

Legislative Proceedings.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

FRIDAY, Feb. 13.
MORNING SITTING.
SUPPORT.

Hon. Mr. POPE moved, that it may be made an order of the day, for to-morrow for the House to go into Committee of Supply. Ordered accordingly.

ESTIMATES.

Hon. Mr. WARBURTON laid before the House the Estimates for 1853.

COMPENSATION TO EJECTED TENANTS.

Hon. Mr. COLES introduced a Bill to provide Compensation to ejected Tenants for their improvements. The Bill was read a first time, and its second reading ordered for to-morrow.

SEDUCTION OF FEMALES.

On motion of Mr. Palmer, the Bill to provide a summary remedy for females seduced, was read a second time, and thereupon committed to a Committee of the whole House. Mr. CLARK in the Chair.

Mr. PALMER in explaining the principles of the Bill said, it doubtless was known to hon. members, that by the law as it existed at present, the party aggrieved has a remedy by action in the Supreme Court, brought by either the master or her parents for the loss of service, as it is termed, though as laid, it is for the benefit of the seduced, who by her own evidence can substantiate her case. But the formalities of the law, when the action is thus brought, are such as to exclude a remedy oftentimes when an injury of this nature is inflicted; for should it happen, as indeed it too frequently does, that the seduced has neither parents nor guardians to look to for protection, or having either, happens to be so located at a time when not living in their service, or under their actual care, she is, in fact, without remedy, however pitiable or aggravated her case may be; and this because she cannot comply with the legal form of alleging and proving some petty or immaterial loss of service: thus the remedy is not within the reach of those who bring so situated, most needfully require its application. The Bill was, therefore, intended to remove these technical difficulties; and to allow the action to be brought under any circumstances, in the name of the woman herself, and at the same time to give her the benefit of her own testimony, although a party to the record. It dispenses with the necessity of showing loss of service, or any pecuniary loss, and simplifies in a material degree, the pleadings in the cases. The Bill was at the same time, he feared, not sufficiently drafted to prevent its provisions being abused: It left the credibility of the plaintiff's testimony wholly with the jury, who, notwithstanding such testimony, were not bound in law to find even nominal damages, if they thought proper. It enabled the judge to place the damages recovered in the hands of a trustee for the plaintiff, if he thought it for her interest; and the Bill itself was only to extend to actions where the damages claimed did not exceed one hundred pounds. He doubted not, therefore, that it would meet the approval of the Committee. It was certainly high time, that some alteration in the law was made on the subject; as a professional man, he could say many cases had come to his knowledge, especially distressing in their circumstances, owing to the present state of the law. (The hon. member here narrated some instances of extreme destitution and suffering brought upon young and unprotected women, and where their seducers, although able to alleviate it, rather mocked than attempted to relieve their misery.) The evil, too, he added, appeared to be on the increase, and in his opinion, called loudly for a remedy.

Hon. Mr. COLES was of opinion, that the Small Debts Court ought to be made available to the aggrieved parties, because if redress was to be obtained in the Supreme Court only, starvation might happen, before the sitting of the latter court would.

Mr. PALMER said, it was his intention to introduce a Bill on Saturday before the closing of the Session, which would empower the mother to affiliate the child before a Justice of the Peace; previously to confinement, as in England; this Bill would more immediately meet the extreme cases alluded to by the hon. Mr. Coles, but would operate independent of any new order consideration, as in latter would be available to women in any class of life. He (Mr. P.) expected many cases would occur, where parties might be in circumstances sufficiently averse to deter them from seeking a remedy in and only for the destitute, but who, nevertheless, looked more to the injury to their reputation; though the law should provide a remedy, which the present Bill would enable them to do, and at the same time, would be a law which would apply to all. The Bill he intended to introduce respecting Bastardy, would be a mere transcript from the law of Nova Scotia, which as it had been lately revised, he had no doubt, had been found to work well.

After a few remarks from Mr. Montgomery and the Hon. Mr. Coles, the Bill was reported agreed to, and ordered to be engrossed.

BILL TO AMEND THE LAW OF EVIDENCE.

This Bill, on motion of Mr. Haviland, was read a second time, when the speaker explained its principle: It was, he said, framed from a British Statute, of which Lord Campbell was the author, and intended to be a great saving in cases tried in the Supreme Court. It had been found that where parties were obstinate, and would not produce evidence required by the plaintiff, Chancery must be resorted to, to compel them, whereby much expense was incurred; this was one thing his Bill would remedy; Another was, that masters of vessels should produce their Registers in any Court, without the delay and expense of perhaps having to send thousands of miles. Another cause of expense intended to be remedied, was where a party had been tried and acquitted, and a second indictment was brought against him, he should not be bound to be put to the expense of producing all the proceedings had in the first indictment, as is now the case. When any book or original document was required in Court, the Bill provided that a certified copy should be substituted, inasmuch that the book or other document may be wanted in several places at one and the same time. Any person or persons found guilty of certifying false documents, to be considered as having committed a misdemeanor, and be liable to be prosecuted. And if a seal is falsified, to be considered felony.

Mr. FRASER said he did not, perhaps, completely understand the Bill; as he approved of some parts of it, but should like to know better, if all after the word book was struck out.

Mr. PALMER inquired if the hon. member he should be under no fear, the Bill only contemplated public books, to show the necessity of certified copies being as valid as the original. He might advise many arguments, take for instance this simple one, that a book was required from the Col. Secretary's office; he might not like to lose it, but an expense would be incurred in calling upon him to produce the book in Court. A dozen documents might be required in one case, and it may be necessary to go to great expense in calling witnesses from a distance to give the mere attestation of such documents. In some cases the parties may not require this, but admit the signature; on the other hand, some may be obstinate and would not consent without witnesses being called, and ought, therefore, to pay the expense of their production. Lawyers, and the hon. member, are generally accused of producing long Bills, but it is forgotten, that great part comprises payments paid to witnesses, and other expenses in preparing the documents to be framed.

Mr. FRASER had known copies of deeds admitted in evidence. Mr. HAVILAND mentioned the hon. member that that must have happened when the original was lost.

Mr. DAVIES agreed with the hon. member Mr. Fraser, he did not approve of sending to England for copies of deeds, they may be copied in the present day, and yet they may be sixty years old. Mr. DOUGLAS had known witnesses to be detained many days about the Court to attest signatures, and very much inconvenienced and annoyed.

Hon. Mr. COLES did not approve of copies of deeds or other documents from England, he is not in favour of it, because if any supposed error, the originals could at once be referred to.

Mr. HAVILAND was not wedded to the Bill, but was morally certain, that if it became law it would be a great benefit to the Colony, and was surprised at the opposition of the hon. member for Belfast. Mr. Davies as Lord Campbell originated the Statute, who was a great Liberal.

Mr. HAVILAND moved that the House go into a Committee of the whole.

The House in amendment, moved that the House go into Committee this day six weeks. The House divided: AYES—Hon. Mr. Pope, and Messrs. Fraser, Laird and McNeill—4.

