LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY,

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

WEDNESDAY, April 8th.

On motion, Hons Callbeck, Laird, and Mr George Sinclair were appointed to bring in a Bill to Incorporate the Baptist Church at North River.

House in Committee of Supply. Mr Reilly in the Chair.

Hon Atty General submitted several Resolutions, among which were for expenditure on bridges and wharfs in Road Drstrict Nos. 3 and 4, Prince County, including extra expenditure of last year, £223 14s. 0d. To build a wharf and block at Battery Point, provided a right of way be given for said wharf, £26 6s. 0d. To Commissioners for revising laws from 1862, £60. A sum sufficient for taking the Census. To Daniel Gillis, Miscouche, for keeping a Way Office for some years past, £7 10s. 0d. House rent for Professor of P. W. College, £35.

To the following persons as School Teachers, to be paid out of the educational funds of the Colony, viz:—

Robina Richardson, Summerside,	£15	0	0
Ellen Welsh, do	15	0	0
Julia Hunt, St. Eleanor's,	8	0	0
Donald McKay, an old Teacher,	5	0	0
James Stewart, Belmont, East Royalty,	10	0	0
Elizabeth McKinnon, Charlottetown,	10	0	0
James H. Fitzgerald, Lot 13,	5	0	0
Charles Fowle, Lot 31,	5	0	0
Arch. McKenzie, West Royalty,	5	0	0
Eulalie Arsenault, Egmont Bay,	10	0	0
Louisa Arsenault, Lot 15,	15	0	0
Francis Buote, Lot 1,	10	0	0
John J. Arsenault, Lot 15,	5	0	0
Geo. Corbett, Charlottetown,	10	0	0
Alice McKenna, do.	5	0	0
Bog School, do.	20	0	0
St. Ann's, do.	20	0	0
James Easton, Georgetown,	30	0	0
	£203	0	0

The foregoing grants are given for this year only, and not to form a precedent for future years.

Hon Atty General said, that the object of the note appended to the foregoing Resolution was to prevent disappointment relative to the continuance of such grants in future. The schools taught by the parties named did not come under the provisions of the School Act, but as similar sums had hitherto been given, it would not be just to deprive the said recipients of their usual allowances without an intimation to that effect. As to the question of special grants, that could not be entertained without a complete change of the Free School system of the Colony.

Hon Leader of the Opposition said he had been anxiously waiting for the Resolution granting the usual annual allowance to the teacher of the Georgetown School, and was glad to find that item among the sums named in the Resolution then before the Committee. Though the school in question was principally supported by the Church of England, three-fourths of the pupils belonged to other denominations. As to the subject of secular schools, he would defer any remarks thereon until the Education Bill was before the House.

Mr Brecken was glad to observe that £10 had been voted for Mr Corbett, the assistant teacher of the school held in the Temperance Hall, Charlottetown. Over 100 pupils were in attendance at that school.

Hon Atty General then submitted Resolutions granting £533 for the relief of paupers.

The grant of £7 10s. to Donald Gillis, Miscouche, for way office, called for some remarks.

Mr Owen said that the way office in question had not been established over a year or two. Newspapers might have been left at Gillis' house for the neighborhood, as was the case in many instances through the country, but that did not constitute a way office.

Hon Atty General said, that it appeaed, a bag was always left at Gillis' for the accommodation of the public for many years past, for which he never received any remuneration.

After some further remarks from hon members on both sides, the Resolutions, as submitted, were agreed to.

Mr Brecken asked the Government what action, if any, would be taken relative to a Memorial from the City Council on the subject of a Workhouse?

Hon Leader of the Government replied, and said that the question was under the consideration of the Government.

Hon Atty General presented a Bill for the better security of the Crown and Government of the United Kingdom, within the Island, which Bill, he said, was based upon a Dispatch from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, to his Excellency the Lieut. Governor, and introduced in compliance with the wishes of the Home Government.

Hon Atty General moved that the Education Bill be read a second time, and in doing so observed that, as he had explained the principal amendments contemplated by the Bill, when first introducing it, and also, when the resolutions touching those amendments were before the House in Committee, he considered it unnecessary to remark again at any length on the subject, at that stage of the proceedings.

