The Herald.

VOL. I. CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. ISLAND, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 12, 1865. NO. 30.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

SATURDAY, March 25.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON: Your honors will observe that I said "perhaps" it was so. I did not speak positively, although painful recollections, the result of personal observations, convince me that my statement is not much beyond the mark with regard to some of those establishments.

Hon. Mr. GOFF: There is a strong objection on the part of many persons to having a tavern in their neighborhood, and not without reason, for it tends to immorality and bad habits. There are very few who like to have a tavern in their midst; but still, every one must acknowledge that it is necessary to have taverns for the accommodation of the travelling public. The public cannot travel without accommodation, and I believe it is well understood that no man will open a house of entertainment unless he has the privilege of selling spirituous liquors, for it is known that it does not pay. And though people may not drink any spirituous liquor at home, yet there are very few who will not enjoy a glass of brandy when they are travelling. Therefore, I believe that taverns are necessary, particularly on the main public roads. But I am not inclined to think that the people in any settlement would be disposed to close a house where the sentiments of the public declare that it is necessary to keep it open. If they did it would cause trouble to themselves, for persons travelling would have to call at private houses, and thus cause trouble and inconvenience to them. I do not apprehend any danger of having them shut up by giving the people power to say whether such and such houses should be closed or not. I think it should be left to the good sense and judgment of the people to say whether certain houses should be continued or not. It will also give power to the people to shut up those little shops on back roads which are only a nuisance. If one good house were kept in every ten or fifteen miles on the main roads it would be sufficient. I would therefore support the bill, trusting to the good faith of the people not to shut up houses that are necessary, and I have no fear that it will be taken advantage of.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL: I am happy to hear that there is some prospects of a movement being made to establish temperance houses. I think they are necessary, and I know there are many in the country who are of that opinion. I would give my support to a measure to prevent a tavern from being opened within a certain distance of a temperance house. That would be an inducement to persons to open such temperance houses, where a man could get a cup of tea or coffee, and which would be just as good on a cold day as a glass of liquor.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY: I am aware that many of those public houses are public nuisances, and it should have my [illegible] introduced to close them. [illegible] often a great annoyance, and I do not think that any one of your honors would like to see your next neighbor open a public house. If any way could be devised to place houses of entertainment where they are required I would support it. If the Magistrates were authorized to decide where it was necessary to have public houses I think it would have a very good effect. Take, for instance, the road to St. Eleanor's, if two or three Magistrates were to travel the road and say where a public house was necessary, and a man in that district only allowed to take out a license, it would answer a very good purpose. As the law is at present, we might have fifty taverns between this town and the North Cape. Houses of entertainment are necessary, but when there are too many taverns, as there are at the present time, they become a nuisance. I was surprised to hear the account given by his honor from Queen's County, (Mr. Henderson) of the number of deaths caused by intemperance, and I hope his calculation is not correct. I would be sorry to think that one death in five hundred had been caused by drunkenness, or that one in five of the inhabitants is a drunkard. I do not think it is the case at the present time. A great reform has taken place in the drinking custom of society. His honor said it was the duty of the Government to encourage temperance houses; but I would ask how the Government can be expected to encourage them? Can the Government be expected to give them a subsidy? Perhaps it would not be a movement in the wrong direction if they did. Very few men are willing to open houses of entertainment unless they are allowed to sell liquor, as it is considered that it will not pay.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON: I regret to have to rise so frequently, but his honor who has just spoken has misunderstood my sentiments. I said it was the duty of the Government to provide accommodation for the travelling public, but I insist that the temperance men should take the lead, and that the Government should not discourage them by legislation. In a part of the district which I represent there is a temperance house, kept by Mr. Godfrey, within a half or three quarters of a mile of a tavern. At that house the public can be as well accommodated, and it has successfully competed with the tavern for several years. That shows that temperance houses will pay when they are well conducted. The public should not frown upon such houses, but should give them every encouragement in their power, and if they would do so I believe they would succeed without any subsidies from the Government.