NAYS—13.

The House then went into Committee—Mr. BEATON in the Chair. And the House being resumed.

The hon. SPEAKER said he must make a few remarks; any thing relative to deeds, he considered ought to be looked at with a jealous eye. Mortgages might be effected in England and not known here, and the land sold again, and the purchaser in ignorance of the mortgage existing, and he may lose his purchase. He should be glad to see expenses saved, if danger did not come in.

Mr. HAVILAND reminded the hon. Speaker that if the Mortgages did not register his deeds, then he could not take advantage of the purchase.

Mr. SPEAKER knew the proprietors would not do so. After a short time spent in Committee, the Chairman reported, progress had been made, and he obtained leave to sit again.

Message from the Legislative Council, by C. Desbriay, Esq., informing the House that the Council had passed the following Bills without amendment:—

The Bill to regulate the Sale of Arsenic and other Poisons. The Bill to regulate the Public Advertisements, and also a Bill to incorporate the Discount Society, to which they desire the concurrence of the House.

Hon. Mr. COLES presented a petition from the Rev. Dr. Jenkins, relative to the Bill, and then moved that the Bill be read a first time, which being done, its second reading was ordered for to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. COLES moved that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Private Bills, to report thereon, and it was referred accordingly.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

HOUSE IN COMMITTEE ON MR. HAVILAND'S BILL.—Mr. BEATON in the Chair.

Mr. HAVILAND moved, that the Bill for amending the Law of Evidence be now committed to a Committee of the whole House. At this stage of the Bill, he believed it was his duty to explain to the House, the leading features of the measure he had introduced; and to state the reasons which induced him to bring forward the Act carried through the Imperial Parliament last Session, by that able Law Referee Lord Brougham. The first clause of the proposed Bill, contemplates giving to the Supreme Court, the same power of ordering inspection of Deeds, Books, Documents, &c., as is at present exercised by the Court of Chancery, and which clause, if it should become Law, will prove a great saving of time and unnecessary expense to Sutors. The Bill also proposes, to make Certificate of Registry of British Vessels admissible as *prima facie* evidence of their contents, without proof of the original, and to make it a misdemeanor, to falsify a transcript, to authorize an examination, by which the Bill will prove a great saving of time and unnecessary expense to Sutors. The Bill also proposes, to make Certificate of Registry of British Vessels admissible as *prima facie* evidence of their contents, without proof of the original, and to make it a misdemeanor, to falsify a transcript, to authorize an examination, by which the Bill will prove a great saving of time and unnecessary expense to Sutors.

Class to provide that the Parties and the Persons who be compelled to attend Court, or to be called as witnesses, shall be equally just with respect to the Statute.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN wished to know, whether the honorable and learned member who had brought in the Bill, intended to introduce into it a clause similar to that in the English Statute, of which the Bill was a transcript, to authorize an examination, by Courts, of both plaintiff and defendant, and, if not, what reasons or considerations had induced him to omit it. He (Mr. W.) was of opinion, that its introduction would rather prove conducive than prejudicial, to the ends of justice.

Mr. HAVILAND. He had omitted it because he was afraid, that its adoption might frequently prove too strong a temptation to the crime of perjury.

Mr. PALMER was glad, that the clause had been omitted. It would be better to wait, until the experiment had a fair trial at home; when, should it have been found to be really serviceable, in the eliciting of truth and determining the course of justice, it might easily and safely be adopted here. It was by no means generally admitted to be a good policy; and the Judges differed in opinion with respect to it. In cases of seduction, the propriety of its admissibility seemed to be very questionable; for where parties had proved to a large amount of damages, on the evidence of the plaintiff, the defendant came in, and swore point blank, that he had not been the seducer, and was not the father of the child. Such cases had caused the Judges to differ in opinion as to its policy. They had come to a conclusion to examine both parties on oath as to the facts; but to give credence to the party whose evidence was most strongly corroborated by the evidence of others, and to charge the jury accordingly. Nevertheless, the principle, as he thought, was a very dangerous one, and offered too great a temptation to perjury.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN. The principle had been recognized as a just one in the Small Debts Bill; why should it not be held to be equally just with respect to the Statute?

Hon. Mr. POPE. He understood, when it was admitted into the Small Debts Bill, that its adoption was to be general with respect to all the Courts. What had been stated, by the honorable member for Charlottetown, with respect to the practice of the English Judges, afforded, instead of an argument against the principle, a proof that its admission, when duly regulated, could not tend to the obstruction of justice. In the case of alleged seduction, in which the plaintiff might be a woman of abandoned character, and the defendant, a man whose general reputation was good, it would be perfectly in accordance with the principles of justice for the Court to receive his testimony in his own favor, and for the Judge, in his summing up, to show whether, with reference to previous character, more credit was due to the defendant or to the plaintiff. The credibility of a party, in any such case, would depend upon previous reputation; and the principle, in his opinion, was therefore as admissible and defensible, on the part of the defendant, as it was of the plaintiff. The principle, he thought, was founded in reason, justice, and equity; and it would seldom, if ever, be abused.

Mr. MOONEY disapproved of the provision, as being likely to take out the cream and marrow of the Bill, observing that a tenant stood little chance of contending against his landlord in Court.

Mr. McNEILL was of the same opinion as his hon. colleague, and believed that, in nine cases out of ten, the tenant would be unsuccessful as against the proprietor in Court.

Mr. WIGHTMAN thought, as the arbitrators were to be chosen by each party, that an appeal was unnecessary, and he must say, he could not but think a tenant would not be in a situation to compete with his landlord. For this reason he wished to see the award of the arbitrators made final.

Hon. Mr. POPE approved of the clause. The tenant should be protected by all just means; too much caution could not be used to keep him in possession of his property till he received a just compensation and that was the great aim and object of the Bill. He was of opinion, that reference in case of dispute ought to be allowed, and that the dispute should be subject to the strictest scrutiny. He did not think the observation offered had been in point.

Mr. MOONEY considered he had as good a right to give his opinion as the hon. the Treasurer himself. He was pretty certain, from his knowledge of the matter, the tenants would put up with almost any injustice from their landlords, sooner than run the risk of going to law, where they stood so little chance of success against the power of the landlords.

Mr. HAVILAND did not rise for the purpose of saying which way he intended to vote, but to say he was surprised at the opposition of hon. members. There must be an appeal allowed to the tenant, as well as to the landlord, but if the award was founded in equity, it would not be requisite to apply to the Supreme Court. The hon. member who had just sat down, seemed to insinuate that a tenant could not obtain justice in the Supreme Court. To convince the hon. member how completely erroneous his opinion was, he need only remind him that in the very last Court, out of three cases, two were given in favor of the tenant.

Mr. WIGHTMAN conceived it would be very hard to compel a poor man to go into Court, and would much prefer some other remedy being provided.

