The Examiner.

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND NEWS.

"This is true Liberty, when Freeborn Men, having to advise the Public, may speak free."---Euripides

VOL. XXII.] CHARLOTTETOWN, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, MONDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1871. [NO. 40.

Important Speeches on the Railway Question, etc.

Hon. P. SINCLAIR.—I suppose those branches which are intended to connect with the main trunk line are merely to be put forward in order to catch a few more votes to assist in carrying the measure. The difference between the resolution submitted by his honor the Leader of the Government and the amendment submitted by the hon. Leader of the Opposition is, that it is the intention of the former that the country shou'd go on with the work at once while the latter asks for delay in order to consult the people and obtain their consent before proceeding with the matter. The former resolution is so non-committal that the hon Leader of the Government could withdraw it at any time without injury to the Government, but his honor was not so non committal in his remarks upon it, for he stated that the Government had received several offers to construct the road, and that some of them were lower than the offer which had been so much talked of. The House should be very cautious before consenting to the construction of a railway, for by undertaking it they might sink the whole revenue of the colony quite easily. No person having a large amount of capital would attempt to commence such a work without knowing the length of the road, the difficulties of the country through which it would pass, and the exact cost (the latter could be ascertained by public tender with good security for the performance of the contract) A railroad from Tignish to Souris would require to be 185 miles in length and reckoning the cost including right of way at £5,200 per mile, the annual interest would, in round numbers, amount to £52,000. We already pay £9 000 annually as interest upon our public debt, and the total interest would amount to £61 000. The interest on the debt of Canada amounts to ninety cents per head of her population, but ours would amount to a trifle over two dollars per head of our population. The question should be considered whether it would be better for us to bear that heavy burden and have a railway like the other provinces, or do without the railway. Would it be better to proceed with the undertaking, and plunge into debt with this fact before our eyes or continue to make the steady progress which we have made in the past without a railroad? There is not a solitary petition before the House asking for a railway, but there is a very numerously signed petition against its construction. That is the position in which the House is at present placed. The government are endeavouring by every means in their power to get the consent of the House to proceed with the construction of the railway, without consulting the people to ascertain whether they are willing that it should be undertaken or not. The hon Atty. General speaks very loudly in his praise of the country, and in showing its superiority over the other colonies; but it is only a short time since we heard him speak of our insignificance of the greatness of the Dominion, of its stalwart sons, &c. Times have changed, and it is we who are now great and prosperous when compared with any part of Canada. When we find men occupying high positions changing with the wind, we cannot but feel that they do not carry as much weight as they otherwise would. It is no wander that the hon. Leader of the Government complains of the want of confidence in the government when they wish to undertake a work of such magnitude as the construction of a railway, and attempt to force it upon the people without consulting them on the matter, and without giving them time to consider their position and what they would have to bear in consequence of it. If the railway is to be built, it will involve us in a taxation heavier than that of Canada, and there will be nothing left us but to enter the Dominion on any terms on which they will accept us. England is taxed four dollars per head for her debt, Canada one dollar; and this Colony, if the railway is proceeded with, will be taxed over two dollars per head for the debt which will be increased. Will this House give the Government liberty to rush into the building of a railway at £5,000 per mile, while we are told they have had offers to build it for much less than that sum? It was only by a side wind that the country received any intimation of the intentions of the Government before the commencement of the session, and it could not be expected that with so little notice the people had time to express their opinions in reference to the matter. The Government think they can hood wink the people and the members of this hon. House who are opposed to the present undertaking of so vast and extensive a work; but they will find themselves mistaken; for the people are beginning to be thoroughly awakened upon it. Whether we should build a railway or not at the present time, when it is undertaken, it should be done in the most straightforward manner, and by the consent of the majority of the people at the polls. I will never vote to give any government the power to proceed with the work till this is done and the road surveyed by a competent engineer, and put up to public tender.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—I have great respect for the opinions of the hon. member for New London, but I understand that during my absence he made some remarks misrepresenting what I had stated last session. I never ran down the wealth of this little colony: I never stated that Providence had not blessed us with a fertile soil, or that our men had not strong hearts and willing hands to develop the resources and forward the interests of this country. I never ran down or spoke disparagingly of this my home and my native country. I am pledged not to agitate directly or indirectly in favor of Confederation, and that pledge I have kept and will keep sacred. The hon member for Belfast tried to draw a comparison between the conduct of the hon. member for Souris (Mr. McLean,) in reference to the resolution introduced by that hon member on the Education question, and that of the hon. Leader of the Government in reference to the resolution on the Railway question before the committee; but there is no analogy whatever between the two cases. The hon member for Souris placed a notice on the Order Book in the early part of the session, stating that he would introduce a resolution upon the Education question, and when he thought the proper time had arrived for doing so, rose in his place and moved a resolution, but after being questioned and cross-questioned he had not the candor to say what his motives were in doing so, or whether he intended to ask for a money vote or not. The hon. member for Belfast was quite alarmed lest the hon. member for Souris should not get justice in reference to the matter, but could not at the same time ascertain from him what his real motives were. The hon. member for Belfast was very anxious to make the country believe there was no sense of justice whatever in the ranks of the government; and, of course, that they were therefore not fit to be trusted with the public affairs of the country. It was intimated by a side whisper to his honor the Speaker that the hon. member for Souris did not intend to ask for a grant of the public money for any purpose; but the whole affair was a political dodge of that hon member got up for a political purpose. Where is the analogy between the action of the hon. member for Souris and that of the hon. Leader of the Government? There is none whatever. The hon Leader of the Government placed a notice on the Order Book that he would introduce a Bill for the construction of a railway, and the matter was also mentioned in the Governor's Speech at the opening of the session. The hon. member for Souris did what he will not attempt to do again, and although called upon to state his object in moving his resolution and whether it involved a money vote or not refused to do so; but the hon. Leader of the Government has tabled a resolution stating