The Herald.

VOL. III. CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. ISLAND, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19, 1867. NO. 36

THE HERALD

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY MORNING

BY

EDWARD REILLY,

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,

at his Office, Queen Street.

TERMS FOR THE "HERALD."

For 1 year, paid in advance, £0 9 0

" " " half-yearly in advance, 0 10 0

Advertisements inserted at the usual rates.

JOB PRINTING.

Of every description, performed with neatness and despatch and on moderate terms, at the HERALD Office.

ALMANACK FOR JUNE.

MOON'S PHASES.

New Moon, 2d day, 11h. 0m, morning, S.
First Quarter, 9th day, 2h. 25m., morning, N. W.
Full Moon, 17th day, 0h. 42m., morning, S.
Last Quarter, 25th day, 1h. 15m., morning, E.

DAY MONTH.	DAY WEEK.	SUN rises	SUN sets	High Water	Moon rises.	Day's length.
		h m	h m	h m	h m	h m
1	Saturday	4 17	7 37	9 26	3 57	15 20
2	Sunday	17	38	10 52	sets	21
3	Monday	16	39	11 43	8 36	23
4	Tuesday	16	40	morn.	9 35	24
5	Wednesday	16	41	0 36	10 26	26
6	Thursday	15	42	1 28	11 12	27
7	Friday	14	42	2 22	11 42	28
8	Saturday	14	43	3 15	morn.	29
9	Sunday	14	44	4 7	0 24	30
10	Monday	14	45	5 5	0 56	31
11	Tuesday	14	46	6 2	1 26	32
12	Wednesday	13	46	6 59	1 57	33
13	Thursday	13	47	7 51	2 27	33
14	Friday	13	47	8 43	3 2	34
15	Saturday	13	47	9 31	3 36	34
16	Sunday	13	48	10 16	rises	34
17	Monday	13	49	10 59	7 51	35
18	Tuesday	13	49	11 40	8 36	35
19	Wednesday	13	49	even.	9 17	36
20	Thursday	13	50	1 0	9 54	36
21	Friday	13	50	1 39	10 28	15 37
22	Saturday	14	49	2 21	11 0	37
23	Sunday	14	49	3 2	11 30	36
24	Monday	15	49	3 47	12 0	35
25	Tuesday	15	49	4 36	morn	34
26	Wednesday	16	49	5 59	0 32	33
27	Thursday	17	49	6 27	1 8	34
28	Friday	17	49	7 31	1 46	32
29	Saturday	17	49	8 33	2 31	33
30	Sunday	18	49	9 35	2 23	32

Prices Current.

CHARLOTTETOWN, June 11, 1867.

Provisions.	
Beef, (small) per lb.,	6d to 9d
Do by the quarter.	6d to 8d
Pork, (carcass)	4½d to 5d
Do (small)	6d to 8d
Mutton, per lb.,	6d to 9d
Veal, per lb.,	3d to 5d
Ham, per lb.,	6d to 1d
Butter, (fresh)	11d to 1s
Do by the tub,	
Cheese, per lb.,	4d to 9d
Tallow, per lb.,	9d to 1½d
Lard, per lb.,	8d to 6s
Flour, per lb.,	3½ to 4d
Oatmeal, per 100 lbs.,	20s to 21s
Eggs, per dozen,	7d to 8d
Grain.	
Barley, per bushel,	5s to 5s
Oats per do.,	2s 4d to 2s 6d
Vegetables.	
Peas, per quart,	
Potatoes, per bushel.	2s 9d to 3s
Poultry.	
Geese,	5s to 8s 6d
Turkeys, each,	1s to 1s 8d
Fowls, each,	none
Ducks,	
Fish.	
Codfish, per qtl.,	20s to 30s
Herrings, per barrel,	20s to 40s
Mackerel, per dozen,	
Lumber.	
Boards (Hemlock)	4s
Do (Spruce)	4s to 5s
Do (Pine)	7s to 9s
Shangles, per M.	13s to 18s
Sundries.	
Hay, per ton,	80s to 100s
Straw, per ton	20s to 25s
Timothy Seed,	18s to 20s
Clover Seed, per lb.,	1s 6d
Homespun, per yard,	4s to 6s
Calfskins, per lb.,	6d to 9d
Hides, per lb.,	4d
Wool,	1s to 1s 3d
Sheepskins,	9d to 1s
Apples, per doz.,	3d to 4d
Partridges,	

GEORGE LEWIS, Market Clerk.