Hon. Mr. BEER: I was going to allude to that circumstance. I have travelled many times on the Anderson road, and have been well accomodated at Godfrey's. And if a house of that description can be kept on that road, and successfully compete with a tavern within half a mile, why cannot the same be done on other roads? If such houses were kept, as I believe they could be, if they were more extensively patronized, there would be very little necessity for taverns. In a part of the district which I represent there are too many public houses. The people complain that they are a nuisance and they want the power to shut them up. This Bill gives power to two thirds of the inhabitants of a district to close public houses, or to prevent them from getting a renewal of license, but I do not think there are any grounds of apprehension that they will close houses that are really necessary for the accommodation of the public. I think there will be good faith enough in the people to allow a public house at every ten or twelve miles on the main road.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON: I dare say those temperance houses would do very well. There is one upon a road which I often travel, and I get as good accommodation there as in any house in the Country. Still, I am apprehensive that this bill will be the means of closing many houses that are required, and some of those men who would close up the public houses would be the last to open their doors to a person who was travelling. I would like to see one door opened before another is shut.

Hon. Mr. GOFF: There is a law now on our statute book requiring the sanction of two thirds of the inhabitants of a district before a man can open a tavern, and it is evident that the law has not been abused from the fact that there are complaints that they have sanctioned too many. Therefore, I do not think there is any danger in leaving it to the good sense of the people, and I am persuaded that they will not close houses which are required for the accommodation of the public.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY: The law requiring two thirds of the inhabitants of a district to sign a certificate before a man can get a license would be a very good one if it were not so often evaded. I am aware that persons often go round and get the names of parties to a certificate who are averse to opening a tavern, either from those parties being in debt, or by bringing a pressure to bear upon them in some other way. I think the bill might be so framed as to prevent an abuse of this kind. If a person going round to get signatures to his certificate had to take a Magistrate to see that no undue influence were used I think it would have a good effect. Sometimes, I believe, persons names are appended to a certificate without their consent, and thus taverns are opened where the majority of the inhabitants are not willing to have them, but if the plan I have suggested were adopted it would prevent abuses of that kind.

Hon. Mr. WALKER: I have not much faith in temperance houses. Licenses were required in Pictou at one time but there was just as much liquor sold as before. It is generally understood that temperance houses will not pay. There was one opened by Mr. Worth at Glasgow Bridge, but he soon found that it would not pay and he had to close it. It was a great deal of trouble, for people travelling would often rouse him up in the night; they would warm themselves and go away without paying anything. I do not like those little shanties which sell liquor but keep no accommodation for travellers. I consider them a curse to any settlement, and I would like to see them closed up. At the same time I would like to encourage good houses, and I do not know how far this bill will have that effect. I am afraid that two thirds of the inhabitants of a district might refuse license to a man who would keep a good house where it was required.

Hon. ATTY. GEN.: I consider this a very necessary amendment to the present law which places the power of granting licenses in the hands of two thirds of the inhabitants of a district. When that law was passed there was no provision made for the renewal of license; so that if a man once obtained a license by a two thirds vote of the inhabitants, he would [illegible] his tavern may have fallen off, and he himself from being a good man to the worst specimen of humanity. I think this is a very wholesome check upon taverns which may become disorderly or bad in their character. I am sorry that we are so often called upon to legislate upon the tavern license laws. I certainly agree with many persons that it is almost impossible to cure the evils and abuses of spirituous liquors by legislation. So long as the laws legalize the indiscriminate use of the article so long will people make an improper use of it. At the same time a great deal may be accomplished by legislation. Houses of entertainment are indispensable; but while spirituous liquor is permitted to be sold at such houses, we should endeavour to keep it under such wholesome restrictions as will lessen the evil as much as possible. An inn we know, when properly conducted, is very acceptable to the travelling public, and the best way to secure good houses is to put down those little dens which are established in many places to make a living out of the sale of spirituous liquors, when the persons who keep them do not care what kind of accommodation they have for men and horses. Respecting many of those places where bad spirits is sold it is very likely that the violation of the law is winked at by those whose duty it is to see it enforced. A person is forced to that conclusion when he looks at some of those shanties which are licensed to retail spirituous liquors, for a man could hardly get into them without doubling himself up. There is hardly a place to shelter a horse, much less could you find a bed for yourself. Everything about them has a repulsive appearance. I think this bill will have the effect of putting down those houses.

Hon. the PRESIDENT: Though the country is improving in every other respect, I do not think the accommodation at public houses is as good as it was 20 years ago. There are licensed houses between this place and New London in which a man could scarcely get a meal of victuals. A few years ago a man established a good house at New Glasgow and got a license, but by some means it was taken from him, and now there is not a house on the road fit to accommodate travellers. If a man were caught in a snow storm he might experience great inconvenience for want of a house to put up at. Few men like a public house at their doors, and I do not know that we can blame them, but still the public suffer.