that his object is to consider the expediency or otherwise of constructing a railroad There is a vast difference between the two cases. Now I am not an engineer, the few figures I submitted were in reference to the Shediac and St. John Railroad, and went to show its cost and earnings. I believe that a railway through this Island would at least earn as much as that line, The Shediac and St John Railroad, 108 miles in length, realized last year the sum of $188 598, and a railway in this Island, 120 miles in length, would, with equal traffic, yield $204,097 per year. Persons experienced in railway matters state that the working expenses of the narrow gauge would be 40 per cent of the earnings of the road, while that of the broad gauge was 70 per cent. That would give us £26,140 above the working expenses which taken from the interest, viz: £39,-000 leaves but a trifle to be paid from the public chest. I want to tie down the hon members of the opposition to one proposition as to the cost, when we throw down the gauntlet and state that the railroad shall not cost more than £5,000 or £5,500 per mile, where is the common sense in their arguing that it will cost £10 000 per mile? The whole burden of the speech of the hon. member for Belfast is, that the latter sum will be the cost. If the railroad will cost more than £5,500 per mile, the House should give it no further consideration, that is the only way to settle the matter. I do not believe in cramming any measure down the throats of hon. members of the opposition, for every hon. member has a right to vote as he thinks proper at all times. When the measure comes down it will stipulate what the cost shall be, and there shall be a fixed sum which shall not be exceeded under any circumstances. It has been stated that many will derive large pickings out of the undertaking. Well, I believe no railway has ever been constructed without pickings for some parties. I have been six months at the Executive Board, and have only had such pickings as the statute allows me; but I know what parties under the late administration have derived pickings. If a railroad is to advance the interests and prosperity of the country, although there should be a few pickings for our merchants and others we should not oppose it. I heard an hon. member talk about the "scum of creation," which, he said, the railroad navvies were. I dare say when those hard working men leave their homes, and home influence in the mother country, and congregate together and come out to America to build railroads, they are likely to be less strict in their morals; but I am surprised to hear any hon. member designate those honest, stout-hearted men the "scum of creation." If those navvies who are so stigmatized by the liberals are so objectionable on account of the political influence they would possess through their numbers, let there be a clause put in the Bill that they shall not be entitled to vote while engaged in the construction of a railroad. Those men will not be in the pay of the Government, but in that of the contractors; and, therefore, would not influence the elections in favor of the government as they would owe them nothing. What do we know about those navvies what they may be, or whether they will be English, Scotch, Irish or of other nations. If the contract is entered into, the contractors will receive no more than the amount of their contract, and I cannot, therefore, see what motives they would have in inducing their employees to vote for the Government. It was only the other evening I heard the hon. member for Rustico, when speaking with reference to the Tenant League question, charge the conservatives with bringing the troops here for the purpose of disturbing the order of the country, and he declared that a similar motive now influenced them in carrying on the railroad undertaking. He knows perfectly well that both of those statements are utterly false, but when I remember the close affinity existing between the hon. member for Rustico and the hon. member for Belfast, I was not surprised to hear the Government charged with wanting to bring a large number of navvies into the Colony for the purpose of overruling the law It was only one of those precious statements we hear circulated by those hon members throughout the length and breadth of this Island, and crammed down the throats of men at hole and corner meetings for the purpose of making them believe that the members of the present Government are not to be trusted. Those hon members will tell the people that the hon. Leader of the Government wishes to sink this country in debt to lay upon the people greater burdens than they can bear and to beggar the Colony till she is obliged to knock at the doors of the Dominion of Canada for admission. In reference to figures I would be quite content to take those of the Shediac and St. John railroad as it is the nearest to this Island, and looking at the fact that our population is far more dense than that of New Brunswick, and our soil far more productive, we have good reason to conclude that a railway through this Island would at the very least return as much as that road, and as the first cost would be so much less, it would pay so much the better. The hon. member for Belfast declared that if the most eminent Engineers of England and Canada stated that a narrow gauge railway could be built at a cost of £5,000 per mile, he would not believe them. Upon what grounds, or for what reasons do we take the opinions of men? Because they have closely and for a long time studied any particular question If a man's property is in danger, he goes to a lawyer instead of to a parson Why? Because the former has to do with his temporal matters, and the latter has to do with his spiritual matters. But the hon. member tells us we should not take the opinion of a professional man who has studied railway matters; he will not believe any engineer in reference to the cost of a narrow gauge railway, however eminent he may be. Like Thomas of old he says, let me see the thing or I cannot believe it. The hon. member knows no more about building railroads than I do, and I know precious little about them. I do not pretend to be any great authority on the matter, but this railway like the Tenant League question has been made a political stalking horse by the hon. member for Belfast and the hon. member for Rustico The former stated that I said if we got the railway established the Government would be in power for life. We would indeed be a little generous to give the opposition another opportunity of getting the reins of power, in order to show their superior ability to carry on the Government If as he has stated, he thinks the Government are bound to ruin the colony by the construction of a railroad, to make his argument good he must prove the government have formed some corrupt ring to make something out of it. If this were the case, at the end of their term of four years, they would be sent into the cool shades of the opposition, and the hon members on the other side would have a grand opportunity to get into power. The hon. member has twitted the members on this side of the House with being tories; but when I look around at the gentlemen forming the Government I do not know that in the whole history of this Island the country has ever had a fairer representation of its interests in it than at the present time. I see some of our most wealthy and enterprising merchants among the members of the government and I know that they would not remain in the government twenty-four hours if there was a ring formed to fill their pockets at the public expense. The truth of the matter is, that the government of this Island and its supporters are entitled to the respect and confidence of all honest men, and in order to show clearly that there is not the least foundation for the charges made against them, there are some of them who do not support the construction of a railway because they believe a majority of their constituents are opposed to it at present. The policy of the Government has been a straightforward one, there has been no scheming or anything resembling it among them, and therefore they have as fair a claim upon the people of this Colony as their detractors who take the part of men behind the curtains, known as prompters