COLONIAL PARLIAMENT.

DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Council Chamber.

THURSDAY, May 9, (*continued.*)

Hon. Mr. LORD: I am bound to reply to some of the remarks of his honor who has just sat down, particularly those in reference to the Tenant League. I think it is very unhandsome in his honor to use those personalities. I have sat with those Tenant Leaguers, and have subscribed to their funds, and I must express my disapprobation of such. I was going to say ungentlemanly conduct, but, perhaps, that would be going a little too far. We have only one or two Tenant Leaguers in this House, and it is not fair to make such allusions. My hon friend who introduced this resolution did so, I suppose, to draw out a debate; not to have it put to the House, and carried or lost. I say those small proprietors have been a curse to this Island. A tract of land not far from Lot 28, consisting of 7000 acres, was once offered to me for £100, but I said, No! There was a large number of squatters upon it, and I knew that I would have to use coercive measures to get them out. It was purchased by another, who dragged those poor men before the Court from time to time, till at last he worried them out and got judgment against them by default. Then he compelled them to submit to his terms. These are the men we have to contend with, and they have been a curse to the Island from the very first. Now, my Hon. friend on my right, (Mr. Palmer) wants us to say what we are going to do. He knows very well that the Government is not going to take up that question this session. We have a question to grapple with, which has been entailed upon us by the late Government, and which will give us a great deal of trouble before we get it settled. Then why ask the Government to go into this question now? They have not passed a measure worth a cent to the tenantry during their eight years term of office, or, indeed, to any other class in the Colony. Talk about the "Fifteen Years Purchase Bill?" Who sent that bill here? Why, it was Sir Samuel Cunard! His honor knows that very well. He (Mr. Palmer) was sent to England to represent the interests of the tenantry, I suppose, and what was done? After that the "Fifteen Years Purchase Bill," passed, I suppose, by Judge Peters, made its appearance, and they, those famous small proprietors, gave their assent to it. And now we are just come into power; placed here by the Tenant League it may be, or by any other party, but placed here to represent the views of the people, not to act as the tools of the proprietors, and they want us to say what we are going to do. I am obliged to his honor who brought forward this subject, for this discussion will show us in our true colors before the people.

Adjourned till to-morrow at eleven o'clock.

FRIDAY, May 10

LAND QUESTION, (*continued.*)

Hon. Mr. BALDERSTON: I do not wish to cast any reflections upon the late Government, as I assisted in placing them in power, but I do not think there is much credit due to them for the purchase of the "Cunard Estate," because they purchased it at too high a price. Perhaps it will be some benefit in this way, that it has broken the heart of proprietorism in the Colony, so that it may not be so difficult to get a compulsory measure passed now as it was formerly. I believe they only purchased that estate for a stalking horse to ride into power. I remember a candidate saying just before the election, that it was no reason that a man should not ride a horse, because he had thrown him down and kicked him—it was no reason that he should leave the horse and take an ass—but I think the old horse has kicked them overboard altogether. I hope the party now in power will do all they can to settle this question. There were two evils connected with the "Fifteen Years Purchase Bill." They should have allowed it to go into operation, and then the tenants would probably have purchased the best lands, and in the course of a few years the proprietors would have sold the balance to the Government at a reasonable rate. There was one feature in that Bill which was very objectionable. They should have established a uniform price for the land. The price of land held at one shilling an acre would be 16s. 8d. instead of 15s. as some suppose; but what benefit was it to be to those who held their land at two or three shillings sterling an acre? As to bringing in the Troops, I am of opinion, that if there was any necessity for bringing them here, there may also be some necessity for retaining them, for if those men who were connected with the Tenant League are to be looked upon with suspicion and proscribed, I would not be surprised if it would have a bad effect upon their loyalty. His honor from the city (Mr. Palmer) says they have altered their views, and I believe many of them have, for some time went too far; but I was a member of that organization, and I have not altered my views, for I believe it was based on sound principles. The Imperial Government admitted that the tenantry had grievances, and their object was to negociate with the proprietors, and try to induce them to sell their lands at a fair price. Larger prices were offered in some cases than what is contemplated by the "Fifteen Years Purchase Bill," but they were refused, and it is no wonder that some of the tenantry became outrageous.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE: His honor from the city (Mr. Palmer) made some remarks which I think were quite uncalled for. He called upon the Government of the day to announce their policy. I think it was very fairly shadowed forth in His Excellency's Speech at the opening of the session, and no person knows better than his honor the difficulties under which we took the reins of Government. He should remember the complete failure of the Land Question under their administration. The "Fifteen Years Purchase Bill" was unsuccessful. It is true, a large amount of arrears of rent was remitted, but they were so old, in most cases, that it was impossible to collect them. The arrears subsequent to 1858 were to be paid in full. His honor has challenged the Government to state their policy, and I do not think his remarks are consistent with his usual candor. He might have reflected upon that statement in His Excellency's Speech:—