Hon. Mr. GOFF: As it is necessary to have houses of entertainment I would be disposed to support the suggestion of his honor from Prince County (Mr. Ramsay) that a Commission should be appointed to go through the principal roads and [illegible] sites for them at regular distances. Then it would be worth a man's while to keep a good house. Under this bill, if a man were to open a good house, he would not know but next year two thirds of the inhabitants of the district might vote against him getting his license renewed, by which means he might be subjected to great loss. If the public require those houses for accommodation I do not know any better way than to appoint a commission to say where they should be placed. If there was one at every ten or twelve miles it would be close enough.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD: As regards the remark of his honor the President, that the accommodation at the public houses, instead of improving is deteriorating, I can only say that in King's County the reverse is the case. I know that the accommodation at houses there has been greatly improved within the last two or three years. A person can now get good accommodation on all the main roads. There is no law, I believe ever passed which is more difficult to make perfect than the liquor license law, for it is no matter what changes are made they do not appear to meet the views of some parties, and every session there are petitions before the Legislature for further changes. The clause under consideration leaves it to two thirds of the householders in a school district to say whether a man shall get a license or not, and I presume that those only are intended who are qualified to elect Trustees for the school. I therefore think the clause is imperfect, because a number of the householders may not have children of the ages which would entitle them to vote for Trustees, and therefore the case might be decided by one third of the householders in place of two thirds, while those who would be prohibited from voting might be just as capable of judging whether a tavern were required or not as the others. Besides, I believe the bill does not go to the great root of the evil. In my opinion it is those little shanties which sell inferior spirits without license that cause the greatest amount of evil. And however much a few persons may wish to put them down still where they are supported by a large number it is not easy to get them abolished. I believe that from the number of houses returned as having licenses a very large number must be selling without license, and we should endeavour to legislate so as to get at those houses. There may be cases where a man would get a license and afterwards become addicted to the immoderate use of liquor himself, so that it would be necessary to shut up the tavern, and if it were left to two thirds of the resident householders I think it would meet the wants of the case.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY: I knew a case since the present law went into operation where three taverns were opened in one district. The first man went round and the people signed his certificate, the second went and they signed his, and the third likewise; they were all good fellows together. There houses were a great nuisance, and if a law like this had been in operation I think only one of them would have got license. However, two of them have since been closed.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON: I am glad to hear that two of them went down, and I hope it is a very exceptional case. It does not say much for the inhabitants of the district. I think this clause aims well. It gives the power to those on whom the greatest responsibility rests—those who have children growing up. The law already provides for the suppression of those dens, as they are called. When a Constable is sworn in it is his obligation to report houses that he knows to be selling liquor without license. That is a good provision, but much depends upon the character of the people themselves.

Hon. Mr. WALKER: According to that clause the best houses, and kept in the most eligible situations, might be shut up. The Sons of Temperance and Good Templars might have it in their power to close them, and would do so, no matter how necessary they might be, for I believe it is the obligation of the members of those societies not to grant a certificate to obtain a license.

Hon. ATTY. GEN.: That is the very [illegible] of the act—to place it in the power of two thirds of the inhabitants of a district to close a tavern no matter what motive they may act from. If the householders think, in their own judgment that there is no necessity for a tavern in a district, they may prevent a license from being renewed; no matter what kind of house it is, good or bad, we cannot make a distinction. As far as I know the members of those societies are under no obligation to take up a prosecution against every man who sells liquor. If that were the case they would have to proceed against well regulated houses as well as others; but we must assume that there is nothing unfair or improper in them asking power to put down bad and unnecessary houses.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL: I am as anxious as any of your honors to afford proper accommodation to the travelling public, but I do not think this clause will effect any good houses. On the other hand, it is a safeguard against houses which are not properly conducted, being allowed to continue—houses which, perhaps, were good once but have fallen. I do not concur in the propriety of legislating upon men's interests every Session. I do not think it is a sound principle to legislate upon individual rights; but still, I think we are safe in passing this Bill. Perhaps it will not shut up three public houses on the Island; at least, not three which are entitled to the name of houses of accommodation.