Hon. P. SINCLAIR.—The remarks of his honor the Attorney General did not bear upon the question before the committee, and I do not, therefore, desire to go into them for the purpose of answering them. The members of the Government tell us that 2½ per cent upon our imports, together with the returns which will be made, will be quite sufficient to meet the working expanses and the interest upon the money expended upon the construction of a railroad. Now, I contend that the Colony will require 2½ per cent upon its imports in addition to the present duty to meet its requirements, and keep it in a sound condition financially without undertaking a railroad. In return for the one per cent added to our duties two years ago we have received nothing in reality. Unless there is some more effective plan for raising money by taxation carried out the revenue will not increase in proportion to the addition made to the tax. The public expenditure last year was about £13 000 more than the revenue; and, therefore, money must be raised in some way or other to meet the increased annual requirements of the Colony. We may be told that last year there was a much larger outlay than usual in erecting the new Post Office Building, &c.; but I find the purchase of the Stock Farm, the building of a new Asylum, and the purchase of a Steam Dredge will cause a large additional expenditure this year also I say that the state of the finances of the Colony requires that £15.-000 should be raised by additional taxes in order to prevent the Colony from running deeply in debt, and to place it in a good position without undertaking the construction of a railroad The hon. Attorney General has informed us that if a proviso will be made in the Bill that the cost of the railway shall not exceed £5 000 per mile, and that the Bill will remain a dead letter if it is found that the road cannot be built for that sum; but I believe that if this House give the Government liberty to build it, whether it will cost more or not, it must go ahead. There is not a Bill which has been passed this session but may be amended next session; and, therefore, the best guarantee we can have that the railroad will be built at the lowest price is, for the Government to put it up to public tender and take the lowest they can get, but they have no intention of doing this.