Hon. Mr. COLES replied to the fears expressed about the tenants not getting justice in the Supreme Court, that if there had ever been wrong committed there, Responsible Government would prevent it in future. Appeal must be had somewhere, and he saw no other so fitting, as that provided for in the clause under consideration. If the award was made final, then he thought the tenant would stand a much worse chance. He was glad to see so little opposition and some from the proprietors' agents, several of whom were present.

Mr. MONTGOMERY said the clause protected the tenant equally with the landlord. The Bar would protect the tenant interest as much as that of the proprietors; but he appeared some hon. members wished to legislate for the tenant only.

Mr. MOONEY was sorry to say, that the Judges of the Supreme Court or the gentlemen of the Bar were a corrupt class of men. He said so nothing, although some hon. members would wish to make him say so. The fact he had to the Supreme Court was, that the tenant had not the means at his disposal to contend against the landlord.

Mr. LAIRD expressed himself of the same opinion as the hon. member as to the little chance a tenant would have in contending with his landlord.

Hon. Mr. WARBURTON said such a provision as was contained in the clause was necessary. The Court must be appealed to, before the proceedings for the ejectment of a tenant commenced, and the matter would not be taken out of court, till the award of the arbitrators had been determined. There was no fear but that justice would be done to both landlord and tenant.

Hon. Mr. POPE observed, that the idea of the hon. member for the second district of Queen's County relative to a fresh choice of arbitrators was impracticable; for choosing and choosing again might continue, till there should be no end to it. The arbitrators might be chosen by each party, and if they abide by the rule laid down, and did their duty, it was not likely that the court would set its face against their award; it was not so corrupt as that. There must be a tribunal to appeal to, and the Supreme Court was the proper one. He had no doubt but care would be taken that one had no advantage over the other.

Mr. DAVIES was not afraid of leaving the matter to the judgment of the Court. What he dreaded most was that it might be put off from Court to Court, as was too often the case, and such procrastination a poor man would find most inconvenient. Perhaps if second arbitrators were chosen, their award would not be final.

Mr. MOONEY thought that a decision by arbitrators would be binding; it ought to be so at any rate. He did not want to protect the tenant only, or to endeavor to get passed any unjust law to uphold his popularity, but he considered he had as much right as the hon. member for Prince County (Mr. Montgomery) to give his opinion, which he considered as good as his at any time. What he wanted was that the arbitration should be made final.

Mr. MONTGOMERY explained that, what he had before said with the tenant would be protected as much as the landlord, and that he considered the Supreme Court to be the proper place of appeal, particularly as large amounts might have to be decided on.

Mr. HAVILAND must correct the hon. member for the second district of Queen's County, (Mr. Montgomery) as the award of the arbitrators was almost daily occurrence in the old country and very properly. Suppose, said the hon. member, that a witness said, a certain property was worth £300 and the award by the arbitrators under this Bill should be only £50, the hon. member surely would not contend that that was right, and that no appeal ought to be allowed. A remedy must be resorted to, to reconcile disputes, and the Supreme Court must be the most legitimate source.

Mr. THORNTON could not designate the opposition to the clause as anything less than sheer ridiculousness. What could be more fair, than the provision that each party should choose his own arbitrator; that then, in case of dispute, a third should be called in; and that if the award was not satisfactory, a reference should be made. He could not see that any course more proper could be adopted than that laid down in the clause. If hon. members did not approve of the remedy being in the Supreme Court, why did they not come forward with some amendment, some plan to meet their views; but nothing of the kind was proposed. He (Mr. T.) could not think that the opponents were really serious in insisting that the door of the Supreme Court was not open to justice, or that the Bar and Judges could not be confided in.

Hon. Mr. COLES said, the hon. member for the second district of Queen's County seemed very hard to be convinced by the House, that the award of arbitrators in all cases was not binding. Perhaps the law may be provided upon the subject would have more weight with him—he would therefore read him the law which must satisfy him.

Mr. MOONEY replied, that whatever the law might be, he could not but think that, in this case, the arbitration ought to be made final.

Messrs. FRASER, MONTGOMERY, and CLARK, vacated the debate; when, on motion the Chairman reported the Bill agreed to.

On motion the question being about to be put from the chair, that it be engrossed, Mr. MOONEY moved that it be recommitted in order to make the arbitrators' award final. No second being found and the question being put as to its being engrossed, Mr. MOONEY divided the House, when the hon. member stood alone. The Bill was then ordered to be engrossed.

DISCOUNT SOCIETY INCORPORATING BILL.—Mr. FRASER, as Chairman of the Committee on Private Bills, reported in favor of this Bill and recommended the remission of the usual fees.

HOUSE IN COMMITTEE ON THE COMPENSATION TO EJECTED TENANTS BILL.—Mr. BEATON in the Chair.

Hon. Mr. COLES stated, the Bill was the same which was before the House in its last Session, with the exception of a few alterations in the detail, which had been made, in pursuance of the suggestions of some hon. member when the House was in Committee thereon, and in the propriety of which, the House appeared generally to concur. He hoped no opposition would now be made to the measure, for it was one of vital importance to the interest of the tenants; it was intended to afford the tenant a fair protection and encouragement, without which it could scarcely be expected they could, with sufficient spirit and determination, contend against the many difficulties they had to encounter in the clearing and improving of their farms.

The hon. member (Mr. C.) also, as the Bill progressed, explained the nature of each clause, upon none of which was opposition offered, all the clause providing that either landlord or tenant should have the power to appeal to the Supreme Court, in the case of feeling aggrieved by the Award of the Arbitrators, when

IT'S SOUGHT!
PAIN'S PILLS
EVER AND STOMACH, WHEN
WELESS STATE.
William Harvey, of Chapel Hill
the 16th January, 1850.

the means, with God's blessing
that health, and at a time when
the grave. I had consulted several
they could for me, stated that
I ought to say that I had been suf-
ficient of long standing, which de-
clared, that every one considered my
were got a Box of your Pills, which
in their use for some weeks, together
I omitted over my chest and neck
and every body who knows me,
MATTHEW HARVEY.

WEAKNESS AND DEBILITY OF
STANDING.
William Smith, of No. 5, Little
Street, Lambeth, dated Dec. 12,

for nearly 5 years I hardly knew what
from extreme weakness and debility,
paleness and sickness of the
of spirits. I used to think that
been to many medical men, some of
in their power, informed me that they
suffered beyond the reach of cure,
of the stomach and liver, making
my bed for me. One day
I saw a box of your Pills advertised
and I bought a box, and I found myself
better by taking them than
I had ever before, when, I am
cure.

WILLIAM SMITH,
formerly called EDWARDS,
WIGAN YEARS STANDING,
J. K. Heydon, 28 King Street,
14th November, 1849.

form you that many extraordinary cures
by means of your Pills. One is that
"black," who after receiving "Twenty
best medicine, suffering very feebly
and, still, but in now, (to use her
to the top of that mountain. Another
latterly's buildings, Clarendon-street,
was confined entirely to his bed-room,
and was unable to rise, and was in-
frequently told to be in a dying state,
has been restored to perfect health by
your most just and morning into

(Signed) J. K. HEYDON,
LUGH CURED OF A LIVER AND
COMPLAINT.
is Lordship, dated Villa Maestria
16th February, 1845.

prevented the possibility of my thanking
in sending me your Pills as my
of sending you an order for the amount
your Pills have effected a cure of a dis-
which all the most eminent of the Faculty
had not been able to effect; I feel
and I thank you, I wish to have notice
in case any of my family should ever
and oldest Servant.