Clause agreed to—Clause relating to store license read.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY: That is a part of the Act which is often evaded, and I have often heard it said that those stores are not much better than grog shops. Perhaps the parties are not allowed to drink in the stores, but they take their bottle outside and drink it, and then go in and get another. I think many of those stores are a public nuisance, and I would not allow them to sell less than two gallons.

Hon. Mr. LORD: I do not speak against this amendment, and pint license may be an injury in some cases if people will take bottle after bottle and drink it; but, suppose a little brandy or wine is required for sickness, how would his honor like to have to pay for two gallons, as he would have to do if there were no store license granted? Perhaps, if he only wanted a pint, he would have to pay £3, for you cannot get good brandy for less than £1 10s. per gallon. No doubt, the benefit intended to be derived from store license is often abused, but still, there is a strong argument in favor of pint or quart license, if there is any good in the article at all, and I think there is, for I have had a very fair trial of it.

Hon. Mr. GOFF: I think it is a very necessary feature of the Bill. Sometimes it is necessary for medicinal purposes, and the stores are the only places where there is any probability of getting a good article. A person would not like to go to a tavern for it, where they generally sell bad, adulterated stuff. There is a store in Georgetown, and I never heard of them drinking over the counter.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD: By that clause, a man has to get the consent of two-thirds of the inhabitants before he can open a store. The regulations in regard to stores are already very stringent, and if it is to be the case that a man has to get the consent of a majority of the inhabitants of a district before he can sell less than two gallons, we might as well say that no person should sell any quantity without the consent of the inhabitants. Therefore, I do not feel disposed to support that clause.

Hon. Mr. GOFF: I think Georgetown and Summerside should be exempted from the operation of that clause.

Hon. Mr. WALKER: I consider it absurd to require the consent of two-thirds of the inhabitants of Georgetown and Summerside before a man could open a store—the very same as tavern license. I would, therefore, oppose that clause.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON: I do not see why they should not be put upon the same footing as tavern license. There is no end to the extent to which those store licenses have been abused, and, therefore, I would be sorry to see that clause struck out of the Bill. If there are localities to which it is not applicable, let it be shown. We cannot use the same arguments in favor of the stores which have been used with regard to the taverns or houses of accommodation.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY: If Georgetown and Summerside are exempted, why not exempt St. Eleanor's and Cascumpec, and other thickly populated places. If we make any exemptions, I think it would be considered class legislation.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL: There is some force in the arguments on both sides. If a man wants a little good liquor, he would go to a store for it where he would be most likely to get a good article, and, on the other hand, it is often considered a great nuisance to have a store in a settlement. Persons will go and buy a pint and just go outside and drink it, and perhaps drink a little inside, too. I do not exactly agree with the clause, but I do not see how we can improve it.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I am sorry to have to disagree with some of your honors, but I do not see why a different rule should apply to this from the last evil we were trying to obviate. It has been found that the old law did not work well. It is just as much abused with regard to the store license as the tavern license. If a person wishes to purchase a little to take home, he can get it at the tavern, and to sell it in stores is interfering with the proper business of the taverns. As to the objections which have been urged against the clause, on the ground that it would prevent facilities for procuring small quantities for medicinal purposes, I cannot see any force in them, for a man can get it at the tavern as well as at the store, and wherever there is a store there is generally a tavern within a few miles of it. I have heard the law, in this respect, very much complained of, and several persons have said to me that it was a pity that the license had been reduced to a pint.

Hon. the PRESIDENT: The reason it was reduced was, that it was considered absolutely necessary to allow persons to get small quantities for medicinal purposes. It would be very hard to compel a man to purchase two gallons when he only wanted a pint. I happened to go to a store not long ago, and the man told me that he had just run out two gallons of wine in pints for sick people. Under this clause, I believe there is not one store keeper in ten that would take the trouble to procure license. I am not in favor of affording facilities for obtaining liquor, but it is often wanted as a medicine, and it is no use to try to make laws to put down drunkenness.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON: I would just remark that I have frequently to do with cases of sickness, and the instances where wine or brandy is re[illegible] are few and far between. And I think [illegible] would find that immorality has re[illegible] from pint license in twenty cases for every [illegible] which it has been a benefit in case of sickness.

Hon. Mr. WALKER: I do not think it is worth while to alter the clause, for it is certain that there will be applications to alter it next year again.