"I do not fail to observe the general desire evinced by the Tenantry to obtain the fee simple of their land, by the purchase of their farms. My efforts are, therefore, directed towards extending the action of the Land Purchase Bill to such parts of the Island as have not yet participated in its benefits, and I shall endeavour, under its provisions, to buy out the interests of the remaining proprietors, in the comparatively small portion of the land which is now held under leasehold tenure. The means for providing funds for this purpose will require your serious consideration."

Now, I do think that was a fair exposure of the policy of the Government; and when I add to that the fact which has already been stated by his honor from Georgetown, that a measure was in progress, to enable the Government to obtain a loan, to buy out those remaining estates, I think it must be seen that the challenge of his honor was quite unnecessary. That paragraph in His Excellency's Speech, I am aware, has given satisfaction in the country. I trust his honor who introduced the resolution will see the propriety of withdrawing it, and leaving the matter in the hands of the Government.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON: As respects the "Fifteen Years Purchase Bill," I think it has been a great benefit. It has been the means of bringing a great quantity of land into the market. I do not think the Cunard property would have been purchased yet if it had not been for that Act; and I know that very considerable quantities of land have been purchased under it. A number of tenants on Lot 16, who had short leases, have purchased the fee simple of their farms under that bill, and it has therefore been of great service to them.

Hon. Mr. PALMER: What I stated was this: I alluded to the "Fifteen Years Purchase Bill" as the great remedy which was devised by the late Government for the settlement of the Land Question; and when I look at the principle involved in it, I think it has approached far nearer to the wishes of the great body of the people than anything I have yet heard from the then Opposition or from the members of the present Government. The great cry was for a compulsory measure. Now, as that turned out ineffective, I want to know whether the present Government will show themselves to be possessed of as much moral courage as the late Government. If you turn to the debates of the Legislative Council you will find that every one of their honors who composed the then Opposition expressed their disapprobation of that measure, on the grounds that it was fixing the purchase money at too high a rate. Well, I see nothing in His Excellency's Speech beyond the policy of the late Government. The present Government have not shown a disposition to go as far as the late Government in complying with the wishes of the people in that respect. In adopting that measure the late Government went to the very verge of constitutional principles. It broke down hundreds of contracts, and compelled proprietors to sell at fifteen years' purchase who had refused a sovereign an acre. That price, fifteen years' purchase, was considered too high, and now I repeat the question, and I put it to them as a body, not singling out any one member, for I am happy to say that I am on good terms with every member of the Government, because we do not carry our political principles to the extremes which many of us used to do ten or twelve years ago; I say I speak to them as a body and ask them, now that they are in power, whether they are going to use the moral force which their powers of legislation give them to pass a compulsory measure. "The time has arrived," and their supporters expect it of them, that they should exercise that power, or else come to the opposite conclusion and say, "it is vain, we cannot go beyond the line of reason." That is the position of the present Government, and it is due from them to the country to come to some definite conclusion. It is open to them to say, "here is the principle admitted by the Government of the Colony, as well as by the Imperial Government, and now let us fix the price so as to be within the reach of every man, for we are pledged to our constituencies to do so." I speak the sentiments of a vast number of the supporters of members of the present Government. They were sent here under the assurance that that principle would be carried out, and I want to see if there is to be any attempt made to carry it out. I cannot expect such a measure to be introduced this session, but a plain declaration would set the minds of the people at rest. There should be some clearer and more satisfactory declaration than that which has been given by his honor who has just spoken. He should not take shelter under what is set forth in His Excellency's Speech, for when we come to analyze it we will see that it contains no promise of a Land Tenure Bill. A plain declaration coming from the present Government would have a vast influence upon the minds of the people, and would satisfy them, for if anything decisive as to the hopes of a compulsory measure should come from the mouths of those in whom they have such unbounded confidence, they would be quieted forever, and they would turn their attention to something that would be more useful to themselves and more conducive to the prosperity of the country at large.

