

Government to maintain the law. He has tried to prove that such and such was the meaning of these dispatches, but he has left us no wiser than we were before.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD—Mr. Chairman, the principal charge against the present Government seems to be, that they have opposed the proprietary tendencies of the late Government. It certainly is the duty of the representatives of the people to maintain the rights and privileges of the territory. It is their peculiar duty to speak for them; but it appears that instead of doing so, when Mr. Sullivan visited her tenants, the hon. member (Miss Henderson) stayed at home. Why did she not go and consult with her and impress upon her the necessities of the people? Her great influence and eloquence would probably have had a magical effect upon her.

Mr. PROWSE—Mr. Chairman, the majority of the tenantry have lately supported the present Government. If I have gathered anything from the debate, it is this, that the tenantry need not expect much to be accomplished to relieve them from their burdens, during the present Session. If the Government have anything to bring in to relieve the people, why do they not introduce it at once? They tell us that it is better to feel the way as we go along, and not to be too hasty. The hon. member for Belfast (Mr. Davies) has said that we will see what twelve months will bring forth. When another election approaches they will promise to do something. But I can tell the hon. member that the people will not then believe them. Now is the time, and the only time, to do something for the tenantry.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT—I did hear how that some of the well-to-do folks in Murray Harbor were not to be taken into consideration. Why the gentleman who accompanied her, took her to the poorer classes of her tenants, was what they did not understand, as they were prepared to give her a better reception. But the course adopted was a wise one, as by that means, she could see for herself that many of her tenants were unable to pay their rents. A letter appeared in the Examiner, which stated that when she was at Cavendish, she was taken to the residence of the wealthiest of the people; but whether she went to the poorest or the wealthiest portion of them, is what I cannot say. In driving through Cavendish, probably she saw the best part of her estates. I believe she did not wish to sell. Perhaps it was because of some hidden value which she perceived in the soil. She has been in the country for an hour, and has seen the notice of the hon. member (Mr. Henderson); she might have seen gold in it, as there must have been something very peculiar in connection with that soil, or it would not have called forth such a glow of eloquence from the hon. member.

Mr. BULL—I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, to say much on this question; but it appears to me that parties in the House are so great pleasure in taking up everything that is against each other. I have taken an active part in politics for some time, in connection with the Liberal party, and I think that they have always been the friends of the tenantry. There is one Act of the Conservative party which I would like to notice—that is the bringing of the Tenantry Bill, which is a very good Bill. It is not a very pleasant thing for a whole country to be branded as rebels. The Government of the day should have advised the people of the dangerous course they were pursuing. I do believe, and always have believed, that some of the members of the Government, then in power, had no other end in view than to bring the Island into Confederation. One prominent member of the Government laid his scheme for that purpose, and he thought that by stigmatising us as rebels, the Home Government would be induced to force us into Confederation. The present party must, however, have credit of getting the charges for the pay of the troops reduced. There is, also, a great deal of talk about the Land Purchase Act. The fact of the matter is, that this Act is not what it is said to be. If, when this Act first came into operation, the land had been passed as it is to-day, is a failure. It is worse than paying rent. No active farmer will purchase his farm when he can invest his money to more advantage.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I have certainly been rather amused with the speaker who has just sat down. He got up to lecture us on political morality, and said that we should not impute motives; but he soon got the floor on him, and he proceeded to lecture us. He said he believed the late Government got the Tenantry Bill into existence for the purpose of forcing the Island into Confederation. It is not often that the hon. member troubles us, but when he gets up to lecture us on political morality he should be careful not to fall into the error which he condemns. The charge he attempts to sustain is that the late Government were not in the least desirous to force the Island into Confederation. He here read the Tenantry Bill; and in reference to each member bearing an equal share of the expenses, said: "I believe they paid pretty dearly for it. We go to another meeting and find that they passed another resolution, which, if carried out, would realize the agricultural interest of the community." "Resolved, That we will not subscribe to the Tenantry Bill." The hon. member (Mr. Davies) said that his district was free from this canker; but it was born there.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES—I rise to a point of order. I said that in Belfast there were no Tenantry Leagues.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I thought that the hon. member said he had no Tenantry League in his district. He said the late Government had not done their duty; but if he refers to the minutes, he will find that there was a meeting of the Executive Council, and a proclamation issued; and after this proclamation was issued, he subscribed to the funds of the Tenantry League.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES—If you believe this to be an illegal association, why do you not go and arrest the members? The hon. member said that none of the public men of the Conservative party said anything against the League. A Bill was introduced into this House, called a Tenantry Loan Bill, providing that if any leaseholder should purchase his land, at a price not exceeding 16s. 8d. per acre, the Government would loan him the purchase money; and, on that occasion, I expressed myself in the following manner, respecting the Tenantry League movement:—

