time. Was it likely that he could employ them, unless he paid them when the work was done? He had voted against the resolution before, and would still vote against it.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY said, he had stated already that the Commissioner of Crown Lands had paid the money in question by the authority of the Government. He then entered into an explanation of the accounts of the Commissioner similar to what he had before made. That gentleman also had vouchers for the sums he had expended. He hoped the House had a better opinion of the Commissioner than pass the resolution; and he did not think that the hon. mover and the seconder of the resolution doubted his honesty, yet they said there were no vouchers; and the resolution was to the effect that he had paid that money. As to that part of the resolution which stated that he should not have paid the money without the authority of Government, he (hon. Col. Secretary) had already stated that the Government had authorized him to pay those small sums. Still there must be some discretionary power in the hands of the Commissioner, as was the case with the Commissioners of Roads, for the warrants required to be drawn from the Treasury. He did not think it was worth cavilling about those small sums; and he thought the hon. member had better withdraw the resolution.

Mr. T. H. HAVILAND did not see the matter in the same light as the Hon. Col. Secretary. He considered the resolution of great importance; because why should the House pass acts from time to time, if the Government could say they were not to be carried out. The Hon. Col. Secretary had said it was understood that the law would be dispensed with; but he (Mr. H.) said it was not the practice of the Imperial Government to dispense with law. If the Government could not keep the law, could the House expect that the public would do so?

Hon. COL. TREASURER would merely state the fact that the auditors of the public accounts had seen the vouchers alluded to. He himself had applied to the Commissioner for information on the subject; and he stated that they had seen every one of them.

Mr. COOPER said, there was no person but must acknowledge that the money had been drawn contrary to law; and the law ought to be a guide for the Government, nor should they deviate from it. Certain hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House had paid a great deal of attention to the public accounts; and if there was anything of importance astray, it would be worth while to pass the resolution; but there would be no occasion to do that, if any error had occurred merely from the want of consideration on the part of the Commissioner, and if there was nothing criminal in it he did not think it necessary to push the matter so far as was contemplated by passing the resolution.

Hon. Mr. PALMER, from what had been said respecting vouchers, was willing to have that part of the resolution which related to them, struck out; and that being done, he did not think the resolution contained any such censure on the Commissioner of Crown Lands as the Hon. Col. Secretary thought it did. It was found that an officer had deviated from the Act of the Legislature in expending money. The first year it had been done by statute, and then by warrant, and as the money increased in his hands, they gave a dispensing power not to require it. He saw many reasons why the House should not permit proceedings of that kind to pass unnoticed. The resolution contained no censure upon the officers; it merely stated that the Act had not been carried out.

Hon. Mr. LORD would move that the hon. member have leave to withdraw his resolution; for it contained a direct censure upon the officers.