The question of concurrence was then put on the clause under consideration, and the Committee divided:

CONTENTS—Hon. the President, Hon. Messrs. Henderson, McLaren, Ramsay, Goff, Lord, Dingwell, and Walker—8.

NON-CONTENTS—Hon. Messrs. McDonald and Anderson—2.

So it passed in the affirmative.

The House was then resumed, and the Bill reported agreed to without any amendment.

Adjourned till Monday next at eleven o'clock.

MONDAY, March 27.

A Bill in further amendment of the laws relating to the sale by license of spirituous liquors, and a Bill to incorporate the Summerside Bank, were severally read a third time and passed.

A message was brought from the House of Assembly by the Hon. Mr. Hensley, with a Bill to repeal the laws now in force establishing and regulating the rate of interest, and to make some provisions on the same subject, and a Bill to alter the time for holding certain terms of the Supreme Court in the several counties of this Island.

MERCHANT SEAMEN'S BILL.

The House then resolved itself into a Committee of the whole to take into further consideration a Bill for the regulation of Merchant Seamen, and the Hon. Attorney General proposed the following amendment, which was agreed to:

Folio 32, Line 4,—Leave out "in any part of the Island," and insert "for the County in which the owner or part owner of the ship resides; or, in case the owner or owners reside abroad, then for the County wherein such ship was last in port."

The House was then resumed, and the Chairman reported the Bill agreed to with several amendments.

BOARDS OF HEALTH.

A Bill to amend the Act for constituting Boards of Health, was then read a second time and committed—Hon. Mr. Beer in the chair.

Hon. Mr. LORD: I observe that this is merely an amendment to the present Act, and I suppose the intention of it is to save the Health Officer a little trouble. We had a similar Act in force a few years ago, and many a time the owners of vessels had to pay the fee without the Health Officer seeing them at all. The law is not as well carried out now as it was some years ago. In nine cases out of ten the passengers are ashore and get their dinner, or something else, before the Health Officer is on board. I think the Health Officer must have friends in the other end of this building, or we would not have such a Bill brought before us. I would like to know what sized vessels it refers to, or whether it refers to Colonial, as well as foreign vessels?

Hon. the PRESIDENT: It refers to all vessels suspected of having sickness on board.

Hon. Mr. LORD: Well, I consider it an extreme hardship that owners or masters of small coasting vessels—perhaps only running over to Nova Scotia—should have to pay the Health Officer's fee at the custom house before they could get a clearance. At all events, there should be something to show that the Health Officer had really visited the vessels before the fee would be demanded from them.

Hon. the PRESIDENT: It does appear to me that the health officer should leave his account with the collector of customs; otherwise how is that officer to know whether a vessel has been visited or not?

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL: I think that clause is rather too sweeping. I would like to protect the health of the city and of the country, but I do not wish to give unnecessary trouble and expense to owners or masters of vessels. By this clause, every master of a vessel would have to pay the health officer's fee before he would get his clearance, therefore, there is no inducement held out to that officer to do his duty. If the health officer is to have fees he should earn them.

Hon. Mr. LORD: His honor (Mr. Dingwell) has exactly spoken my sentiments, and I think it is out of the question to expect the health officer to board vessels and do his duty unless he is provided with a boat and two men, with the yellow flag flying at the stern. He cannot provide himself with a boat out of the small fee which he is allowed at present. That vessel with the small pox was at the wharf last year before the health officer was on board. I would like to oblige the health officer, but I cannot support that clause.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL: The observations of his honor who has just resumed his seat are very proper and worthy of consideration. The health officer is authorized to board vessels in his discretion by the Act of 1857, and vessels which are not suspected of having sickness on board will not be boarded by him. But, as observed by your honors, the collector of customs will not have any opportunity of knowing what vessels have been boarded by the health officer, unless he gets some intimation of the name of the vessel boarded. It will rest with the health officer himself, and I think he has the right to collect his fee when he boards a vessel, but if he does not do so, he will have to give some intimation to the collector. Therefore, I think the clause requires amendment.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON: The law should contemplate two things, the safety of the citizens, and to avoid any factious interference with vessels putting into the harbor, such as would be detrimental to trade; and with these two objects in view, our enactments on this subject cannot be made too pointed. But I have doubts whether what is desired can be accomplished by this Act. The health officer has not the means of accomplishing what is required of him, therefore, I think the Bill requires amendment.