"They would obtain more benefit by sending their friends to this House, to carry out constitutional measures, such as the one now proposed, than by joining the Tenantry League; if we must judge of the principles of that body by the wild and seditious articles published in its organs, *Ross's Weekly*. The principles advanced in that tract, were, that we should be obliged to act as would end in rebellion. The tenantry were greatly deceived, if they imagined that they could obtain redress for their grievances by combining to resist the payment of rents. They might depend upon it, that all the power which Queen Victoria could command, would be exerted to maintain the law of their country. They might depend upon it, that if they were allowed to act as they wished over the principles of British law, and the rights of property? If so, and the principle of reputation were admitted, they would next refuse to pay their shop accounts, and every other lawful debt. A recent number of the acknowledged organ of the Tenantry League, argued to the effect that a sheriff was only a 'raider,' and might be shot down, as if he were a common thief. The hon. member said that the first French Revolution, resistance to the laws could never be tolerated. If the Government of the day were to refuse to do their duty, it was well known that the representative of His Majesty would be bound to take the matter up; and provided the civil power in the Colony was not sufficient to enforce respect to the laws, he would be obliged to act according to his instructions, and send for soldiers to Halifax, New Brunswick, or Canada."

Mr. McNEILL—I did not expect when this paragraph was brought forward, that it would have caused so much discussion. But it is a question of so much importance, perhaps it is all for the best. I believe that the majority of the people and the members of the Legislature, do not regret this fact, but we cannot expect that the whole population would regret it. There are some very talented men in this House, who hold lucrative positions as agents, and it is not likely that these gentlemen would cut their own throats. But there are others who are not so attached to the population, who are bound down by the proprietary system, and they do regret that these negotiations have failed. This Government, the Opposition tell us, went into office promising the people that they would settle the Land Question at once. In fact, the people have become very weary, they have waited for many years. I believe the people are very tired, and they are not likely to get any more of this kind of thing. If the Government, did the very best he could. This hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned to-day that an intelligent community was more easily governed than one that was not intelligent; but he did not say what way they were to be governed. There are two ways of governing—one is by public opinion, and the other by the sword. I believe that the Government should be more anxious to get the public opinion, and to make it the only way. It is not easy to govern this Colony in any other way.

It has been tried by the late Government and proved a miserable failure, thanks to the Free Education Act, and has left those who tried the experiment like some characters Milton speaks of, "in a dismal situation, waste and wild." There are two hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, who seem to be very favorable to the late Government, but they are not so attached to the late Government as to settle the question would be the worst and the best. This governing of people by the sword has proved a failure, and I hope it will be a warning to other Governments not to try to stifle public opinion. May it be as a beacon on a rock to warn them of the danger. I believe that the forces of circumstances will yet cause the remaining proprietors to be in an equal position with the tenants. I have spoken of here to-night. I believe she came out here for the purpose of disposing of her property; but perhaps some of her confidante friends persuaded her to wait until it was known whether we would get the \$800,000 bribe from Canada or not; but by my oath she will wait a week. Miss Sullivan is, no doubt, a lady of great influence and respectability, but she is associated with the late Government. I will now read something, Mr. Chairman, which, if you have not heard, will startle you. It is an extract from Sheriff Dodd's letter, dated 10th August, 1865, addressed to the Colonial Secretary, and published in the Journals of this House:—

"I would say in conclusion, that the great difficulty I experience in executing the writs placed in my hands, arises from the active sympathy which all the tenantry feel for each other, and their device of giving warning to each other by means of blowing their trumpets, upon the approach of any of my officers, effectually prevents a levy being made before a large number of men are collected, while their system of terrorism, by which they intimidate the well disposed, under threats of burning their houses, and taking their lives, is so complete, that it is utterly impossible to look for any assistance outside of the town."