Hon Leader of the Opposition then addressed the House, and reviewed the leading amendments of the School Act, as submitted in the bill under consideration. The alteration relative to the Normal School, three Visitors, instead of two, the Board of Education to be composed of eleven members, instead of nine, as formerly, granting £5 extra to teachers of the French language, were, he said, the principal amendments contemplated by the bill, and were not, in his opinion, calculated to prove any material improvement to the general educational interests of the Colony. The question as to the best system of Education to be imparted by the State, was, he said, agitating the public mind. Some held the opinion that a mere secular education was futile, and in fact, injurious, when it was not based on a religious and sound moral training. He expected that on that vital and all important point, some expression of opinion would be given by hon. members of the Government.

Hon Atty General replied, he alluded to the momentous interests involved in the question, and said that a religious education was of the first importance, compared with which mere secular knowledge was but of secondary consideration. But the mode of imparting to the youthful mind a knowledge of religious truths, was a question on which some of the greatest minds of the age differed. He then compared the several enactments of the Conservatives, with those of the Liberal party, relating to Education; and said, that if the former had in any way changed their views, and were prepared to effect any vital change of the present system, let them table their Resolutions to that effect and the Government would be prepared to meet the question.

Dr Jenkins said that he felt very much disappointed that something of more importance than a few trifling alterations was introduced in the bill. The incompetency of the District Teachers, generally as a class, the necessity of a uniform and efficient system of training candidates for the office of teachers; the propriety of a re-examination of the present class of teachers; the importance of military training in connection with the physical exercises of the school; a compulsory measure, to a limited extent, to secure a good attendance at school; and the importance of combining religion with moral training, as being inseparably connected with the prosperity of the country, were some of the remarks which he (Dr. Jenkins) offered, and upon the adoption of which he said depended the improvement of the school of the colony.

Hon Leader of the Government observed that some of the requisites alluded to by the hon member Dr. Jenkins, were already provided for in the School Act. The amendments to the law were but matters of detail. The main principles of the free school system, as first introduced and carried out by the Liberal party, still continued the same, and were not improved on by the changes of successive Governments. As to the Normal School, the only change was to do away with the imperative necessity on the part of candidates for the office of teacher, however high their attainments, of serving five months at that school, which would still continue available for those candidates whom the Board of Education might pronounce incompetent to obtain license. He reviewed the general working of the free school system, and the incalculable benefits it conferred on the rising generation. Religious training, he observed, was a subject of vast importance, and one upon which the ablest minds found it difficult to legislate.

Mr Brecken said that the allusion made to the subject of Education in His Excellency's Speech, at the close of last Session, and the opening of the present, led the public to look for some more important changes than the mere trifling amendments referred to in the Bill. He then spoke of the memorial of His Lordship the R. C. Bishop, and said that the Catholic population, whose exclusive support was given to the party composing the present Government, expected what His Lordship's Memorial termed—common justice—at the hands of the party in power. It appeared, however, from the Minute of Council in reply to said Memorial, that those whose influence placed the Government in power, were deceived. Some hon members of the Government, doubtless, responded to the views expressed by their Bishop, and thought it a crying injustice to be denied the prayer of His Lordship's Memorial, and yet they remained silent on the question. The system of paying the whole of the salary of teachers from the treasury, was contrary to that which obtained in the sister Colonies. The principle of raising a portion of the teachers pay by local assessment was, in his opinion, a sound one; if not, all the Colonies and the United States also, were wrong, and P. E. Island alone right.

Hon Mr Laird, the only important change relating to the Education Act that had been on the platform at the last election, and that had been promised by the Liberal party, was the paying of teachers' salaries exclusively from the Treasury, and not in part, as provided by the unpopular amendment of the Conservatives. He said that the reducing the salaries of teachers, led to the opening of many Private Schools. He quoted extracts from a Report of Commissioners of Education in Scotland, showing that the recommendation of said Commissioners favored one uniform and more concentrated national system; similar in its provisions, relative to the nature of instruction, to the secular system which had, hitherto, given general satisfaction in our Colony.

Mr McNeill was of opinion that the duty of the State was to impart a sound system of secular Education, leaving in the hands of parents the religious training of their children. He spoke of the manner in which he said Liberal Protestants had been maligned by the Conservative party, because they acted in harmony with their Catholic fellow subjects on political grounds; and that in his opinion, the people appreciated too highly the privileges of a free system of Education, to allow any vital change to be effected in that system.