(Signed) ALIBOROUGH,
Indefinitely efficacious in the following
cases:—

Liver com-plaints	Secondary symptoms
Lumbago	Tic Douloureux
Rheumatism	Ulcers
Retention of urine	General Affections
Scratches or Worms of all kinds	Evil humors
Sore Throats	Weakness, from Stone and Gra- whatever cause
and vel. &c. &c.	

ration Notice.
The Estate of the late John Craig,
is hereby notified to make im-
have claims against the Estate, are
King's Calendar Months.
WILLIAM CRAIG, } Executors.
THUR RAMSAY, }

Kent Street.
Sale as to let, his Dwelling House in
the occupation of Mr. John Copley,
a good front-pear, and 6 other
in or in two parts. On £200 being
paid he on mortgage for four or five
JOHN BREEN.

O LET,
situated on Mile from Charlottetown,
into two new fields and fenced with
the land is in the highest state of
of 12 acre lots to suit occupants.—
G. R. GOODMAN.

erty in Charlottetown.
for Sale his Premises, situated in Grafton
of John McNeill, Esq., School Visitor,
Lot No. 47, third hundred, with two
Stable, Workshop, &c. For further
WILLIAM CUTCLIFF.

at Found.
on the New London Cape, a Boat 13
and part cedar bait. The owner may
and paying expenses.
JOHN ADAMS.

CE REMOVED.
moved his Office from Desbriay's Build-
BUILDINGS, Prince Street, near the
JOSEPH HENSLEY
Attorney-at-Law.

ding Lots.
in Building Lots to suit Purchasers, the
Nos. 16, 17, 18, 19 and 20, in the 2nd
Charlottetown, fronting on Queen Square,
by Street, and Prince Street. For terms,
apply to SAMUEL NATION, Esq., Char-

ING FLUID,
the above useful article for Sale at
Store, Medical Warehouse, Desbriay's
LANSARD, at his Office, Queen Street.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1882.
AFTERNOON SITTING.

Fish Bounties.—The Hon. the Colonial Secretary presented a Petition from Martin Collins, of St. Peter's, fisherman, setting forth: "That in the summer and fall seasons of the past year he prosecuted the Mackerel Fishery on the Northern coast of the Island, having cleared at the Customs for the purpose on or about the 11th July: That his vessel of eighty tons, which was built for the purpose, was launched, on or about the 25th day of April, but being unable to procure the necessary general supplies here, he had proceeded to Boston to procure them; and that though every exertion had been used by him, to expedite his return to the Island, he was not able to accomplish it, until the time was passed, when, according to the Act, he should have commenced his voyage, in order to have a legal right to the bounty: That he had, nevertheless, immediately commenced a fishing voyage, and continued actively engaged therefor for a period of four months: That although he is sensible he is not in a position to say that he has literally complied with the terms of the Act for the Encouragement of the Fisheries, he trusts the House, having a regard to the facts, will consider that he has substantially conformed to the spirit and essence of its provisions, and see fit to extend to him, the benefits contemplated to be conferred on the labour and enterprise of persons, who should engage in the fisheries, after the passing of the said Act."

The statement made in the Petition, is supported by an affidavit of the Petitioner.

The Hon. Mr. Coles presented two Petitions of a similar nature; one from John McLeod, senior, and John McLeod, junior, of New London; accompanied by a certificate of the declaration of the Petitioner, to the effect, that their vessel was fully equipped, manned, and victualled, and that they had prosecuted their voyage without deviation by freighting, and that they had caught on the said voyage, about one hundred quintals of Codfish, and two barrels of Mackerel; a second from Donald Morrison, of New London, merchant, setting forth, that on the eighth day of July last, the Petitioner fitted out a vessel expressly for the Cod and Mackerel fisheries, agreeably to Collector McNutt's fishing pass hereto attached: That he remained on the fishing ground till the twenty-first day of October, when he came into port and entered the cargo of fish, consisting in part of 125½ barrels of mackerel, which were cleared for Halifax, with 10 quintals of Codfish, according to the Naval Officer's certificate attached: That his vessel would have been on the fishing ground on the date prescribed by the Statute, but salt, barrels, &c., could not be obtained in New London, and had to be procured from Halifax, which occasioned the delay: That he is of opinion that he had complied with the essentials and spirit of the Act, but, although his vessel was on the fishing ground for three and a half months, as they were not identical with the provisions of the Act, the Governor in Council declined granting a warrant for the amount of Bounty to which he considers himself entitled. His remarks, it would be observed, were directed only against the claim for tonnage bounty: the requisite quantity of fish having been caught by him, the Petitioner (Mr. Morrison) was entitled to the Bounty.

Mr. MOSEY. He would oppose the Petition, on the ground, that having made a law, they were bound to carry it out. There were many petitions of the same kind; but the House could not entertain them without setting aside the law. It had, heretofore, been the practice for parties to apply to the House for grants; and, if they had a friend or two in it, they would drum up recruits, and carry the day. Was that fair legislation? It was not. When they passed a law, he would wish it to be carried out. It was his duty, as a representative of the people, to know no man who petitioned the House, unless his application was founded in justice.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary having moved for the appointment of a Committee to whom should be referred all such Petitions, that they might report thereon to the House, a short discussion ensued, touching the propriety of the House's entertaining any Petitions of the kind.

Hon. Mr. POPE was decidedly of opinion, that it would be best to shut the door at once against the admission of any such Petitions. The Government, said the hon. member, had spared no pains to acquire fully into the nature of the claims for bounty which had been preferred to them, and they had allowed it in every case in which it seemed to be fairly due. They had no desire to repudiate fair claims. But, for himself, he would protest against the reception of such Petitions, as those which had just been read. Unless they meant to set aside the law altogether, he would not consent to entertain Petitions for bounty, when the Petitioners themselves declared they had not complied with the provisions of the Law, as to be legally entitled to what they petitioned for. He sincerely wished well to the fisheries, and was willing to go all reasonable and just lengths for their encouragement; but when the Legislature had just passed a Law, in which rules were laid down for the guidance of those who embarked in them, with a view to obtaining the bounty provided by that Law, it was imperative, not only upon the Government, but the House, to grant no bounties, save to those who had complied with the rules so laid down. If those who had not complied with these rules, were to have the bounty awarded to them, it would create much dissatisfaction amongst those who had complied only through their observance of the Law. The bounty ought to be allowed only in such cases as it could be awarded by a fair interpretation of the law. The amount of bounty already given was nearly equal to the value of all the fish that had been taken; and, where hundreds had been required, on account of the last season, thousands would be required for the next. But should such Petitions as those which had just been presented, be entertained, they might, next year, expect to have presented so large a number of similar ones, that they were even to direct the Public Treasury should be thrown open to the Petitioners without reserve, it would be insufficient to satisfy them. With respect to Collins, the hon. member observed, that although, according to his own showing, he had no claim to the tonnage bounty, and ought not to receive it; his title to the premium on his catch had been allowed.