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—All I can say is this, no less than five or six of that hon. member's constituents stated in my office, that through force or terror, they were obliged to subscribe to the funds of the Tenantry League.

Mr. McNEILL—Did you take their affidavits?

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—No.

Mr. McNEILL—You did not take their affidavits; why did you not do so? You say that you were threatened to burn your neighbors' houses; that man should have been punished. But such a state of things never existed. No, sir, they would rather risk their lives to save their neighbor's house from destruction. [The member for Belfast (Mr. Duncan) here rose from his seat.] When Mr. McNeill said, "I have not forgotten the ex-Executive Council, that they have not forgotten the people of this Colony, which robbed the schoolmasters of their pay, and burnt the barns, dragged innocent men to jail, but left those at liberty who had threatened to burn their neighbors' houses. Why did they not proceed to the North American Hotel and arrest the leaders of the League; many of them had not even a walking-stick to defend themselves. Why did not the hon. member for Belfast (Mr. Duncan), go there and seize their tools, and then let them be tried in their splendid buildings in finding out how much each man got."

Hon. Mr. DUNCAN—How the hon. member tells us how much he got when he bled the tenantry. There is the friend of the fatherless and the widow. Will the hon. member tell us how much he received?

Mr. McNEILL—I will never know, because you misstate the facts. You say that the leader of the Tenantry League, and seized their papers. Now you will be forever in the dark.

Mr. BRECKEN—Mr. Chairman, the hon. member has referred to Mr. Dodd, and as that gentleman is one of the most respectable of my constituents, it is my duty to defend him, especially as he has been brought before the public, and he has been accused of what he has not done. I have also referred to the people, and said that they were now satisfied.

Mr. McNEILL—I did not say that the people were satisfied. I said that they were not.

Mr. BRECKEN—What queried? For my part, I am not aware, perhaps the hon. member is. In so far as Mr. Dodd is concerned, I am sure that any person who knows him would not believe that he would put his hand to a statement which would lead to his being tried in the Supreme Court. I do not think that he has the true interests of the County as much at heart as the hon. member for Cavendish.

Mr. McNEILL—But the statements are there.

Mr. BRECKEN—Mr. Dodd was the Sheriff of the County, and had personal experience of the difficulties he had experienced in carrying out the law. He was a man of high character, and his statements in his letter were true or false; it is therefore absurd for the hon. member to be endeavoring to fasten this charge upon the Government by throwing out the insinuation, that they could not get the money. When we reflect upon the results of this mischievous agitation, which resulted in putting this country to the cost of building the Barracks, and other large expenditures of public money, we cannot be too slow in denouncing the man who has done this. As long as the statement remains on the Journals, that it is a disgrace to Queen's County and the Colony. It is a pity he did not think of this disgrace when he was encouraging the League to be formed. I do not know how the hon. member can challenge the hon. member to bring in a Resolution, either to remove or alter it. I tell that hon. member, when that association was at its height, that no man did more to produce those excesses than did the hon. member for Cavendish. You know, Sir, from what the reports are in the old country, that it is very easy to excite the people to the perpetration of acts of violence which they did not intend committing. On one occasion I sued a man because he would not pay his rent, and Mr. Chairman, he was a constituent of your own. On that occasion, he threatened to burn my house, and subscribed to his funds, but said he had not attended any of my meetings, except at one time, when he gave them a dollar. I said, you have joined a party which will bring on a dispute that will result in a conflict between your property and mine. He replied by saying that it was well for me to say so, and that he knew that it was all nonsense, but he knew also that if he got into any difficulty with his cattle, or in any other way, that his neighbors would not help him, and that when he was in any difficulty, he could not tell what might happen to him before morning.

Mr. McNEILL—Name him.