Hon Mr Howlan replied to the remarks of the hon member (Mr Brecken) relative to the Memorial alluded to by that hon member. He, (hon Mr Howlan,) reviewed the labors of His Lordship the Bishop, touching the advancement of the educational interests of the whole Island, and his efforts to provide schools for the poor of Charlottetown. The amount it cost the Colony to educate the 640 pupils that attended the different schools in Charlottetown, paid for out of the Treasury, whilst not one shilling was paid towards the education of the 500 children provided for, as set forth in said Memorial. In New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and other places, similar grants to that asked for here had been given, and no hue and cry was raised against the principle in those Provinces. Surely hon members should consider that something of more lasting importance than a mere knowledge of reading and writing should be imparted in the school. He then reviewed the course pursued by the Conservative party towards the Catholics, relative to the Orange Bill, and the writings and speeches of one who had been Colonial Secretary of that party at the time that bill had been introduced, and which, he was proud to say, Her Majesty was pleased to disallow; and asked if it was reasonable to suppose, that the Catholics could receive even-handed justice at the hands of a party who had sanctioned such proceedings as those to whom he alluded.

On motion, the debate was then adjourned until to-morrow.

House adjourned.

THURSDAY, April 9th.

Hon Mr Davies presented a petition from inhabitants of Lot 62, and its vicinity, praying for the establishment of a Small Debt Court in that locality. Ordered that said petition be referred to the Committee appointed on similar petitions presented during the Session.

Hon Mr Callbeck from a Committee appointed for that purpose presented a bill to Incorporate the Baptist Church at North River. Received and read.

Mr Yeo asked the Government what action they intended to take relative to West Point Wharf, according to a petition on that subject, already before the House.

Hon Leader of the Government replied to the effect, that no further action was taken on the subject.

Hon Mr Davies said the situation selected for that wharf was of such an exposed nature, that no work would stand there.

Mr Yeo referred to the favorable report given by competent Engineers, touching the practicability of the work; and said that it was impossible to suppose a work left in an unfinished and insecure state as that wharf had been, could stand. The building of the West Point Wharf was a work of the greatest importance to a large portion of the people in that part of the country, and he hoped the Government would consider the necessity of causing its completion.

Mr Ramsay said that in addition to the grants of the Legislature, amounting to £500, the sum of £150 had been subscribed by the people, making in all £650. The amount of the contract was £900, and he hoped the securities would not be relieved from the said contract. There was no difficulty about making the work permanent, if properly built.

House in Committee of the whole, on general matters relating to Roads, Bridges, and Wharfs.

Mr Geo. Sinclair, after some time spent in Committee, the Chairman reported the Road Appropriation Scales for the current year.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

House resumed the debate on the Education Bill.

Mr Prowse said the bill to amend the School Act now before the House, contained but very trifling changes compared to all that might be expected from the prominence given to the subject in speeches of His Excellency already referred to. The appointment of two Examiners was a move in the right direction, but they should have been selected from the numbers already composing the Board of Education. The change which the bill would effect, relative to the Normal School, was, he said, calculated to destroy the future usefulness of that Institution. He was not in favor of giving a grant to the Roman Catholic Bishop, nor for separate Schools, but as head of the 35,000 Roman Catholics who gave their undivided support to the party now in power, that gentleman had a right to expect what he considered justice at the hands of that party. He (Mr Prowse) then replied to the remarks made, touching the actions of the Conservative party, by hon members on the Government side of the House, and said that no allusions of that kind would satisfy those disappointed at the manner in which the Memorial of the R. C. Bishop had been treated.

Mr. Kickham alluded to the peace and harmony that prevailed when no such religious dissensions and bickering as that now displayed on the floor of that House existed in the Colony—when Catholics and Protestants alike contributed to the building of each others Churches and Schoolhouses, and all lived as neighbors should in the enjoyment of peace and goodwill towards each other.

Hon Mr Henderson replied to the remarks made by the hon Member, Mr Howlan, on the previous evening, touching the different matters alluded to by that hon member. He (Hon Mr. Henderson) defended the course pursued, and the action taken by the Conservative party relative to the orange bill, the Bible question, and other subjects affecting, he said, Protestant interests in the Colony. He also expressed his opposition to giving any grant of the public money for the purposes alluded to in the Memorial of His Lordship the R. C. Bishop. He then reviewed the aggressive characteristics of the Roman Catholic Religion, and quoted authorities in defence of his arguments. The details of the bill before the House, he said, would receive his attention when in Committee.