Hon Mr McDONALD: It is a fine thing to be a member of the 'legal profession,' for then a man can speak on both sides of a question, at one and the same time, and those who are listening will know just as much about the subject when he began as when he has ended. His honor wishes the minds of the people to be set at rest, by the Government declaring their policy and saying whether they intend to pass a compulsory measure. At the same time he tells us that the late Government went further than the present Government have shown a disposition to go, by passing what is known as the 'Fifteen Years Purchase Bill.' Now, I would just put a simple case: Suppose his honor had a valuable farm leased to a tenant, and suppose that tenant came and tendered him the 'fifteen years purchase,' as provided by that Bill, which his honor did not conceive to be the value of that farm, he would just tell the tenant that he was not one of the parties who agreed to be bound by the provisions of that Bill, for the Bill, in the preamble, sets forth the names of those proprietors who were consenting parties to it, and it further says:

'*And whereas*, the said proprietors have intimated to Her Majesty's Government their willingness to remit to their tenants, on their respective estates, certain arrears of rent hereinafter mentioned; and also, that the tenants on the said estates shall have the right to purchase the fee simple of their farms at the rate hereinafter expressed.'

Now, it there plainly says that those proprietors agreed and were willing to become bound by that Bill, and how it can be characterized as a compulsory measure, after they had agreed to it, I cannot conceive. It is very different from what I conceive to be a compulsory measure. I am not prepared to state at present what the future policy of the Government will be with respect to a compulsory measure; but, when they are prepared to purchase, and certain proprietors refuse to sell on fair and equitable terms, then would be the time to introduce such a measure, not only with a prospect of carrying it out, but with a show of reason on the part of the Government which would introduce it. As I said before, there is a Bill before the House of Assembly to enable the Government to borrow money to purchase out the rights of the remaining proprietors, and when that will have become law, and several estates purchased under it, which I have no doubt will be offered to the Government, then it will be time enough to talk about a compulsory measure. The highest price the Government can give under the Land Purchase Bill is five shillings sterling an acre, and there are several estates which are, perhaps, worth more than that; but, at the same time, there are others which are not worth so much—which would be dear at five shillings an acre. The Cunard estate was one of the largest estates on the Island, and some parts of it would compare favorably with the most valuable properties we have, and, though some parts of it will be sold to the tenants at the high price of fifteen or sixteen shillings an acre, still it is believed that it will entail a loss upon the colony, owing to some of the parts of the land not being worth the price paid for it. Therefore, it is evident that five shillings sterling an acre is the full value of many of the estates now held by the proprietors. There are other estates which I think the Government may expect to purchase; and when they come into the market and the value of them is ascertained—for there is provision in the Bill to enable the Government to ascertain their value—then it will be time enough to fix the price beyond what it is at present.

Hon Mr BAKER: I am pleased to hear that a measure is in progress to enable the Government to purchase the balance of the lands held by the proprietors, much more easily than they could do without the additional funds which it is contemplated to obtain by means of that Bill, and I trust that good will result from it. In the meantime, I will withdraw my resolution, but looking forward and hoping that, if I have a seat here at a future session, I will have the privilege of bringing forward and urging upon the Legislature some such measure as I have been advocating, should the necessity for it still exist.

Adjourned till eleven o'clock to-morrow.

SATURDAY, May 11th.

Hon. Mr. McDonald moved that a bill to continue and amend certain acts therein mentioned relating to Education, be now read a third time.