Mr. BRECKEN—I do not recollect his name, if I did I do not think it would be right in me to drag his name before the public. I do not know how the hon. member can challenge the hon. member to bring in a Resolution, either to remove or alter it. I tell that hon. member, when that association was at its height, that no man did more to produce those excesses than did the hon. member for Cavendish. You know, Sir, from what the reports are in the old country, that it is very easy to excite the people to the perpetration of acts of violence which they did not intend committing. On one occasion I sued a man because he would not pay his rent, and Mr. Chairman, he was a constituent of your own. On that occasion, he threatened to burn my house, and subscribed to his funds, but said he had not attended any of my meetings, except at one time, when he gave them a dollar. I said, you have joined a party which will bring on a dispute that will result in a conflict between your property and mine. He replied by saying that it was well for me to say so, and that he knew that it was all nonsense, but he knew also that if he got into any difficulty with his cattle, or in any other way, that his neighbors would not help him, and that when he was in any difficulty, he could not tell what might happen to him before morning.

Mr. McNEILL—Name him.

Mr. BRECKEN—I do not recollect his name, if I did I do not think it would be right in me to drag his name before the public. I do not know how the hon. member can challenge the hon. member to bring in a Resolution, either to remove or alter it. I tell that hon. member, when that association was at its height, that no man did more to produce those excesses than did the hon. member for Cavendish. You know, Sir, from what the reports are in the old country, that it is very easy to excite the people to the perpetration of acts of violence which they did not intend committing. On one occasion I sued a man because he would not pay his rent, and Mr. Chairman, he was a constituent of your own. On that occasion, he threatened to burn my house, and subscribed to his funds, but said he had not attended any of my meetings, except at one time, when he gave them a dollar. I said, you have joined a party which will bring on a dispute that will result in a conflict between your property and mine. He replied by saying that it was well for me to say so, and that he knew that it was all nonsense, but he knew also that if he got into any difficulty with his cattle, or in any other way, that his neighbors would not help him, and that when he was in any difficulty, he could not tell what might happen to him before morning.

Mr. McNEILL—I said the letter was not written by Mr. Dodd, at least that I did not believe it was, but then suppose this famous man whom the hon. member (Mr. B.) has referred to, had all the dread upon him that the hon. member has said, what any reason why every man in the county, outside of Charlottetown, should be charged with being ready to perpetrate the same kind of thing as the people who were so to be guilty, without the shadow of proof upon each or other, was to substantiate such a foul charge upon as and kind a loyal people as the British flag waves over. I throw back the imputation of political fire-brands. Let the hon. member clean his own shirt, but let him be careful in placing Mr. Dodd's letter upon the Journals.

Hon. Mr. DUNCAN—When the hon. member went to Lot 65, did he advise the people to assist the Sheriff in executing his duty, and did he advise the hon. member saying that he advised them to assist the Sheriff?

Mr. McNEILL—I attended a meeting at Lot 65, and will defy the hon. member to say that I gave seditious counsel to the people. The meeting I attended had under their consideration the question of the Tenantry League, and the hon. member said that he was not present at that meeting. The subject which on that day engaged their attention.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION—I do not think that the hon. member should be allowed to say that he advised the people to assist the Sheriff.

FRIDAY, March 20.

Hon. Mr. DUNCAN moved the following resolution, seconded by Mr. McNeill:—

Resolved, That a Committee of three members be appointed to enquire into certain charges made by Mr. ex-Sheriff Dodd to the Hon. Colonial Secretary, charging the loyalty of the inhabitants of Queen's County, the said charges being attached to the

Journals of this House for the year 1865; with power to send for papers, papers and records.

Hon. Mr. DAVIES observed that his sole object in submitting the above resolution was to investigate the charges contained in the letter, against the people of Queen's County, which charges had been placed on the Journals of the House, without calling in question their truthfulness. The statements made by Mr. Dodd were as follows:—

"I would say in conclusion, that the great difficulty I experience in executing the writs placed in my hands, arises from the active sympathy which all the tenantry feel for each other, and their device of giving warning to each other by means of blowing their trumpets, upon the approach of any of my officers, effectually prevents a levy being made before a large number of men are collected, while their system of terrorism, by which they intimidate the well disposed, under threats of burning their houses, and taking their lives, is so complete, that it is utterly impossible to look for any assistance outside of the town; and I attribute the capture of Donnetto wholly to the fact that he was in the town, and that I had placed in the hands of my Constables."