Mr Arsenault said the amendments in the bill were, on the whole, an improvement to the School Act. The Schools named in His Lordship's Memorial were as deserving of a share of the public money as others. Catholic members, he said, were taunted for supporting a government that refused the request of their Bishop, but

(Continued on second page.)

(Continued from first page.)

an act was passed to abolish imprisonment for debt, and the people petitioned to have it repealed, so that they might be allowed to go to Jail again. If they wanted to have more executions issued, so that they might be able to get to Jail, it was perhaps, better that they should have more courts for that purpose.

The petition was ordered to be laid on the table.

Adjourned till to-morrow at eleven o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, April 1.

A bill further to amend and explain the Land Purchase Act, was again referred to a committee of the whole House and reported agreed to. It was then, on motion of the Hon. Mr. MacDonald, read a third time and passed.

WILDERNESS LANDS BILL.

A bill to encourage the settlement and cultivation of public wilderness lands, was again referred to a committee of the whole House. Hon. Mr. MacDonald in the chair.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON asked if there was any provision in the bill for opening roads, as it would be very inconvenient to give a man a tract of land which might be several miles away from a road.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD replied that the Commissioner of public lands was authorised to open roads where they were required.

Hon Mr. PALMER proposed the following amendment:—

"And, whereas, it is necessary to provide for the protection of valuable timber and growing wood on the said wilderness lands, intended to be let by virtue of this act, in cases where waste thereof may be committed, or suffered, or any improvident use made thereof, especially by purchasers, where there may be reason to apprehend that such purchasers do not intend permanently to settle on and improve such lands. Be it, therefore, further enacted, that no purchaser, who shall receive possession of any land by virtue of this act, shall, at any time, during the first three years from the date of his Government deed, have power or authority to sell or dispose of any timber or other valuable wood off or from the land so by him purchased, to any person whomsoever, without first obtaining for that purpose a license in writing, under the hand of the aforesaid Commissioner of public lands, anything herein-before contained to the contrary thereof notwithstanding."

Hon. Mr. Palmer, on moving the adoption of this amendment said: My object is to prevent the improvident use or waste of timber, which there is no doubt would be made by designing persons taking land without any view of settling upon it. I think there should be some means prescribed to prevent such destruction of property without interfering with the liberty of an actual settler in using as much timber as he requires. I think a man should be prevented from selling timber for a given period—say three years—without permission from the Commissioner of public lands; but yet not absolutely preventing him, if he can make it appear that he is really and truly going on with the improvement of his farm, and that there is more timber upon it than he requires for his own purposes. The Commissioner should then be authorised to permit him to sell a given number of trees, or tons, as might be agreed upon. I do not see what reasonable objection there can be to a provision of that kind, for if the man is going on honestly working and improving his farm, and if he can satisfy the Commissioner that he intends to settle permanently upon it, he can get whatever timber he requires. The Commissioner, with the aid of the information in his office, will have a good idea of what timber is on the land, and will act accordingly. If a man who had taken land would say, "I am hard run for a few pounds to assist me in the ordinary operations on my farm, and I can obtain what I require by selling a few tons of timber," the Commissioner, in whose hands a large discretionary power would be placed, could grant him a license to do so. A provision of that kind in the bill would prevent speculators from destroying Government property. I do not wish to take up the time of the House with further discussion, but I feel that I have done my duty so far as to endeavor to preserve public property from being plundered.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE: I think the clause which his honor has submitted is rather opposed to the spirit and intention of the bill. Our object is to promote the settlement of those wilderness lands, and that can be best effected by giving parties possession, not only of the land, but also of the timber that is growing upon it. To debar a settler from the use of the timber for three years, would be depriving him of the best means he would have of obtaining a subsistance, and it is at the commencement, or during the first three years, that settlers generally have the greatest difficulty. Therefore, I think that to sell a few pieces of timber, under these circumstances, would be a very legitimate use to make of it, and it would be very impolitic to deprive a settler of the privilege of doing so. I say so with greater confidence, when I consider that few such restrictions are imposed by the proprietors upon their tenants, and yet, the leasehold system is very objectionable, and very unpopular. I would very much regret, as a Member of a Government which calls itself liberal, to sanction such an exceedingly illiberal provision. Heaven knows the labor a new settler has to undergo is not so light, that we should refuse to let him lighten it by selling a few sticks of timber off the land where he intends to make his future home. Another objection I have to the clause, which his honor proposes adding to the bill, is, that it is so complicated, and such serious responsibilities are thrown on the Commissioner, for I cannot conceive of any more unenviable position than to have to administer it. The whole power of granting permission to cut timber would be in the hands of the Commissioner, who might be a strong partizan, and might use his power to advance the political interests of his friends, or to influence votes at an election, which would be a still greater evil than that which his honor proposes to remedy. I do not think any possible position would be more invidious than that; neither do I see what better use can be made of Government lands than to offer them to settlers. A tree is of little value while standing in the forest, but when it is converted into a marketable commodity it may represent every article used in civilized life.