Hon. Mr. Gordon moved an amendment that the said bill be referred back to a Committee of the whole House, with a view of increasing the salary allowed to junior teachers, who had not been three years at the occupation.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD: I must express my dissent from the amendment proposed by my hon. colleague. The matter has been considered very carefully by the House of Assembly, and the Act was introduced by the Government after due deliberation. They considered it advisable to insert this clause in the bill, so that a reduction of five pounds should be made for the first three years. It will not affect teachers who have been some time engaged in the occupation, and I am of opinion that going on in that progressive ratio of increase will have the effect of inducing persons who commence teaching to follow it up as an occupation. I have known many cases where young men engaged in teaching for one year, and as soon as they got money enough to pay their passage, they left the Island. Therefore, I trust your honors will see the propriety of passing the bill in its present shape.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: I regret that my hon. colleague should oppose the amendment, for, from various letters that I have received since the bill was introduced, I find that it is not acceptable to the people. I am of opinion that teachers are often more energetic and useful the first year or two than they are afterwards, and I have often heard persons say that their children have received more benefit from junior teachers than from those who had been some time time engaged in the occupation. Besides, I do not think it is fair, for it costs them the same to qualify themselves, and surely when they pass through their course in the Normal School, and get their certificate, they are qualified for teaching. I am sorry that the bill is brought forward in the shape it is at present, for there are many amendments required. There are too many schools on the Island. In many places they are three miles apart. When the advantages of education are considered, we should not be too sparing in granting a sufficient sum for its encouragement. Next to the land question, it is the most important question that we have to deal with. Many of our young men have gone abroad and have distinguished themselves in various professions. I am, therefore, of opinion that those young men should be allowed the same as the others, and there is no fear but they would do their duty, otherwise they will not study so as to qualify themselves for the sake of £30. People in King's County expected very great improvements in the Education Act, but it appears to me that this bill is a very small advance upon the old one.

Hon Mr. HAYTHORNE: As to the policy of placing the junior teachers upon an equality with those who have been some years engaged in the occupation, I think his honor's view is not a correct one. I believe the idea of introducing this amendment was adopted upon a recommendation contained in a resolution passed at the teachers' association, which met in this city some time ago. I do not speak positively upon this point, for I did not expect this question to come up today, but that is my impression. His honor says this provision of the bill is not favorably received in the country, but the views of his correspondents are not universal, for I have received letters of an opposite nature myself. They consider that a man who has devoted his life to the occupation of a teacher should receive a higher salary. Therefore I think your honors will see the propriety of passing the bill as it is at present. None of your honors would think of paying the same wages to a junior clerk that you would pay to an experienced cashier; neither is it done in Great Britain. I do not think the junior teachers will have any cause to complain of this bill, and whatever his honor's views may be, I think it would be impolitic, considering the discussion it has undergone in the House of Assembly, to press his motion, or to attempt to make any amendment to it.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL: I think the suggestion of his honor from Georgetown (Mr. Gordon) is a very good one, and there is a great deal of sound sense in his remarks. If the Act were to be passed for a length of time, I would probably support his motion; but as it is only to be passed for one year, perhaps we cannot do better than to allow it to remain in its present shape. I agree with his honor that a young teacher can be as successful the first year as any year afterwards, and he may also be in as much need of his pay, but when we consider that the Government have taken no steps to increase the taxation, I think we should be satisfied with what they have done with respect to education.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: I am glad that his honor who spoke last has taken the same view of the subject as I have, and I am satisfied that the public will agree with us that a young teacher who has just received his license possesses a vigor of thought and can communicate his ideas with perhaps greater facility than a man who has been for years engaged in the occupation. I am sorry that the Education Acts were not revised and consolidated, for, as they are at present, I defy any board of trustees to take them up and ascertain what their duties really are. There is the Act of the 24th Victoria, chapter 36, with 97 sections, 26 Victoria, chapter 5, 29 sections, and 27 Victoria, chapter 31, with 13 sections. I have heard a lawyer say that he could not attempt to give an opinion upon a point involved in those acts without two days' consideration. When cases are brought before the Commissioners' Court it is often very difficult to decide upon them. Those acts should certainly be made more explicit, but as this bill is only to be passed for one year, I will not offer any opposition to it.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE: If his honor would consider the short time we have been in office, and the various interests we have had to attend to, I think he would see that it was almost impossible for us to make very extensive improvements in this Act this year. However, as he appears disposed to withdraw his motion, perhaps the less that is said about it the better.

Hon. Mr. McDONALD: This act may be looked upon as a temporary one, as the whole question is to undergo investigation during the recess.