The object of the House, in passing the Bill, had been the promotion of the general good, by the encouragement of our fisheries; but that object would be lost sight of, should they allow bounties to persons to any who were not legally entitled to them, by having complied with all the provisions of the Act. The bounties came out of the pockets of the farmers; and they could receive nothing in return, unless the fisheries should be both extensively and successfully prosecuted; and, to that end, they who purposed to engage in them should be made positively to understand that their claim to the bounty, and chance of success in the business, would depend altogether upon their entering upon it, and faithfully prosecuting it according to the law.

Mr. LATER. If such Petitions were to meet with the favorable consideration of the House, they might as well say at once that all who applied for the bounty should receive it.

Mr. PALMER. They had passed a law for the encouragement of the Fisheries, and that law clearly pointed out, to all who wished to entitle themselves to the bounty provided by it, when they were to commence their fishing voyage, how they were to be provided for it, and how long they were to prosecute it. Was that law to be observed, or was it not? If it was, it was surely very improper that either the Government or individuals should be allowed to prefer Petitions, to that House, for the allowance of the bounty to those who had failed to entitle themselves to it by a compliance with the law.

Hon. Mr. WARBURTON replied to the observations of the hon. and learned member of Charlottetown, that hon. members frequently felt it to be their duty to present Petitions, although they were not prepared to support the prayers of them. It was his opinion, with respect to Petitions for the tonnage bounty as he expected would come before the House, that some of the Petitioners, even although they had not been able to comply with the strict letter of the law, were yet fairly entitled to the bounty, whilst others of them had no such claim whatever to it. And the best way of dealing with them all, he thought, would be to refer them to the consideration of a Committee, to be reported upon according to their different merits. It would surely be a better way than for the House to waste their time in a discussion concerning the merits of every such case, not only in support of Collins's Petition, but also in favor of all who had fitted out vessels, as prescribed by the Act, with the bona fide intention of prosecuting the fisheries, and who they gave for no good gain, &c., in '77, '78, '79. The grant proposed was far from being sufficient; there were considerable sums due on account of contracts performed on Wharfs and Bridges; and nothing but statute labour had been expended on the roads last year.

Mr. PALMER. He had expected, that now Responsible Government was established, the members of our local Administration would, in all their proceedings, copy the practice of Great Britain; for the country had long been assured, that that would be the case, when our Responsible System should be conceded to the Colony. He therefore, expected that at the opening of the Committee of Supply, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have stood up in his place, and have stated, what amount of Revenue was required for the contemplated expenditure of the year, and what amount of taxes would have to be raised to meet the necessities of the year. Before the relief of Responsibility commenced, the "Liberals" could never raise the Road Service vote high enough for their liking; their cry was then, "Oh, it's not enough—it's the People's money, and the only way they get any benefit by it, let it be increased,"—such was their cry, when the country was deeply in debt, and the Revenue falling off—and financial prospects bad; but now, liberality and Liberalism seemed to be quite different in their signification. Should no larger amount be granted, than that proposed by the Resolution, the cry throughout the country would be, that it was not enough. The money granted for the Road Service, was for the return of the people out of the taxes paid by them; and the amount in the Resolution under present prospects as painted by the Liberals, should be doubled. Even when the revenue was small, a very liberal grant was always made for the Road Service; and now when they were told by very credible authorities, that the Revenue was falling off, and its credit good, and its resources increasing, were the people to be put off with the paltry sum of £3700 for Roads and Bridges? It was not enough, and the people would not be satisfied with it. It was known too, and admitted by all, that the Statute Labour System did not work well; that there were more Road Commissioners than formerly; that there was no improvement in the working of the system; the labour was, every where, more or less slighted or evaded. The people, themselves, saw that it would be much better, and operate more equally and justly, even should the Legislature would not be deterred to confer that it would be much better to provide for the whole of that Service out of the general Revenue, than partly by grants and partly by labour, as at present, even if to meet it, they should be obliged to increase the ad valorem tax. The poor man, were this the case, would pay no more than the rich man; and the rich man would pay no more than his limited expenditure, for the dutiable articles consumed by him; and the rich man who might consume to the amount of £100 or £500 a year, of such articles, would be compelled to contribute in proportion to the amount of his consumption. So long, however, as the House would not feel disposed to adopt that system, the only course left them to approach towards it would be, to grant a large sum out of the revenue, whether on the increase or not. But, until it should be demonstrated to the Committee, by some calculation from Government members, what the revenue and what the expenditure of the year would be, and that a large sum could not be granted, he would vote for an increase; and if the country was really as flourishing as they were told it was, a sum, very much larger than that proposed, might surely be allowed.

Mr. WARBURTON. He disagreed altogether with what he had fallen from the hon. member for Charlottetown, who seemed to desire that a large amount should be annually granted and expended upon the roads, whether required for the repairs of them or not. In urging the Committee to agree to a larger grant, the honorable and learned member appeared to have forgotten, what would be required for the payment of the Fish Bounties. A very large sum would be required to pay the tonnage bounty—perhaps ten thousands. The sum proposed to be granted for roads and bridges, was quite sufficient, and quite as much as, with a due regard to economy, the Government could propose, or the House agree to give.

