

on board the steamer was quite moderate, and the supply of liquors for the men was necessary. He did not see why he should be made the scape-goat for the Board of Works; he had not received any intimation that an attack was to be made on the Government in connection with that department.

Mr COFFIN thought that great credit was due to Mr McLellan for having brought the subject to the House. If liquors had been supplied to Government vessels under the names of beef, and pork, he could only say that it was a disgraceful action, whoever the parties were that had been concerned in it. The commander of an ordinary ship who would connive at such an act should be dismissed; and he thought that if the matter had been left to the commander of the *Druid* this would not have occurred. He would not say that the expenditure of \$600 was too large, but it should not appear in the shape in which it was put down in the accounts. If liquor were required for the men on the Island, there were no necessity for hiding it from the public; but he did not see why it was necessary to offer such inducements to the men on the Island,—they should do their work under the direction of their officers, without a glass of grog being held out to them as an incentive to exertion.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said he had on a previous occasion denied the correctness of the course taken by the member for North Colchester,—if that gentleman in the investigation of the accounts required any explanation he should have called before him the parties who could give the information, but he had left his duty undone, and had come to the house to make political capital out of the accounts. He, Mr. McL., had sat for weeks on the committee and had never given to his colleagues the slightest intimation that any explanation was required in the accounts entrusted to him, but went about the city asking the prices of the articles charged. Was that the course of a dignified member of the house or was it the conduct of a political pedlar? The government could not be expected to be present at every transaction in all the departments, and could not therefore be expected to furnish an explanation on the instant. The object evidently was to send the charges to the country unaccompanied by reply, and thus to obtain a trivial success at the expense of the government subordinates. The hon. member had led the country to believe that the expenditure occurred in the ordinary service of the government vessels and had kept out of sight the fact that the money earned by them at Sable Island was \$90,000. It might be wrong for members of the Board to deal with the department, but this system had been followed for a number of years by gentlemen who were above suspicion. If the hon. member for North Colchester had examined into the expenditure, he would have found it impossible to make the complaint which he had made.

PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS.

Mr. HILL moved the second reading of the bill sent down from the Council for the prevention of cruelty to animals.

Mr. MILLER said that this bill had been introduced in the house previously, and was re-

ported against as injudicious by the Committee on Law Amendments.

Mr. S. McDONNELL thought that the bill was unnecessary, and would be of too arbitrary a nature.

Mr. TOWNSEND approved of the bill, and thought that a necessity existed for its enactment.

Mr. BOURINOT concurred in this view.

Mr. ROSS thought that the bill would be the means of doing a great deal of good in the country.

Mr. HILL thought that the bill was necessary, especially in the city of Halifax.

Hon. PROV. SECY could not see any strong objections to the bill. It might include matters which did not require legislation, but it would be creditable to the legislature to pass such an Act.

Mr. MILLER said that the existing provisions were ample. The bill by placing larger powers in the hands of magistrates would tend to foster petty disputes, and would only differ from the existing law in the vexation it would cause.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. thought the clause giving to two magistrates the right to try for any injury inflicted on cattle, etc., was a good one.

Hon. Mr. SHANNON believed that the bill would be very beneficial. The present law was somewhat ambiguous.

Mr. MILLER said that the bill would not remove the ambiguity. It was not required by the practical circumstances of the country.

Hon. FIN. SEC said that a good deal of cruelty to horses existed in the country towns. As to the bill not being generally required, it would do no injury to those who did not come within its operation.

Mr. TOBIN thought that the bill should receive very careful consideration. The provision respecting overloading of horses was very vague.

Mr. ALLISON thought that a good deal of uncertainty would be created by the bill.

Hon. ATTY. GEN. said that the prosecutor in each case would be obliged to prove the overloading or other cruelty.

Mr. MILLER said that in the city he had observed injury done to horses by their loads coming into contact with the street railway; some one might in such a case say that the horse had been overloaded, and thus a good deal of annoyance would arise.

The bill was read a second time.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Hon. PROV. SEC read a telegram from New Lurg, conveying to the members of the Legislature an invitation from Mr. Fleming to be present at the opening of the railway to Pictou on the 31st.

Mr. McDONNELL laid on the table the road scale for the county of Inverness.

The report of the Crown Lands Committee was adopted.

The House then adjourned until the next day at 11 o'clock.

TUESDAY, May 7.

The House met at 11 o'clock.

The Crown Land Report was adopted.

The bill in reference to cruelty to animals was taken up, and Mr. S. McDonnell opposed the bill, and, after some further discussion, it was deferred by a vote of 25 to 7.