He did not wish to cast any undue reflections on Mr. Dodd's character, but the charges contained in the above extract were of so serious a nature to be endured, without being submitted to a Committee of investigation. (Mr. Davies) protested against those libellous and foul charges, and he felt it to be his duty to raise his voice against them. Troops were sent for on the plea that those statements were correct, that the laws were disregarded, that the people were rebellious, that life and property were endangered, that on his best rights the subjects were trampled upon and disregarded, and that, therefore, an armed force must be called in to subdue the people and compel them to obey the law. Had such a state of things existed, the people would indeed be unworthy of a free government, and they would be justly entitled to be treated as rebels. He, however, contended that the statements in question could not be borne out by facts, and that, therefore, it was necessary and due to the people that an expression of opinion against the charges should be given by the House. He contended that the matter took place, the inference was that the statements expressed in Sheriff Dodd's letter were endorsed by the House. Mr. McNeill, in supporting the resolution, said that the statements referred to were false, and that it was his duty to stand up for the truth. He contended that the statements in question had been sent to the law, and that, therefore, it was necessary and due to the people that an expression of opinion against the charges should be given by the House. He contended that the matter took place, the inference was that the statements expressed in Sheriff Dodd's letter were endorsed by the House. Mr. McNeill, in supporting the resolution, said that the statements referred to were false, and that it was his duty to stand up for the truth. He contended that the statements in question had been sent to the law, and that, therefore, it was necessary and due to the people that an expression of opinion against the charges should be given by the House.

Hon. Mr. McNEILL, in supporting the resolution, said that the statements referred to were false, and that it was his duty to stand up for the truth. He contended that the statements in question had been sent to the law, and that, therefore, it was necessary and due to the people that an expression of opinion against the charges should be given by the House. He contended that the matter took place, the inference was that the statements expressed in Sheriff Dodd's letter were endorsed by the House. Mr. McNeill, in supporting the resolution, said that the statements referred to were false, and that it was his duty to stand up for the truth. He contended that the statements in question had been sent to the law, and that, therefore, it was necessary and due to the people that an expression of opinion against the charges should be given by the House.

Hon. Mr. BRECKEN said one of the first duties of the Representatives of the people was to defend the character of the country. If, however, that portion of the people of Queen's County, not associated with the late Government, were to be treated as rebels, or left neglected, or left aggrieved, that would not appear to the movers of the Resolution under consideration for a redress of such grievances. The Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government. The Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government.

Hon. Mr. DUNCAN said that the Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government. The Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government.

Hon. Mr. McNEILL said that the Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government. The Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government.

Hon. Mr. BRECKEN said that the Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government. The Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government.

Hon. Mr. DUNCAN said that the Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government. The Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government.

Hon. Mr. McNEILL said that the Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government. The Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government.

Hon. Mr. BRECKEN said that the Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government. The Hon. Mr. Davies and Mr. McNeill were accused of charging upon the people, who were not the majority of the population, the responsibility of the late Government, on the ground that it was contrary to the principles of British justice to put any man on his trial before a prejudiced, interested and partial tribunal. Who were to be the Judges in this matter? It was surely those who were pledged to the people, and not those who were pledged to the late Government.

Education, a sum sufficient, £1,500 0 0
Expenses of Light Houses, 15 0 0
Light at St. Andrew's Point, 15 0 0
Do. Ruston Harbor, 15 0 0
Do. Tracadie, 15 0 0
Do. St. Peter's Harbor, 15 0 0
New Light at Murray Harbor, 20 0 0
Do. do. New London, 20 0 0
Summerside Light Keeper, 15 0 0
St. Paul's and Centaurie Lights, 45 0 0

A Bill to revise and consolidate the laws relating to the inspection of Pickled Fish, was read a second time, and agreed to.

Said Bill provides for regulating the size and quality of fish barrels and tins, and the weight of fish made up therein, the appointment of Fish Inspectors, and the inspection of pickled fish exposed for sale within this Island.

House adjourned.

TUESDAY, March 24.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD introduced two bills for the incorporation of the Agricultural Societies of Prince County and St. Peter's Bay. Said bills were received and read.

Mr. Brecken introduced a bill to amend the Act relating to Jail limits. Received and read.

Hon. Mr. Kelly, Messrs. Owen, G. Sinclair, Hon. Col. Secretary presented the Report of the Postmaster General, also that officer's account with respect to the Postal Department for the year ending on the 31st of December, 1865. Said documents were laid on the table.