Hon. Mr. Gordon then, by leave, withdrew his amendment, and the original motion having been put and carried, the bill was read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. PALMER, on rising to move for the second reading of a Bill to amend an Act for the establishment of the Prince of Wales College, said: I think it is not improper to state that, after the experience we have had since the establishment of that College, there is a great deal of disappointment on the part of the public with regard to the success of that institution. Your honors are no doubt aware that previous to 1860, it was merely kept under the denomination of a Grammar School; and it was supposed that if a change were made in its constitution, if it were raised to the *status* of a College, and proper professors procured, it would be an advantage to the public, and especially to the youth of the Colony, large numbers of whom, it was supposed, would be attracted to the institution, and great progress made in education and science. The Government of that day were induced to make great and radical changes in that institution, raising it, as I said, to the status of a College, and providing for the maintenance of two professors. It was supposed that, with the advantage of superior gentlemen to fill those stuations, that vastly different would be the result of its operation and effect. I was one of those who acceded to that idea, and I confess that my mind was incited by two or three individuals, one in particular, who professed to know a great deal about the progress of education, and brought in the bill which constitutes the change to which I allude. Gentlemen were then induced to come to the Colony and accept professorships in that College. But I feel bound to confess, and I also feel it to be my duty to state, as a representative of this town, that I, as one individual, have experienced great disappointment, and in saying so I am confident that I express the sentiments of many of the inhabitants of the Island. It may be difficult, and I need not venture to state what the principal causes are why it has not prospered as we anticipated, but such is the case. I confess that I was sanguine in 1860, but perhaps I was not so thoroughly conversant with the working of classical institutions, beyond the pale of this Island, as some others who, from their travels or residence abroad, have become better acquainted with them, and my disappointment may have been owing to that. I believe, however, that it was a bad and rather unfortunate alteration which we made in that institution. I think we forgot the smallness of our Colony and our limited population, when we supposed that we would be able to maintain such a college within ourselves. There have been very few students entered for the higher branches of literature or the classics. The professors say the objection or want of success is not attributable to them; but whatever may be the reason, there does not appear to have been an inducement to the people to send their pupils to that institution. A very small number attend from beyond the precincts of Charlottetown, while we supposed it would have drawn pupils from all parts of the Island, and even from the neighboring colonies. It is a pity is has not proved as successful as was anticipated. The fees are very low, only £10 a year, £6 for one term and £4 for the other, and small as that sum is, still it does not appear to have drawn enough pupils to the institution to make it respectable in the eyes of our neighbors. For that small yearly sum a young man may obtain a very fair education at that institution; still, and it is with reluctance I state it, there has been a failure to a great extent, and it now devolves upon the Legislature to try to make some improvement. I think myself that in the present state of the colony, we need not expect to maintain anything but a first class grammar school, with one, two or three masters. The present bill does not propose to adopt that principle but the main object is this: according to the law of 1860, the two professors were put upon an equal footing, so that neither had to take the responsibility of the arrangement of classes and the management of the internal economy of the institution. It has been considered that some of the want of success was to be attributed to that circumstance. The present bill, therefore, is intended to constitue one of the profesors as principal and the other as subordinate, thereby making the principal professor more responsible for the management of the institution in future. This will place the responsibility upon one individual, and it will behoove him to look more to the organization of classes and other arrangements connected with teaching in the institution. I hope, therefore, that it will be more satisfactory to the public, and that there will be no cause to complain of the progress made by the few pupils who attend there. The fees will be the same as formerly under the supervision of the Governor and Trustees. It is true, we cannot perhaps devise legislative enactments which will insure a fuller attendance of students. There must be a fee paid to go towards meeting the expenses of the establishment, and it could hardly be fixed at a lower rate.

The Bill was then read a second time, committed to a committee of the whole House, reported agreed to without any amendment, and read a third time and passed.

Hon. Mr. Balderston obtained leave of absence till Tuesday next.

Adjourned till eleven o'clock, on Monday.

MONDAY, May 13th.

SUPREME COURT.

Hon Mr PALMER, on rising to move for the second reading of a bill relating to practice and pleading in the Supreme Court, said: As it is a bill relating to the practice in the Supreme Court, it may be incumbent upon me to give some explanation of its provisions. I believe it contains very little that is original, but is compiled from Acts already in force in Great Britain; some provisions of which are considered applicable to the circumstances of this Colony. The amendments are conducive to the convenience, and to a saving of expense, to those who have to apply to the Court in order to get their business settled.

The bill was then read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House.

—Hon Mr Palmer in the chair.

Hon Mr DINGWELL enquired whether the Act would authorize the Sheriff to seize money in a man's house or to examine his chest.

Hon Mr PALMER replied that it would.

Hon Mr DINGWELL: Well, it is something new, and it should be well understood in the country. It is an important step to allow the Sheriff to break a man's chest to see whether he has any money or not, and if your honors think it is necessary I will not oppose it; but it lies with the House to consider well whether that amendment should be allowed to pass.

Hon the PRESIDENT: That provision of the bill has been in operation in Great Britain for a number of years. Certainly if a man should convert his