Hon Mr. HOWLAN.—What better guarantee would you have by letting it at public tender than by private contract?

Hon. P. SINCLAIR.—The very fact that the Government ask for power to let it for £5,000 looks suspicious; if they receive that power the road will cost the full amount at the very least The hon. member stated that the Government had £ 0 000 in the Savings' Bank, but he must remember that money is required to cash the Government Warrants and should not be taken for any other purpose. I maintain that the 2½ per cent additional taxation will be required even if we never undertake the construction of a railroad to meet the extra demands of the Colony, and to make matters square. If the Government intend to pay the large amount of interest which will be required on the money employed in constructing a railroad, they will be obliged to add to the present taxation at least four per cent.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The hon. member has told us that if the contract is to be confined to the sum of £5 000 per mile, the contractors might break down, and the Government would have to pay the additional cost which would be required to finish the work His cure for this is to make a survey locate the line and let it by public tender. What additional security would that give? What security will the Government require? It is the contract entered into with responsible parties and the sureties for the fulfilment of it; it will therefore be the duty of the Government to see that they get good and substantial security. Supposing the construction of the railway were put off for twelve months, and the hon. member obtained the time he asks for to cram the people with every thing he can say against the Government to make them dissatisfied with the undertaking, the country would be no further ahead than before, for after all the road would have to be let by contract, and the fulfilment of it would be deferred a year later. The hon. member accused the Government of running the country in debt, but does he forget that he advocated the loan of a very large amount of money and supported the Leader of the late Government when that hon. gentleman who had so much influence, tried to negotiate a loan in England, to be spent in public improvements? Is the hon. member satisfied with the present state of our public roads? if he has I will give him my support if he will bring it forward and endeavor to carry it out. He supported the late Government in sending their Leader (Hon. Mr. Hensley) to London to get a loan for the purpose of making better roads and bridges throughout the Island; it is therefore, surprising that he accuses the present Government for endeavoring to remedy the very same evil. As the Government will issue Debentures which the country will be pledged to redeem the latter will offer the best of security and the people will invest freely in them; the interest of the money will, therefore, to a large extent, be spent in the Colony as well as the principal. Does the hon. member mean to say that our present means of communication are sufficient for the requirements of the country for all time to come, or that it can be improved at a moderate expense so to suit even our present circumstances? If so it would be well for him to point out how it can be done.