House adjourned.

SATURDAY, March 21.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD presented a petition asking for an Act of Incorporation for the Prince County Agricultural Society.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAND took exception to the name assumed by petitioners. He alluded to the Agricultural Society of Cascoque, which had been in existence for many years, but had never arrogated to itself the title of Prince County. A petition similar to that now before the House was submitted by the Agricultural Society of St. Peter's, but they had not assumed the title of King's County for their Society. Why, he would ask, did they not call their Society the St. Eleanor's or Summerside Agricultural Society, and not Prince County?

Hon. Mr. LAIRD in reply, said that he had no objection to the name proposed, and that the Society in question was a rival institution to that at Cascoque? Their objects were similar. He could see no reasonable objection to the name, it was established at Summerside, the capital of the County.

The petition, together with one on a similar subject previously presented by Mr. Kelly, for an Agricultural Society at the Agricultural Society at St. Peter's, were referred to the following Committee to report thereon, viz.—**Hon. Laird, Kelly, Messrs. Kelly, McNeill, Howland.**

Hon. Atty. General introduced a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.

Hon. Atty. General moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, to which the Hon. Mr. McNeill offered objection, on the ground that the motion was irregular. The motion, he contended, should be to go into committee to consider Supply, and that the Hon. Atty. General's motion was in support of his objection.

Hon. Atty. General, in reply, said that the motion was in accordance with the usual practice of the House.

After which the House went into Committee. **Mr. Kelly** in the Chair.

Hon. Atty. General presented a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.

Hon. Atty. General moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, to which the Hon. Mr. McNeill offered objection, on the ground that the motion was irregular. The motion, he contended, should be to go into committee to consider Supply, and that the Hon. Atty. General's motion was in support of his objection.

Hon. Atty. General, in reply, said that the motion was in accordance with the usual practice of the House.

After which the House went into Committee. **Mr. Kelly** in the Chair.

Hon. Atty. General presented a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.

Hon. Atty. General moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, to which the Hon. Mr. McNeill offered objection, on the ground that the motion was irregular. The motion, he contended, should be to go into committee to consider Supply, and that the Hon. Atty. General's motion was in support of his objection.

Hon. Atty. General, in reply, said that the motion was in accordance with the usual practice of the House.

After which the House went into Committee. **Mr. Kelly** in the Chair.

Hon. Atty. General presented a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.

Hon. Atty. General moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, to which the Hon. Mr. McNeill offered objection, on the ground that the motion was irregular. The motion, he contended, should be to go into committee to consider Supply, and that the Hon. Atty. General's motion was in support of his objection.

Hon. Atty. General, in reply, said that the motion was in accordance with the usual practice of the House.

After which the House went into Committee. **Mr. Kelly** in the Chair.

Hon. Atty. General presented a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.

Hon. Atty. General moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, to which the Hon. Mr. McNeill offered objection, on the ground that the motion was irregular. The motion, he contended, should be to go into committee to consider Supply, and that the Hon. Atty. General's motion was in support of his objection.

Hon. Atty. General, in reply, said that the motion was in accordance with the usual practice of the House.

After which the House went into Committee. **Mr. Kelly** in the Chair.

Hon. Atty. General presented a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.

Hon. Atty. General moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, to which the Hon. Mr. McNeill offered objection, on the ground that the motion was irregular. The motion, he contended, should be to go into committee to consider Supply, and that the Hon. Atty. General's motion was in support of his objection.

Hon. Atty. General, in reply, said that the motion was in accordance with the usual practice of the House.

After which the House went into Committee. **Mr. Kelly** in the Chair.

Hon. Atty. General presented a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.

Hon. Atty. General moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, to which the Hon. Mr. McNeill offered objection, on the ground that the motion was irregular. The motion, he contended, should be to go into committee to consider Supply, and that the Hon. Atty. General's motion was in support of his objection.

Education, a sum sufficient, £1,500 0 0
Expenses of Light Houses, 15 0 0
Light at St. Andrew's Point, 15 0 0
Do. Ruston Harbor, 15 0 0
Do. Tracadie, 15 0 0
Do. St. Peter's Harbor, 15 0 0
New Light at Murray Harbor, 20 0 0
Do. do. New London, 20 0 0
Summerside Light Keeper, 15 0 0
St. Paul's and Centaurie Lights, 45 0 0

A Bill to revise and consolidate the laws relating to the inspection of Pickled Fish, was read a second time, and agreed to.