Hon. Mr. POPE. The Government could very well afford to bear the taunts and jeers of the honorable member for Charlottetown, if he would not consume any dutiable articles, but he would laugh at him, when he had done. The present Government, in the space of two years, which had elapsed since the General Election, had done more for the country, than any Government that had ever preceded it. They had reduced the Colonial Debt to £11,000, and they had effected a saving equivalent to the whole amount of the Colonial Debt, and an amount of the Revenue being available. The honorable member for Charlottetown seemed to think, because the Government had proposed a tax for the support of schools, the country had a right to expect, that a large amount should be granted for the Road Service. But all knew, that if money was to be spent, it must be raised in some way, and the Government were in the habit of economy, and if they did so, and persevered in so doing, they would soon pay off the balance of the Colonial Debt, and establish the credit of the Colony on a firmer basis, than it had ever yet heretofore stood. But should the House choose to pursue an opposite course, the Government could not prevent their doing so. The Government had done their duty by proposing the least sum, and the least money to be raised with the House. But he maintained, that under the present system of management, more could be done with £2,500 than with twice the sum formerly. When Treasury Warrants were presented, it was now no longer, "Call again to-morrow." The holders of such Warrants were no longer obliged to submit to various delays, and to take half their amount in goods. Now, as no one could be sure, when they were there, that their warrants were cashed as soon as they were presented. Much general good was effected by this system; contracts were taken on lower terms, and the outlay was greatly diminished. He was sorry to hear one of the honorable members for Prince-town, (Mr. Clark) say the sum proposed was not enough; but his wanting £100 or £150 for the building of a Wharf, might be sufficient to answer for his doing so. The honorable and learned member for Charlottetown had told them, that in the British Parliament it was the practice of the Government, first to propose the taxes and then to propose the expenditure; he, (Mr. Pope) however, thought the reverse was the practice, that the Government should, what would be the nature and probable extent of the expenditure, and then developed their scheme of taxation. An increase of expenditure could only be sustained by increased taxation; and nine-tenths of the people were opposed to any increase in the taxation of land. To propose an increase of the appropriation for roads and bridges, on the plea, that the money would go into the pockets of the people, was to propose an increase of the expenditure under a false pretence; for it was very well known that, of the money so expended, very little found its way, at any time, into the pockets of the people: the individuals who directly benefited were country dealers, and, in most cases, the people who did the work were ill rewarded for their time and labour. The Government had nothing to fear from the people, through any dissatisfaction which might arise amongst them, on account of a limited grant for the road service; but, on the contrary, their desire to economize would be their best recommendation to the people. If the Government seriously set about the introduction of economy in the public expenditure, and steadily pursued it, they will be upheld by the people. It ought to be remembered, that the increase of the revenue last year was only £150, and that the amount which would be required this year to meet the claims of the Fish Bounties, might very probably be set down as high as £9,000; although, as there were no data for calculation, that would be mere conjecture. £7,000, besides, would be required in aid of the education scheme; and it was quite clear, that if the House should consent to increase the appropriation for roads and bridges, they would be entering upon a course, the direct tendency of which would be to plunge the Colony back into the financial difficulties from which it was just emerging.

Hon. Mr. WARBURTON. He did not think the sum proposed was quite sufficient. He was most friendly to economy; £2000 per annum the sum proposed by the resolution. He would be glad to vote £4,000 or £5,000, if the revenue could afford it. He could not, however, shut his eyes against the necessity of economy, when he considered the large demands which would be made upon the public Treasury.

Hon. Mr. COLES. It was the first time he had ever found the minority in favour of a larger sum than that proposed by the majority; and he fancied it would be accounted a very strange occurrence in the British House of Commons, should the minority propose to increase the amount of expenditure contemplated by the Government. Should an increase of the expenditure, in accordance with the demands of the minority, create dissatisfaction among the people, he did not suppose the majority would be very ready to bear the blame. It would not, for one, however, object to an additional £2000, if it could be fairly shown, that it was required by the country. Such

fishermen who understood his business, observed Mr. Davies, and he had come to Boston to fit out in the same way as the American fishermen, and the success which had attended his prosecution of the voyage, was a proof that all this was wanted to secure the prosperity of our fisheries was that they should be prosecuted in suitable vessels, properly fitted out, by men acquainted with the business. Mr. Thornton observed that the bounty of a few shillings per ton was as a matter of mere moonshine compared with the benefit conferred upon the country by the prosecution of the fisheries. The law was a new one, and, for the first year, they ought not to be too rigorous in the interpretation of it. It had not been promulgated in sufficient time to afford all a fair chance of complying with the very letter of it. They had not always adhered to the literal interpretation of such laws, as witnesses that for the encouragement of the seal fishery, as also that to encourage the export trade in Codfish to the West Indies; and it would be unwise and unjust to do so now, if they really wished to encourage the fisheries, as they all professed they did.

Mr. CLARK believed that very strong and well equipped vessels, with those who had taken freight, under present circumstances, were properly equipped and manned, who had actually cleared out before the Officers had received their instructions under the new law, and who had prosecuted their fishing voyages for the time prescribed, were, in his opinion entitled to favorable consideration. But the case was different with those who had taken freight, and continued fishing during the prescribed time, and continued fishing until a fortnight or a month after the appointed day. By such delay, the island was a loser, as respected the quantity of fish taken by them, which could not be so great as if they had commenced at the appointed time, and continued fishing during the prescribed time. If the bounty should now be granted to such parties as had not commenced fishing until a month after the appointed time, the number of such irregular claimants would be greatly increased next year. They must convince them that to succeed they must be out in time. The Act has been passed for three years, and they who were not prepared to time last year, and who have consequently missed the bounty, will most likely take care to secure it by timely preparation and action in each of the next two years. He would not object to the appointment of a Committee by whose consideration of the Petitions and their report concerning them, the House might be informed which were, and which were not, entitled to their favorable consideration.

Mr. McNutt, in regard to the Bill for the Encouragement of the Cod and Mackerel Fisheries was before the House last year, he opposed it, because he thought the bounty policy a bad one. The Bill, however, passed into a Law; and, that being the case, parties, both within and out of that House, should be governed by it, but to entertain Petitions for the tonnage bounty, from individuals who were not legally entitled to it, would be for the House itself to set aside the law.

Mr. FRASER would not object to the appointment of a Committee, but he would object to the prayer of Collins's Petition, because his not having commenced his fishing voyage at the appointed time, was owing to his having gone a trading; and he would oppose the allowance of the bounty to any who applied for it under similar circumstances. Mr. Yeo said, if they were to entertain the Petitions of such parties as had not commenced their voyages until a fortnight, three weeks, or a month after the time appointed, it might appear that they were in some measure pursuing an example set forth in the Scriptures, by admitting parties at the altar, and, consequently, might did not seem to him a right way of doing business.

The question was then put on the Hon. Mr. Warburton's motion, and the same having been agreed to,—Hon. Mr. Warburton, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Montgomery, Hon. Mr. Jardine, and Mr. Beaton were appointed a Committee accordingly.

The Bill for the Incorporation of the Sons of Temperance was read a second time, committed, and reported agreed to.

AFTERNOON SITTING.
HOUSE IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.
ROAD SERVICE.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN submitted the following Resolution, and in doing so, he observed, that there was still due on Notes of Hand, given to Road Commissioners for seed grain, &c., in the years '47, '48, and '49 a very large sum, amounting he believed, to £3000 or £4000; for the recovery of which, there appeared to be no means but the acceptance of work on roads and bridges, by which amount, or at least, by so much of it as could be made available, it was proposed the specified grant for the road-service, should be increased.

Resolved, That the sum of Two thousand Five hundred pounds be granted for the Service of the Roads and Wharfs for the present year, in addition to the amount already granted, and in accordance with the several Promissory Notes due to the Government by destitute settlers for seed grain, &c.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN. He presumed, the honorable member who had submitted the Resolution, contemplated an additional grant of £100 for Charlottetown Royalty. He was truly surprised at the best plan would be to give to each Commissioner, not one settled Note of Hand, given by individuals in his district or neighborhood, with instructions to take work in payment of them on liberal terms. There was, he believed, an inclination on the part of the people to pay; but it was utterly impossible, as respected sufficient money to pay the Notes of Hand, either by the Government, or by the Commissioners; the hon. member would be allowed to give work in payment as he proposed, the principal part of the amount due, would, he thought, be recovered. It might, by some, be objected to his proposal, that any work so taken in payment, would be very small, and that the money would never be recovered; but he would not be deterred by such objections, as he was formerly remunerated by a commission of 5 per cent. on the amount expended, but were properly paid for their services. Formerly on a contract, say of £20, which required a week for its completion, the Commissioner would receive, on an average, about £1000 a year—his work was done, and he spent nearly a whole week in superintending the work. The effect of the new system would be, to secure a faithful performance of labour and contracts. He would propose, that the whole amount of the grant for the Road Service, should be £3750, over and above all that might be recovered on the Notes of Hand.