Hon. D. DAVIES.—I showed on a former occasion that the Government acted on certain fixed principles, and that as long as they stand true to those principles they shall receive my support. Mr McLean was asked when he introduced his resolution in reference to Education, whether he intended to move for a denominational grants or not; and if he had said "I do not intend to do so," his resolution would have passed. but he would not give any satisfactory answer; and, therefore, it was implied that he intended to ask for those grants—at least that was the inference to be drawn from his action on the matter. When he would not answer he was out of order. The question now brought forward by the hon. Leader of the Government is in regular course, and it is, therefore, not fair to charge the Government supporters with being the pliant tools of the Government, for they will not support the Government in anything and everything they choose to bring forward, as has been insinuated. The majority of the House is in reality the Government while the House is in session, but during the recess the Executive is the Government, The Government has the honest support of its supporters and nothing more. I am inclined to be tender with the minority, but they must not try to bring in resolutions with a sort of side wind to break the rules of this House as did the hon. member for Souris.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT.—There are two or three matters which require a few remarks from me, but I shall not occupy much time in offering them The hon. member for Belfast (Hon D. Davies) knows there is just as much manliness in the Government supporters as in the hon. members of the opposition, and that if the Government proved recreant to their principles their supporters would resign just as quickly as he himself or any member of the opposition would if the latter were in a similar position His denouncing the navvies as the *scum* of the earth is unworthy of any hon. member of this House, and cannot be too strongly condemned, for every man who comes here helps to develop the resources of the country; this remark will apply particularly to laboring men Insinuations have been thrown out by some hon members of the opposition that hon. members on the Government side of the House are not to be trusted, and that they are actuated by corrupt motives; but I can tell those hon gentlemen on the other side that there is just as much straightforwardness and truthfulness on this side of the House as there is among them, and if I were not included among them, I would say there was a little more. Many have been the representations and insinuations made against myself about deriving pickings from the contract for building the Barracks, but they are utterly false. I telegraphed over to New Brunswick at the request of the contractor and got a supply of building materials for him, and received a check for it just as from any other business man, and that was all I had to do with the matter. If hon. members of the opposition wish to make the most of that transaction they are at liberty to do so, provided the truth be told in reference to it. In reference to the independence and straightforwardness of those hon. members who compose the Government, all the guarantee this House can have is the position those hon. members occupy in society and in the business operations of the country. The members of this side of the House have just as much interest at stake in the country, and in managing their affairs properly and profitably as the hon members of the opposition ever can have, and we are just as truthful and perhaps more straightforward. As for pickings I do not begrudge the shopkeepers all the pickings they received from the Lunatic Asylum and the Poor House. I can tell the hon. member for Belfast that he never attended to his duties in connexion with the Board of Works while he was a member of it, for it was shamefully neglected; and the new Post Office building was mismanaged to such an extent that the lumber alone cost £1,500, and had it not been for the exertions of the present Government it would have cost £200 or £300 more. Parties were sent away to the other Provinces for lumber with unlimited powers to do just as they pleased, and without a written document of any kind, so that it cost nearly double as much as it otherwise would. There was no management whatever in the late Board of Works, yet that hon. member comes in here and throws out insinuations about pickings to members of the present Government. The hon member for New London speaks about the debt of England and Canada, where the railways are generally owned by Companies; but if we go in debt in this Colony we shall have something to show for it we shall have a railway through a fertile country which will in a short time after the road is finished cost the country nothing even the amount raised by an additional tax of 2½ per cent in the course of time may not have to be exacted The hon. member made insinuations about the honesty of the members of the Government in carrying such an undertaking; but I can tell him they are well known in this community and cannot be accused of one act of dishonesty in any of their business operations, and this is the best guarantee the country can have for their political honesty. Those base insinuations are unworthy of men, and those who make them only injure themselves by so doing. Reference has been made to the increase of the public debt during the past year, but it should be remembered we have something to show for it; an estate in Lot One was purchased from the proprietor, and the new Post Office cost £8 000. If a man expends money and receives full value for it, he has merely to pay the interest for it he has lost nothing. If the debt of the Colony has increased £5 000 or £10 000 per year in actual improvements, the prosperity of the country is increased and the payment of the interest is scarcely felt at all. The same rule will apply to the purchase of the Model Farm. The hon. member for New London was a member of the committee appointed to value it and also to consider the advisability of removing the Asylum, and reported in favor of the purchase of the one and the removal of the other. If that farm is purchased the Colony will have full value for the money and will be no poorer than before. As that property will increase in value it will not be necessary to take all the money for the purchase of it out of the Treasury in one year. The amendment submitted by his honor the Leader of the Opposition was drawn up by a certain young legal gentleman who was employed by the opposition for that purpose the latter taking it for granted that a railway was to be constructed forthwith, brought in a resolution accordingly, and it turned out to be more strongly in favor of the construction of a railroad than the resolution submitted by myself, for it authorizes the Government to have a survey of the road made immediately. If the amendment could be passed by the House the Government would be justified in bringing in a Bill for the construction of a railroad from one end of the Island to the other. When the members on this side of the House stated that the cost should not exceed £5 000 per mile, the members of the opposition declare that it would cost £10 000 per mile, and they now wish to authorize the Government to make a survey for a road which, they state will cost the latter sum. If this House has no confidence in the honor and integrity of the Coalition they should not trust the Government in spending one shilling of the public money for any purpose whatever. It would not be safe to take the lowest tender, if it was from small contractors without sufficient security, for if the line were let out in small lots, and the contractors were unable to complete their work, and failed, it would have to be re-let at an extra cost. The better plan would be for the Government to receive all the offers they can get accompanied with good security, and if they can get it done for less than £5,000 per mile, with the required security, it will be their duty to accept the offer. The insinuation which has been thrown out that the Government would take the contract themselves at £5 000 per mile, if they were allowed to proceed with the matter, was unfair and illiberal in the extreme; if the members of the Government were all dishonest men it would be reasonable, but their characters are irreproachable both in their private and public capacity. The hon. member for New London stated that although the Government were to be bound by law not to let the contract for over £5 000 per mile they could enter into a contract for a larger amount, and then come down to the Legislature and ask it for an extra sum to pay the contractors to carry it out.

