

The large sums of money expended and demanded by the Commissioner of the East Point District, to keep the Roads and Bridges in repair, show a want of economy, if not a misapplication of the public money, and it is difficult to find out from the report where grants of money are most required, and although the above appropriation exceeds the grant, it is far short of the Commissioner's report, and, therefore, should be applied with frugality, according to the scale of appropriation.

DISTRICT No. 6.

Table listing various road and bridge projects for District No. 6, including items like 'Road from Red House to Grand River Wharf' and 'To repair Grand River Bridge'.

DISTRICT No. 7.

Table listing various road and bridge projects for District No. 7, including items like 'The Road leading from the Head of Cardigan River towards St. Peter's Bay'.

DISTRICT No. 8.

Table listing various road and bridge projects for District No. 8, including items like 'To repair Bridge at 18 Mile Brook' and 'Main Post Road, from County Line to the boundary of the 11th District'.

SPECIAL GRANTS.

Table listing special grants for various projects, including 'To pay balance of contract on south side of Brudenel River Wharf'.

DISTRICT No. 9.

Table listing various road and bridge projects for District No. 9, including items like 'To alter the north end of the Wood Island Road' and 'Shore Road from Aitkin's to St. Andrew's Point'.

DISTRICT No. 10.

Table listing various road and bridge projects for District No. 10, including items like 'Towards a new Bridge across the Murray River' and 'South River Bridge'.

DISTRICT No. 11.

Table listing various road and bridge projects for District No. 11, including items like 'Ferry Wharf, in Royalty, south side of Cardigan River' and 'New Wharf south side Cardigan River'.

Colonial Legislature.

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS.

TUESDAY, March 20.

House in committee on the Act relating to the opening of Highways. Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN explained the object of the Bill, which was the provision of a summary method of settling the amount of compensation for land taken for a public highway, by arbitration; and if the occupier of land refused to allow the road to be opened, after tender of the appraised value of the land, he was liable to a fine of ten pounds.

let them take the consequences of such refusal; proceedings have been instituted against them, which are still pending, and now this Bill says they must take the compensation they previously refused.

Hon. Mr. LORD.—According to the hon. member (Mr. Longworth), a defective law can never be remedied. Hon. COL. SECRETARY said a short clause would obviate the objections. The word "proceedings" in the Bill was intended to apply to action taken previously to an appeal to law, and consequently did not embrace legal proceedings.

Hon. Mr. PALMER did not see that the additional clause was required. If the Bill were drawn on the principles on which all legislation should be based, this discussion would have been unnecessary. It is quite right to pass a Bill for cases of future compensation, but when compensation has been already awarded, a measure of this nature is not necessary, and should not apply.

On the clause providing that the tenant receive a reduction in his rent proportionate to the value of the land taken for a public road—Hon. Col. Treasurer explained that under the Tenant Compensation Bill, the tenant received compensation only for improvements, not for land which might be taken for roads, and for which land he was liable to pay rent. He mentioned an instance of a tenant who offered the land for a road, if the proprietor would reduce the rent pro rata.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—The proprietors, by the original grants, were bound to give up land which might be required for roads, and it is but just that the tenant should be protected from paying rent for land taken for public roads. The production of a certificate from the commissioner should entitle the tenant to the benefit of a proportionate reduction.

Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN.—In cases where the proprietors hold extensive tracts of land, it is their duty to give roads. The original grants contain a reservation for public highways, and the proprietors would only be consulting their own interests by reserving roads, as those roads would materially enhance the value of their properties.

Hon. Mr. MOORE.—If such be the case, the House are but wasting time in useless talk. There is no use legislating on the subject unless we can compel the proprietors to yield. Tenants now have to pay rent for land already taken from them for roads, and in the original grants, the proprietors were bound to reserve lands for roads, if required for the public benefit.

Hon. Mr. LORD would support the clause. He had often thought the clause upon the statute book a hardship upon tenants, inasmuch as it compelled them to suffer roads to be opened through their land, for which they would have to pay rent. In consequence of the opening of such roads, the tenants have to incur great expense in fencing, etc., and if there is no provision for reduction from the rent, there should be.

Hon. Mr. PALMER.—If the original grants reserved to the Crown land for roads, such reservation meant only roads necessary for the public. It could not be construed to mean roads to any extent, without end or limitation. He considered that the House had no right to take the land for which the tenant had agreed to pay rent to the landlord.

The Bill was agreed to with amendments. A memorial of the Royal Agricultural Society, recommending a tax on dogs running at large in Charlottetown and Royalty, was referred to Hon. Mr. Palmer, Hon. Mr. Longworth, and Mr. Haviland, as a committee to report by Bill or otherwise.

considered by some as having an interest in advocating the erection on King's Square, but he had not; he would prefer that the Square be kept clear. However, the subscription list accompanying the petition was very large; it would save nearly £1,000; and he understood that the expense of constructing cellarage—necessary if the building was put up on Queen's Square—would not be required on King's. It was, however, for the House to decide the site. If it was intended to ornament Queen's Square, it should be kept clear.

Hon. Mr. LORD thought the site on Queen's Square was decided by the committee last year. He had no personal interest in any particular situation. It would not affect his business to the amount of forty shillings a year, but it would make a great difference with those who had to bring their produce to Town across the ferries. They would have to pay perhaps two shillings a load for cartage from the wharf to King's Square.

Mr. HAVILAND said the removal would not injure his business. He would not sanction a market house on any of the Squares. Better to purchase a site. But he agreed that Mr. Lord's question—"where is the money to come from?"—was very important.

Hon. Mr. PALMER agreed with Mr. Haviland, that the Squares should not be encumbered, but no Act was necessary; an Act would be necessary to authorise the occupation, and he hoped such Act would never be sanctioned. If it were, members would incur the reproach of posterity for their short-sighted policy.

Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN would never consent to vote public money for the purchase of a site. The most that should be granted by the House was a vote in aid of the building. He thought that there was sufficient room where the present market house stands. He was opposed to removing it to King's Square.

Hon. Mr. MOORE had always seen the market in the centre of a town. He had no idea of his constituents having to pay for carting their produce to Town. There was land enough without purchasing a site. As to the doctrine of the member for Charlottetown (Mr. Palmer), that the land could not be used as a public market, he would ask why a public market could not be built on public property?

Hon. COL. SECRETARY advocated the propriety of keeping the Squares as clear of encumbrance as possible. He was inclined to agree with the hon. member for Charlottetown (Hon. Mr. Palmer), that if either of the Squares were appropriated to a market, Hillsborough should be selected, as being nearer than the others to the water. As to the petitioners being interested, all those who accompanied their petitions for public improvements, with lists of subscriptions in aid, were interested in the private and individual benefits expected to result.

Hon. COL. TREASURER.—There were no constituents in the Island less interested in this question than those he represented, but notwithstanding that, he would not oppose the grant of a reasonable sum. He would prefer the purchase of a site to the occupation of any of the Squares, but he would not be justified in supporting a grant of such amount. The market house ought not to be built on any but Hillsborough Square.