Mr. WRIGHTMAN. The sum proposed by the Resolution, was entirely too little. Much more was required for the internal improvements of the country. As to looking for the realization of any thing of consequence on the Notes of Hand, either in the shape of Money or Labour, without litigation; the Hon. Mr. Coles, must know as well as himself, that it would be useless. At the best, in any way, the Notes of Hand would be found to be next to valueless. The grant for the Road Service ought to be £4000 at the least.

Hon. Mr. POPE maintained, that the roads generally were in very good order, and that the House could, with propriety, economize with respect to that service. The ordinary grant—on an average about £2600 a year—was, he was persuaded, he found quite sufficient to meet the wants of the country. He was not, however, believed, got ahead, that the amount due on the Notes of Hand, he was of opinion, a very considerable sum would be recovered. The whole amount due, he thought, might be about £4000 or £5000; and if the same were looked over, it would be found, that many could be paid.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN. The amount proposed was a very liberal one—£2800 in cash, besides what could be recovered on the Notes of Hand. Should the amount recovered on the Notes of Hand amount only to £1000—a fourth or fifth of the amount due—they would have £2500. Under all circumstances, the proposed sum was as liberal as any honorable member could reasonably desire.

Mr. DOUSE. The Notes of Hand were worth nothing—not worth the trouble of looking after. And did not that speak volumes? What could more absurd than to propose an additional grant, when on all hands, it was admitted, that the poverty of the people generally was so great, that it would be the extreme of folly to look to them for the payment of the Notes of Hand which they gave for no good gain, &c., in '77, '78, '79. The grant proposed was far from being sufficient; there were considerable sums due on account of contracts performed on Wharfs and Bridges; and nothing but statute labour had been expended on the roads last year.

Mr. PALMER. He had expected, that now Responsible Government was established, the members of our local Administration would, in all their proceedings, copy the practice of Great Britain; for the country had long been assured, that that would be the case, when our Responsible System should be conceded to the Colony. He therefore, expected that at the opening of the Committee of Supply, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have stood up in his place, and have stated, what amount of Revenue was required for the contemplated expenditure of the year, and what amount of taxes would have to be raised to meet the necessities of the year. Before the relief of Responsibility commenced, the "Liberals" could never raise the Road Service vote high enough for their liking; their cry was then, "Oh, it's not enough—it's the People's money, and the only way they get any benefit by it, let it be increased,"—such was their cry, when the country was deeply in debt, and the Revenue falling off—and financial prospects bad; but now, liberality and Liberalism seemed to be quite different in their signification. Should no larger amount be granted, than that proposed by the Resolution, the cry throughout the country would be, that it was not enough. The money granted for the Road Service, was for the return of the people out of the taxes paid by them; and the amount in the Resolution under present prospects as painted by the Liberals, should be doubled. Even when the revenue was small, a very liberal grant was always made for the Road Service; and now when they were told by very credible authorities, that the Revenue was falling off, and its credit good, and its resources increasing, were the people to be put off with the paltry sum of £3700 for Roads and Bridges? It was not enough, and the people would not be satisfied with it. It was known too, and admitted by all, that the Statute Labour System did not work well; that there were more Road Commissioners than formerly; that there was no improvement in the working of the system; the labour was, every where, more or less slighted or evaded. The people, themselves, saw that it would be much better, and operate more equally and justly, even should the Legislature would not be deterred to confer that it would be much better to provide for the whole of that Service out of the general Revenue, than partly by grants and partly by labour, as at present, even if to meet it, they should be obliged to increase the ad valorem tax. The poor man, were this the case, would pay no more than the rich man; and the rich man would pay no more than his limited expenditure, for the dutiable articles consumed by him; and the rich man who might consume to the amount of £100 or £500 a year, of such articles, would be compelled to contribute in proportion to the amount of his consumption. So long, however, as the House would not feel disposed to adopt that system, the only course left them to approach towards it would be, to grant a large sum out of the revenue, whether on the increase or not. But, until it should be demonstrated to the Committee, by some calculation from Government members, what the revenue and what the expenditure of the year would be, and that a large sum could not be granted, he would vote for an increase; and if the country was really as flourishing as they were told it was, a sum, very much larger than that proposed, might surely be allowed.

Mr. WARBURTON. He disagreed altogether with what he had fallen from the hon. member for Charlottetown, who seemed to desire that a large amount should be annually granted and expended upon the roads, whether required for the repairs of them or not. In urging the Committee to agree to a larger grant, the honorable and learned member appeared to have forgotten, what would be required for the payment of the Fish Bounties. A very large sum would be required to pay the tonnage bounty—perhaps ten thousands. The sum proposed to be granted for roads and bridges, was quite sufficient, and quite as much as, with a due regard to economy, the Government could propose, or the House agree to give.

Hon. Mr. POPE. The Government could very well afford to bear the taunts and jeers of the honorable member for Charlottetown, if he would not consume any dutiable articles, but he would laugh at him, when he had done. The present Government, in the space of two years, which had elapsed since the General Election, had done more for the country, than any Government that had ever preceded it. They had reduced the Colonial Debt to £11,000, and they had effected a saving equivalent to the whole amount of the Colonial Debt, and an amount of the Revenue being available. The honorable member for Charlottetown seemed to think, because the Government had proposed a tax for the support of schools, the country had a right to expect, that a large amount should be granted for the Road Service. But all knew, that if money was to be spent, it must be raised in some way, and the Government were in the habit of economy, and if they did so, and persevered in so doing, they would soon pay off the balance of the Colonial Debt, and establish the credit of the Colony on a firmer basis, than it had ever yet heretofore stood. But should the House choose to pursue an opposite course, the Government could not prevent their doing so. The Government had done their duty by proposing the least sum, and the least money to be raised with the House. But he maintained, that under the present system of management, more could be done with £2,500 than with twice the sum formerly. When Treasury Warrants were presented, it was now no longer, "Call again to-morrow." The holders of such Warrants were no longer obliged to submit to various delays, and to take half their amount in goods. Now, as no one could be sure, when they were there, that their warrants were cashed as soon as they were presented. Much general good was effected by this system; contracts were taken on lower terms, and the outlay was greatly diminished. He was sorry to hear one of the honorable members for Prince-town, (Mr. Clark) say the sum proposed was not enough; but his wanting £100 or £150 for the building of a Wharf, might be sufficient to answer for his doing so. The honorable and learned member for Charlottetown had told them, that in the British Parliament it was the practice of the Government, first to propose the taxes and then to propose the expenditure; he, (Mr. Pope) however, thought the reverse was the practice, that the Government should, what would be the nature and probable extent of the expenditure, and then developed their scheme of taxation. An increase of expenditure could only be sustained by increased taxation; and nine-tenths of the people were opposed to any increase in the taxation of land. To propose an increase of the appropriation for roads and bridges, on the plea, that the money would go into the pockets of the people, was to propose an increase of the expenditure under a false pretence; for it was very well known that, of the money so expended, very little found its way, at any time, into the pockets of the people: the individuals who directly benefited were country dealers, and, in most cases, the people who did the work were ill rewarded for their time and labour. The Government had nothing to fear from the people, through any dissatisfaction which might arise amongst them, on account of a limited grant for the road service; but, on the contrary, their desire to economize would be their best recommendation to the people. If the Government seriously set about the introduction of economy in the public expenditure, and steadily pursued it, they will be upheld by the people. It ought to be remembered, that the increase of the revenue last year was only £150, and that the amount which would be required this year to meet the claims of the Fish Bounties, might very probably be set down as high as £9,000; although, as there were no data for calculation, that would be mere conjecture. £7,000, besides, would be required in aid of the education scheme; and it was quite clear, that if the House should consent to increase the appropriation for roads and bridges, they would be entering upon a course, the direct tendency of which would be to plunge the Colony back into the financial difficulties from which it was just emerging.