The Hon. Attorney General then submitted the following amendment, which was agreed to:

Folio 2, line 11,—After "House," insert "after notification by the health officer to the said collector that such fee is due and unpaid."

(Some discussion arose upon the necessity of providing a boat for the use of the health officer, to enable him to board vessels suspected of having sickness on board, before they should come in close proximity to the town. The Hon. Attorney General proposed an amendment to provide a boat, at the expense of the Government, for that purpose, which was agreed to by the Council, but was subsequently disagreed to by the House of Assembly; provision having been made in the appropriation bill for that service.

The House was then resumed and the Bill reported agreed to with several amendments.

A message was brought from the House of Assembly by the Hon. Mr. Haviland, with a Bill to amend the law of real property. Also, by the Hon. J. C. Pope, with a Bill to compel masters of vessels to exhibit a light while in harbor in the night time.

Adjourned till four o'clock, p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

JURISDICTION OF THE MAYOR'S COURT.

The House again resolved itself into a committee of the whole to take into further consideration a Bill to extend the jurisdiction of the Mayor's Court.—Hon. Mr. Walker in the chair.

Hon. Mr. Beer moved that the Bill be amended by adding the following clause:

"It shall be lawful for the City Council, of the City of Charlottetown, to license boarding houses, victualling houses, saloons, and houses of the like description, within the limits of the City, to sell spirituous liquors, and by a Bye-law to fix the rate, and prescribe the conditions under which such licenses shall be granted."

I believe, said his honor, (Mr. Beer) that there will be no objection to this clause. The City Council have found it necessary to have such houses under their jurisdiction. At present, they cannot license them when they have not the accommodations required by law for a tavern, and the License Law which we have passed this session does not apply to the City.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL: I very much doubt the propriety of inserting a clause of that kind, though it is limited to the city. The great protection which we have at present against having the city overrun with those low taverns, is, that no person shall obtain license to sell liquor, except store license, unless he has the accommodations required by law for a tavern. I do not know any reason why such extreme facility should be afforded to obtain licenses in the city, but, on the other hand, I see very great objections to it. If such a law were passed, every shanty about town would be a "licensed tavern." A man may write a sign over his door in the finest gilt letters, and then say he is entitled to a license to sell spirituous liquors. He may call it a shop, or a saloon, or whatever he pleases. We would soon have a nice nest of shops if such a permission were granted. Black Bill may go to the City Council and say he has opened a fine saloon for the accommodation of ladies and gentlemen, and will be entitled to a license.

Hon. the PRESIDENT: It would also extend to private boarding houses, and I think the city authorities have sufficient power in regard to granting licenses already.

Hon. Mr. BEER: At the present time no houses can be licensed unless they have the accommodations required for a tavern, and the authorities desire to have power to license saloons and boarding houses to sell liquor. But I must admit that there is some weight in the objections of his honor the Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON: I am much of the same opinion as his honor the Attorney General; and I am confirmed in that opinion by the painful recollections which I have of the effects of gin palaces in England. After a trial of two years, their effect was found to be so demoralising that they had to be put a stop to by an Act of Parliament. What I have seen is sufficient to convince me that they would have the same effect here and in other places. Unless we can presume on the morality of the citizens of Charlottetown, we may conclude that it would lead to degradation.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY: I do not think Charlottetown is badly off for grog shops. I would think that if a Bill were introduced to reduce their number, it would be a greater benefit than to increase them. I certainly would not consent to a Bill to open more of them. There might be some reason in giving a little more liberality to respectable boarding houses, but as the same privileges would extend to all, and would be likely to lead to immorality, I cannot support the clause.

Amendment withdrawn.

The House was then resumed, and the Bill reported agreed to without any amendment.

A message was brought from the House of Assembly, by the Hon. J. C. Pope, with a Bill for raising a Revenue.

DEFAMATORY WORDS AND LIBELS.

On motion of the Hon. Attorney General, a Bill to amend the law respecting defamatory words and libels was read a second time, and committed to a committee of the whole House.

Hon. Attorney General moved that the Bill be amended by adding the following section:

"In every case, civil or criminal, where a trial shall be had for a libel published in any printed Newspaper, Magazine, or other periodical publication, evidence may be given of the printing or publishing of such libel by the production of the actual Newspaper, Magazine, or other printed publication, containing the alleged libel, and which shall be proved to have been published or printed by the said defendant, or by his authority, express or implied; and it shall be *prima facie* evidence of such printing and publishing to produce any printed document containing the libellous matter complained of, and which, amongst other printed matter contained therein, purports to be printed and published by the said defendant, together with the testimony of any competent witness, who shall, on oath, state to the effect, that he knows the said defendant, and verily believes that the printed paper, so offered in evidence, has been printed or published by the authority, express or implied, of the said defendant."