Hon. Mr. BALDERSTON: I believe the expense of keeping wood-rangers, or parties to look after the timber, would be greater than the value of all the timber they would preserve; and I am still of opinion that the method proposed yesterday, by his honor on my right, (Mr. Beer,) would have been the most practicable. Rather than impose such restrictions upon the settlers, as his honor from the city proposes, I would run the risk of losing the timber. I would let the settler take what he can get off the land, and if he does leave it at the end of eight years, it will be of some value.

Hon. Mr. LORD: As I stated yesterday, there should be some guarantee given that the parties settling upon the land would not have full liberty to cut any timber they think proper. I have been thinking over the bill, and I am of opinion that it is not rightly framed at all. Here is a large quantity of land thrown open to settlers, and so far, that may be quite proper, but what is the Government to do? They are bound to survey and open out roads where they are required, and they are doing all this, at the expense of the country, without receiving a single shilling from the occupiers of the land, for eight years. Now, I think it would have been much better if the parties who framed this bill had proposed to give the intending settlers possession, upon a payment of 20 per cent. of the purchase money, and give them their deeds; then let them have ten years free occupation, at the end of which time, they would commence to pay their instalments, and have the whole paid in eighteen years from the time they took possession of their land. I do not wish to prevent parties from settling upon the Government land, but I am not wedded to this bill, and I think the Government have made the greatest mistake in introducing it that they have made since they came into power, or that they will make. As to the amendment, it would be placing the whole power in the hands of the Land Commissioner. He will be able to do just as he thinks proper. If any settler on the land does not exactly please him, he will have it in his power to say: "I will not allow you to cut a stick of timber." I am confident that the Government will see before three years are passed, that they have committed a very serious error in granting those lands, as they are doing by this bill.

Hon. Mr. BEER: I expressed myself yesterday, as being in favor of letting those lands upon such terms as would give the settlers some chance to live upon them during the first few years of their occupation, and I do not see any reason to change my opinion. I am only sorry that there was not a majority in favor of the amendment I proposed yesterday.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL: I also expressed my opinion yesterday, and my views have not undergone any change. I do not think it would be liberal to put such restrictions on the settlers as are contained in the proposed amendment. Neither do I apprehend that all the Government land will be taken up under this bill until will we have an opportunity of seeing how it will work, and if it is not found to work well, it can be amended or repealed at a future session. I think it is perfectly safe as long as the Commissioner knows who he is dealing with. Of course he would not let a tract of land to a person who he apprehended was going to destroy the timber, and then leave it. Some member of the Government would have some knowledge of almost any man who would apply for land, and he could direct the commissioner to refuse the application of any man who he thought had an intention of practicing fraud upon the Government. There may be some reason to apprehend that parties will take advantage of this bill, and in some cases, the Government may suffer loss, but the question is, how are we to discriminate between those who intend to settle upon the land, and those who do not? Would it be fair to deprive the honest settler of the very means, perhaps the only means within his reach, of earning a livelihood during the first few years he is in possession of a new farm. If we attempt to prevent the dishonest man from taking the timber, we will probably be depriving the honest man of his rights. For these reasons, I will oppose the amendment.

Hon. Mr. BALDERSTON: His honor from the first district of Prince County, (Mr. Lord), thinks it would be better to require an instalment of 20 per cent., to be paid when the land is taken, but I cannot agree with him. We know that the greater number of men who settle upon new farms have very little to commence with, and they have enough to do to struggle along without paying anything for their land.

Hon. Mr. LORD: I am willing to support the amendment, though I would like to see it modified. I am not seeking for popularity, and I do not hesitate to say that I am opposed to the bill in its present shape. I will not shrink from my duty, whether I am a member of the Government or not, and I feel it to be my duty to support the amendment.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: There is nothing in the amendment to debar a *bona-fide* settler from getting what timber he requires, he has simply to ask leave to cut it. The object is to protect the Government property from being plundered. I am pleased to hear his honor, who spoke last, say he is opposed to the bill in its present shape. For my part, I am prepared to support the principle of the bill, but I cannot assent to the details of it. It is my opinion that the country will be up in arms against it. (Mr. Palmer—Hear).