Said Bill provides for regulating the size and quality of fish barrels and tins, and the weight of fish made up therein, the appointment of Fish Inspectors, and the inspection of pickled fish exposed for sale within this Island.

House adjourned.

TUESDAY, March 24.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD introduced two bills for the incorporation of the Agricultural Societies of Prince County and St. Peter's Bay. Said bills were received and read.

Mr. Brecken introduced a bill to amend the Act relating to Jail limits. Received and read.

Hon. Mr. Kelly, Messrs. Owen, G. Sinclair, Hon. Col. Secretary presented the Report of the Postmaster General, also that officer's account with respect to the Postal Department for the year ending on the 31st of December, 1865. Said documents were laid on the table.

House adjourned.

SATURDAY, March 21.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD presented a petition asking for an Act of Incorporation for the Prince County Agricultural Society.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAND took exception to the name assumed by petitioners. He alluded to the Agricultural Society of Cascoque, which had been in existence for many years, but had never arrogated to itself the title of Prince County. A petition similar to that now before the House was submitted by the Agricultural Society of St. Peter's, but they had not assumed the title of King's County for their Society. Why, he would ask, did they not call their Society the St. Eleanor's or Summerside Agricultural Society, and not Prince County?

Hon. Mr. LAIRD in reply, said that he had no objection to the name proposed, and that the Society in question was a rival institution to that at Cascoque? Their objects were similar. He could see no reasonable objection to the name, it was established at Summerside, the capital of the County.

The petition, together with one on a similar subject previously presented by Mr. Kelly, for an Agricultural Society at the Agricultural Society at St. Peter's, were referred to the following Committee to report thereon, viz.—**Hon. Laird, Kelly, Messrs. Kelly, McNeill, Howland.**

Hon. Atty. General introduced a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.

Hon. Atty. General moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, to which the Hon. Mr. McNeill offered objection, on the ground that the motion was irregular. The motion, he contended, should be to go into committee to consider Supply, and that the Hon. Atty. General's motion was in support of his objection.

Hon. Atty. General, in reply, said that the motion was in accordance with the usual practice of the House.

After which the House went into Committee. **Mr. Kelly** in the Chair.

Hon. Atty. General presented a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.

Hon. Atty. General moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, to which the Hon. Mr. McNeill offered objection, on the ground that the motion was irregular. The motion, he contended, should be to go into committee to consider Supply, and that the Hon. Atty. General's motion was in support of his objection.

Hon. Atty. General, in reply, said that the motion was in accordance with the usual practice of the House.

After which the House went into Committee. **Mr. Kelly** in the Chair.

Hon. Atty. General presented a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.

Hon. Atty. General moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, to which the Hon. Mr. McNeill offered objection, on the ground that the motion was irregular. The motion, he contended, should be to go into committee to consider Supply, and that the Hon. Atty. General's motion was in support of his objection.

Hon. Atty. General, in reply, said that the motion was in accordance with the usual practice of the House.

After which the House went into Committee. **Mr. Kelly** in the Chair.

Hon. Atty. General presented a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.

Hon. Atty. General moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, to which the Hon. Mr. McNeill offered objection, on the ground that the motion was irregular. The motion, he contended, should be to go into committee to consider Supply, and that the Hon. Atty. General's motion was in support of his objection.

Hon. Atty. General, in reply, said that the motion was in accordance with the usual practice of the House.

After which the House went into Committee. **Mr. Kelly** in the Chair.

Hon. Atty. General presented a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.

Hon. Atty. General moved that the House go into Committee of Supply, to which the Hon. Mr. McNeill offered objection, on the ground that the motion was irregular. The motion, he contended, should be to go into committee to consider Supply, and that the Hon. Atty. General's motion was in support of his objection.

Hon. Atty. General, in reply, said that the motion was in accordance with the usual practice of the House.

After which the House went into Committee. **Mr. Kelly** in the Chair.

Hon. Atty. General presented a bill relative to the inspection of Pickled Fish. Received and read.