Hon. P. SINCLAIR.—I said that if the Government let the work to a company for £5 000 per mile, and the latter should happen to fail the Government might come to this House and ask for an extra amount to complete the work.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT.—The hon. member stated to me the other day that it was hard to carry the measure for the construction of a railway at present; but it would be harder if postponed until after the completion of a proper survey of the route and yet he calls loudly for a survey of the road before proceeding further. I am afraid party purposes are influencing him to a very large extent, and therefore I cannot give him credit for sincerity in agitating for a survey before undertaking the work. Experience always tells us that delays never benefit any undertaking. If the matter were delayed, it would only cause a waste of three or four thousand pounds more of the public money on our present road system, and we would be at least as far from partaking the advantages of a railway as before. Under the proposition which has been received by the Government, the Company would be obliged to make the survey themselves, as well as to build the road, and this would save an expenditure of three or four thousand pounds. According to the hon. members opinion, the making of a survey would only render the undertaking of the work more difficult; and we have proved that it would make it more expensive. The insinuations from the other side of the House about corruption come with very bad grace, for I can find plenty of it in the very members who make those charges.

Hon. Mr. DUNCAN.—The hon. member for New London made allusion to the money which will be expended in purchasing the Stock Farm; but I do not think that farm should be charged as an expense to the country, for it will bring its price at any time, if sold; and it will contribute towards paying the interest of the money. I would not pay the debt incurred in purchasing it at present, but would leave it for the succeeding generation which will reap the full benefit of it. The debt incurred in building of the new Post Office should also be paid by the next generation; the money spent on such works can scarcely be called a debt, for we shall have the full value of the money expended; all we should be required to pay for them is the interest of the money. All our surplus money should be spent upon our roads and bridges for the public welfare demands it

The Speaker took the Chair, progress was reported, and leave obtained to sit again.

Hon. Mr. PERRY presented a petition from Prince County respecting Jail Limits. Received, read, and laid on the table. Mr Richards obtained leave of absence till Tuesday next.

House adjourned till ten o'clock to-morrow.

I. C.

Georgetown Ferry.

House went into committee of the whole to take into consideration a petition praying for a Bill to amend the Act to procure a steamboat for the Georgetown Ferry, Mr. Richards in the Chair

Mr. MUNRO, after referring to the steps which had been taken to obtain a boat, and to the numerously signed petition which had been forwarded on the subject, said that the Act of last session granted a monopoly of seven years to any company which would place a boat on that ferry, and a grant of £200 per annum for five years The petitioners had asked for an extention of the term of license from seven to ten years. They did not, however, ask for any more money than had been provided last session; but as a boat suitable for the work would cost at least $2 000, and would not be used up in seven years, he hoped the committee would not object to extend the term to ten years. Especially as no party seemed willing to place a boat on that ferry under the conditions proposed, for a shorter term. He felt confident that such a boat would be a great advantage and accommodation to the public, and as he understood there was a gentleman prepared to place one upon that ferry if the term was extended, hoped the committee would accede to the request.

Mr. HOWAT thought if the extension of time asked for, meant, also, that the £200 a year was to be continued that many years longer, he would oppose it; but as it referred only to the extension of the term of license for the ferry, he would not oppose it.

Mr. PERRY thought where so much money was granted annually for such a service, and contracts given by the Government, which extended over so many years, care should be taken in framing such Bills. The contractors should to bound to serve the country faithfully otherwise they might hinder rather than facilitate the convenience of the travelling public.

After a few remarks from some hon. members Mr. Munro submitted the following resolution, which was reported agreed to:

"*Resolved*, that it is the opinion of the Committee that the seven years be extended to ten years as asked for in the petition for the Georgetown Steam ferry-boat, and that the first section of the Act 33nd. Vic. Cap. 7 be amended in accordance therewith."

House resumed. Resolution reported accordingly.