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON: If a man is allowed to take as much timber as he likes, he may take off all the most valuable trees the first year, and then look for another tract; but if he is only allowed to take what he requires for his own use during the first three years, he will be more likely to settle permanently upon the land.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD: I must say that I am surprised at the expressions of some of your honors, for the proprietors would lease their land on better terms than you propose to let Government land to settlers. They sometimes let their land free for the first five years, then at three pence an acre rent, the next year six pence, and so on till it reaches the maximum price, and that without any such condition as building a house or improving the land in any way. But we would all exclaim against the injury and injustice done to the tenants by the proprietors debarring them from the free use of the timber upon their farms. The settlers under this bill will be bound to make certain improvements, which will be a sufficient guarantee to the Government that the land, with the improvements, will realize the full amount of the money they were bound to pay in the first instance. If a settler fails in fulfilling the conditions upon which he takes the land, even the first year, the Commissioner will be authorized to issue a writ, eject him out of the property, and sell it to another person. If the Commissioner finds that a man, who has taken a piece of land, intends to plunder it, he will be at liberty to eject him at any time.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: True, the proprietors do not often impose such restrictions, and for the very good reason that they cannot carry them out; but we have power to protect the public interests, and why should we not do so? I feel very well satisfied that the bill in its present shape will be very unpopular.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE: I differ from his honor who has just spoken, as to the reception the bill will meet with. I think it is a bill which will be welcomed everywhere, more particularly by tenants who have short leases and have to vacate their farms without knowing where to go. These men will have some other course in their power besides taking the bitter alternative of expatriating themselves, or going to a foreign country. It is surely a hardship that, after a man has reared a family here, and they have been educated at the public expense, they should have to go, with what little effects they possess, to enrich a foreign nation, simply because they cannot obtain land here on reasonable terms. That is a great evil; and if it can be remedied by this bill, it is a most desirable thing. I do not consider it an evil to convert timber, which is useless as long as it stands in the forest, into an article of merchandize; but of course, I would not sanction the indiscriminate use of timber on public lands. It is quite possible that timber may be carried off those lands in a clandestine manner now, and we will require precisely the same machinery at work under this bill, as under the Land Purchase Bill; but I cannot see that we will run any greater risk than a proprietor when he takes new settlers upon his estate. His honor from Prince County, (Mr. Lord), made some reference to the expense of opening roads, and really I think his honor should have been better informed upon that subject. His honor is now opposed to the bill, but he is as responsible for its introduction as any member of the Government, and if he had objections to it, he should have stated them in another place, or have resigned his seat. It is an extraordinary course for him to oppose a bill which he was instrumental in bringing in. If I thought there would be any serious difficulty in the operation of it, or that it would give facilities for plundering government property, I would be as much opposed to it as any of your honors; but I think it would be a great hardship to prevent settlers from taking what timber they require. And suppose his honor's proposed amendment were carried, it would only be necessary for a settler to ask permission from the Commissioner to cut the timber, and, therefore, I think all the security it would afford would only be nominal. The unpleasant nature of the duty that would be imposed on the Commissioner, is a serious objection to that amendment, but as that has already been referred to, I do not deem it necessary for me to say anything more at present.

Hon. Mr. LORD: I can tell his honor who has just spoken, that I know exactly what the duty of a Member of the Government is. I have not to be taught that by his honor. I have the privilege of expressing my opinion here, and I will exercise it. I am not a political hunter, but will do what I conceive to be right and just, and I believe the public will bear me out in the view I take of this bill. I said I intended to vote for the bill, and I will do so, but I will also vote for the amendment, which I am convinced will be an improvement. It is said that the honest settler would suffer with the dishonest one, but the amendment will protect him, for it is left to the Commissioner to give him permission to take what timber he requires—not to strip the whole land.—(Mr. Palmer—Hear.) Another objection I have to the bill, is, that there will be no money raised under it for opening new roads, for there must be roads opened at the public expense before the land will be occupied by settlers. I, therefore, differ from those members who think they are doing good service to the public by passing that bill. This wilderness land is costing the Government a great deal, and now, you are just throwing it open to the public. I am sorry to differ from members of the Government, but I am here to discharge my duty, and I will do so without fear, favor or affection. The people will not find fault with what I have said respecting this bill. Though I am a member of the Government, I am not so pliable as some people may imagine. His honor from Queen's County, (Mr. Haythorne), passed a few lines to me yesterday, saying the Government should thank me for my assistance. Does his honor think I am sent here to act just in accordance with the views of the Government? No, I will do my duty independent of any person, even of his honor the President.