Hon. Mr. WARBURTON. He did not think the sum proposed was quite sufficient. He was most friendly to economy; £2000 per annum the sum proposed by the resolution. He would be glad to vote £4,000 or £5,000, if the revenue could afford it. He could not, however, shut his eyes against the necessity of economy, when he considered the large demands which would be made upon the public Treasury.

Hon. Mr. COLES. It was the first time he had ever found the minority in favour of a larger sum than that proposed by the majority; and he fancied it would be accounted a very strange occurrence in the British House of Commons, should the minority propose to increase the amount of expenditure contemplated by the Government. Should an increase of the expenditure, in accordance with the demands of the minority, create dissatisfaction among the people, he did not suppose the majority would be very ready to bear the blame. It would not, for one, however, object to an additional £2000, if it could be fairly shown, that it was required by the country. Such

was the good state of the roads, however, last year, that the Commissioners were greatly puzzled to know how to expend the money and labour at their disposal, upon them. In order to find work, they had caused men needlessly to break up the roads and turn up soil to throw upon them, and the consequence was, that they left the roads worse than they found them. In the winter months of Charlotte, it is true, that the roads were bad; but in the country districts they were good. It was quite a mistake to suppose, that they were bad in consequence of an appropriation having been made for their repairs in 1850. The rains which fell had washed off all loose materials which had lain upon their surface, and they were left firm and good. All that was required was the filling up of a few pot-holes here and there. It was his opinion, that there was no work, rather than too little, labour expended on our roads: little more was required, in general, than to fill up pot-holes. The making roads and bridges might benefit a few contractors; but he could not be persuaded, that it would be right to increase the amount of taxation upon the people, either by an increase of the ad valorem duty or otherwise, for their benefit. The House must be aware, that to promote the success of the education scheme, £2,000 would have to be taken out of the general revenue; and in all likelihood, £9,000 more would be required to meet the demands for Fish Bounties.

Mr. CLARK was persuaded that as much money would be required this year for the road service, as had ever been required in any previous year. It was well known that the road money was the only public money that went among the people, and the only way in which they received any direct benefit from the taxes. £3,000 at least, would be required this year, and he would move, that that would be the amount inserted in the resolution before the Committee.

Mr. HAVILLAND seconded the motion.

Mr. DOUSE, in allusion to the state of the wharfs and bridges at Charlottetown, observed, that so much money as was now needed to put them into a proper state of repair, would not have been required, had a proper grant been made in time. He should like to ask, with what face honorable members expected to be able to meet their constituents, unless they agreed to make a sufficient appropriation for roads and bridges. He, for one, would insist that a much larger amount than that proposed, was required for the road service. He should not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Hon. Mr. COLES. If the hon. member for Belfast would only consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. HAVILLAND. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Mr. DOUSE. He would not consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Dunsany, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads; but he would not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

was the good state of the roads, however, last year, that the Commissioners were greatly puzzled to know how to expend the money and labour at their disposal, upon them. In order to find work, they had caused men needlessly to break up the roads and turn up soil to throw upon them, and the consequence was, that they left the roads worse than they found them. In the winter months of Charlotte, it is true, that the roads were bad; but in the country districts they were good. It was quite a mistake to suppose, that they were bad in consequence of an appropriation having been made for their repairs in 1850. The rains which fell had washed off all loose materials which had lain upon their surface, and they were left firm

Doctr.

(Great Year Acadia Record.)

WANTS.

The first hundred years of our nation...

To be in want is hard for to endure...

It matters not how poor or rich you be...

Deductions.

UNITED STATES.

BOSTON, January 16.

New Brunswick, Ararat, from St. Louis...

The Great Storm of 1703. The most violent storm...

The Edgystone Light-house, near Plymouth...

The Rev. Dr. Duncanson. "I have a man...

The London City of London. "A forcible article...

Nevada Conveyance to Bonanza. According to the...

The Wreck of Fortin. General Carrington is now a...

The Wreck of Fortin. General Carrington is now a...

The Wreck of Fortin. General Carrington is now a...

The Wreck of Fortin. General Carrington is now a...

The Wreck of Fortin. General Carrington is now a...

The Wreck of Fortin. General Carrington is now a...

The Wreck of Fortin. General Carrington is now a...

WINTER ARRANGEMENTS OF MAILS. The winter...

General Post Office. The mails from New Spain...

NOTARY PUBLIC, CONVEYANCER. R. B. IRVING...

RECENT IMPORTATIONS. Sugar, Molasses, Flour, &c.

A LARGE ASSORTMENT OF EARTHENWARE AND CHINA.

WILLIAM R. WATSON. BROS responsible to announce...

Tea, Tobacco, Apples, &c. The above is a list...

READY MADE CLOTHES AND CLOTHS. JUST received...

200 BOLS OF CAVANNA. In all numbers...

NEW GOODS! NEW GOODS!! Extensive Importation...

QUEEN SEED. NEAR THE QUEEN'S WHARF. H. B. DECHMAN...

OLD IRON, JUNK, &c. THE above is a list...

WILLIAM STRAIGHT, Healer. THE above is a list...

C & J BELL. FASHIONABLE TAILORS. GENTS' FURNISHING...

Sheriff's Sale. BY virtue of a writ...

JOSEPH WIGHTMAN, Sheriff. THE above is a list...

HERE IS YOUR REMEDY! A MOST MIRACULOUS CURE OF RAB LEGS...



Extract of a Letter from Mr. William Galt...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Extract of a Letter from Mr. Wm. W. P. England...

Legislative HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. MORNING.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES. MORNING.