The House was then resumed, and the chairman reported the Bill agreed to with a certain amendment.

A message was brought from the House of Assembly, by the Hon. Mr. Longworth, with a Bill to carry into effect certain unexecuted agreements, made by the late John Hodges Winsloe, for the sale and leasing of certain parts of his estate.

Adjourned till to-morrow at eleven o'clock.

TUESDAY, March 28.

The following petitions were presented to the House:

By the Hon. Mr. McDonald.—Of divers inhabitants of Georgetown and Royalty, praying that an Act may be passed to authorize the erection of a pound, or place of confinement for unruly cattle, on the public Square in Georgetown.

By the Hon. Mr. Palmer.—Of divers tenants settled on the south part of Lot 34, the property of the Rev. James F. Montgomery, praying that an Act may be passed to enable the tenantry of this Island to avail themselves of the provisions of the Fifteen Years' Purchase Bill passed last session.

By the Hon. Mr. Ramsay.—Of divers inhabitants of Summerside, praying that an Act may be passed to incorporate the said town.

The last named petition was referred to a select committee, consisting of the Hon. Messrs. Ramsay, Palmer and Goff, to report upon next session by bill or otherwise. The other two petitions were ordered to be laid on the table.

A Bill relating to merchant seamen, a Bill to amend the law respecting defamatory words and libels, and a Bill to enlarge the jurisdiction of the Mayor's Court in the City of Charlottetown, were severally read a third time and passed.

On motion of the Hon. Attorney General, a Bill to carry into effect certain unexecuted agreements made by the late John Hodges Winsloe, for the sale and leasing of certain parts of his estate, was read a second time, committed, and reported agreed to without any amendment.

A Bill to alter the time for holding certain terms of the Supreme Court was then, on motion, read a second time and committed—Hon. Mr. McDonald in the chair.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL: This Bill, your honors, involves the same principle which was contained in a Bill which was before the Legislature last session, and which was disagreed to by this House. I do not offer any objection to the alteration as regards Hilary Term in Charlottetown, which this Bill changes from the first Tuesday in January to the second. The first Tuesday is found inconvenient on account of the uncertainty, or rather, I might say, the certainty of the weather; for we are almost certain to have bad weather at that season. Then, as regards the change of the June term at St. Eleanor's from the first to the second Tuesday, it is a question which your honors who represent that County are more capable of speaking upon, but, as far as I understand, it would be an acceptable change. Last year I was rather opposed to this alteration, because I thought it was doubtful whether the second Tuesday would not be as valuable to the jurors and suitors as the first; but as far as I can learn, I believe the inhabitants of the County would prefer the change, as their agricultural operations would be more likely to be brought to an end. I therefore waive any objection which I may have had to that alteration. But I feel differently inclined with regard to the proposed alteration of the term in King's County from the second Tuesday in March to the last in February. It is desirable to have as even an interval between the different terms as possible, and we are proposing to carry the January term for Queen's County one week further into the year, and the other two weeks further back, leaving a very short interval between them. Besides, the last Tuesday in February is most likely to be inconvenient as regards the state of the travelling. I remember when a term was held in Charlottetown in February, and it was proverbial for a great snow storm. I therefore think it is by no means an improvement. I think it would be better to leave it as it is, or at the farthest, it should not be altered more than one week. For these reasons, I will object to the alteration as regards King's County.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON: As regards Prince County, I think the second Tuesday in June would answer much better than the first; but, if to change the Term in King's County to the last Tuesday in February would bring back the old fashioned snow storms, I do not think it would be a desirable change, for I remember having to attend the Court here once in February and I had to go home on snow shoes.

Hon. Mr. RAMSAY: I am aware that the change will meet the approbation of the inhabitants of Prince County. Farmers in that County seldom get their agricultural operations completed before the tenth of June, and it is a great inconvenience to them to be called away from their work in the first week of that month, which is one of the most busy weeks they have. When jurors and suitors have to come a long distance, perhaps from the North Cape, it is not only the loss of their own time