Hon. the PRESIDENT: His honor has a perfect right to act as he thinks proper. I certainly do not pretend to control his opinion, neither do I desire to do so.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL: We all profess to be here to represent the interests of the country at large, and though we may differ in opinion's, our differences should be characterized by liberality and forbearance. I regret that members of the Government should differ among themselves, and I hope that difference will not be carried to any greater extent. It is right and reasonable that members of this House should express their opinions freely upon important questions. As to the fate of the bill, I think it is likely to pass, and it is our duty to pass it on the most liberal terms. It is introduced to encourage the settlement of of the wilderness lands, and if we shackle it with restrictions, it will render it inoperative. That, I conceive, will not be doing our duty. I am sorry that any part of the community should suffer by giving unlimited power to the settlers, to appropriate the timber on the lands they occupy, to their own use, but I cannot concur in restricting those men, as the amendment proposes, for they will require all the advantages we can give them, to induce them to settle upon those lands. Our young men are not so willing, or so anxious, to settle upon the wilderness lands as their forefathers were; and if we put such restrictions upon them, they will not settle upon them at all, but will leave their native country. We should, therefore, waive those little objections. I think those objections are magnified, for the Government does not possess such very valuable tracts of wilderness land as to make it of such great consequence whether the timber is taken off or not, and it sounds too hard, according to my views, to say a man should not be allowed to take the timber off the land he occupies.

Hon. Mr. PALMER: I am sure your honors must see that in offering that amendment it is not my intention to obstruct the bill. You have not heard me say I would oppose the bill, for I always intended to support the principle of it; therefore, your honors must see that my opposition to some of the details of the measure, do not by any means savour of party opposition. I am sure your honors must be still further convinced of that, from the fact that it is a Government measure, for if I were so disposed, I might probably induce such a difference of opinion, as would occupy the House for two or three days. I do not object to the main principle of the bill, and as the responsibility of it rests with the Government, I am quite willing that it should pass; but I think the amendment I have offered is a very necessary safeguard. And however cheap and pleasant it might be for me to rise up here and advocate liberal measures, or to give my voice for the people having free scope upon all Government lands, I do not consider that I would be justified in doing so. I might earn for myself the appellation of an exceedingly liberal member, but I do not desire the name of a profligate member. It is the duty of the Legislature to see Government property disposed of honestly. The amendment I have proposed is for the protection of the Government and the honest man. It is to prevent the land from being laid waste by improvident speculators, so that men of honest intentions would not be prevented from settling upon it. There is nothing in the amendment to prevent a good honest man from cutting down every tree upon the land he occupies, and building ships or whatever else he likes, but it is designed to prevent a tract of land from being swept of valuable timber, which would likely ensue, without that reasonable pre caution of going to the Commissioner for permission to sell, or part with the quantity he may have to dispose of. I have not such an opinion of the present land Commissioner or of any other gentleman who may hold that office, as to suppose that he would make his power to serve or advance the interests of any particular party. If that officer would presume to act in that way, it would be good ground for removing him from office, and if the Government would choose to keep him in office, it would be their fault and they would be responsible. It would be easy for that officer to consult with some of the members of the Government near at hand, as to whether he should grant such a license when applied for or not.

The question of concurrence was then put on the amendment, and it passed in the negative.

House resumed and progress reported.

Adjourned till to-morrow at eleven o'clock.

THURSDAY, April 2.

BILLS FORWARDED.

The following bills were brought up from the House of Assembly, severally read a first time, and ordered to be read a second time to-morrow:—

By Mr. McNeill, a bill to prevent accidents to persons travelling on the ice, in this Island.

By Hon. Mr. Callbeck, a bill to Incorporate the Baptist Church of Long Creek, West River.

By Hon. Attorney General, a bill to consolidate and amend the several acts therein mentioned, relating to the Savings Bank.

A bill to encourage the settlement and cultivation of public Wilderness Lands, was again referred to a Committee of the whole House, and further progress reported.

Adjourned till to-morrow at eleven o'clock.

(To be continued.)