Hon. Mr. HOWAT obtained leave to present a petition from Patrick Hogan and others from Tignish against the construction of a Railroad.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN congratulated the hon. member on the honor done him by the petition. But thought he might have informed his hon. collegue or himself that such a document was in his possession. In looking over the petition he noticed however, that all the signatures were in the hand writing of three individuals, and the ages of some of the parties whose names he saw to it did not exceed eleven years.

Hon Mr. PERRY would also congratulate the hon member for Tryon in making the acquaintance of his new-found friends. Had such a petition been sent to him he certainly would have handed it over to the representative of the district, from whence they came In looking over it he did not hesitate to say that it bore unmistakeable evidence on its face of being the fabrication of a few restless individuals, and thought the action of the hon. member for Tryon was discourteous toward his hon. colleague and himself.

Mr HOWAT said he was sorry it had been sent to him, and had he thought of it, he would have handed it to one of the members for the District.

After a few more remarks from hon. Mr. Sinclair, Reilly and McMillan, the petition was received and allowed to be upon the table.

On motion of the Hon. Atty. General, a Bill to confer certain powers upon

Trustees and Executors,

was read a second time. The hon. member in moving the House into committee would merely observe that the intention of the Bill was to extend the powers of Trustees or Executors with respect to their powers as such. Frequently by the wills of those who empowered them to act as Trustees or Executors, they in investing money were restricted to one model of investment only who eas, if power was given by law to them they could invest to more advantage in Government securities. And the object of the Bill was to extend that power, in all cases, where the will of the deceased did not prohibit them from doing so. But not to allow them to interfere or cancel any direct and specific instruction contained in such wills. House then went into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. RIELLY did not know that such a Bill was called for, or that it would be proper to allow it to go through Committee. The Testator, he thought, was the person who knew best himself in what manner his money should be disposed of or appropriated; and he thought it was not right to attempt to interfere with the instructions contained in any mans will.

Hon. ATTY. GENERAL said the Bill did not contemplate allowing anything of the kind. There was a clause in it which met the objection of the hon. member for St. Peter's, and which would not allow monies thus to be disposed of, to be diverted from being invested as was originally intended, or contrary to the intention of the person who made the will. But suppose a man left his money to be invested during the minority of his children in lands, but did not prohibit the trustees or executors from investing in other securities, this Bill in such cases would make it lawful to invest in Government securities, but only where no prohibition was contained in the will.

Mr. REILLY.—Sometimes people were cut off without making a will. Now supposing such to be the case, and he had his money invested in good securities, would not this Bill allow the money to be called in and invested in some other way?

Hon ATTORNEY GENERAL.—When there was no will there were no Trustees unless provided for by deed. Supposing a Trustee by the words of the will was instructed to invest in real estate for the education of two children. As the Law then was, the Trustee would not allow him to do so in bonds or other government securities. The intention of this Bill therefore, was merely to allow a wider field for investment, when such was not prohibited by the Testator. But in all cases when the terms of the will were obligatory the Bill did not contemplate interfering.

Hon. Mr. SINCLAIR had no doubt but that Lawyers' understood those matters better than laymen did. He believed government securities were then about the best going, and as the explanations of the Hon Attorney General were satisfactory, he thought there was no good reason for opposing the Bill. After a few further remarks from Hon. D. Davies, Mr. Reilly and others, the Bill was reported agreed to without any amendments and ordered to be engrossed.

Union Bank Bill

was referred to committee of the whole house, A. C. McDonald in the Chair, and reported agreed to without any amendment and ordered to be engrossed.

House went into committee on the

Physicians and Surgeons Bill.

Mr. Munro in the chair.

Dr. ROBERTSON said the object of the Bill was to grant to some extent that protection to the medical profession which was enjoyed by them in the other provinces. It was well known that persons having no right to practice, made it a rule to come to this Island, and, while ignorant of a knowledge of either Medicine or Surgery, had the assurance to advertise themselves as graduates in both, imposed upon the public, and, he feared, did much injury to many persons who employed them. The intention of the Bill, therefore, was to give power to the Lieut. Governor in Council to appoint a Board of Examiners before whom all persons purposing practising medicine should be examined, if necessary. Gentlemen belonging to the profession who graduated in Great Britain or Ireland, or other countries in Europe; or in the cities of Boston, New York, or Philadelphia, in the United States, would merely be called upon to produce their Diplomas and record their names, while a few persons of character well known to the profession, if they came forward and underwent an examination, would obtain a License to practice, which would place them in a much better position than they were then in. As the law then was, if a person died under their hand they were liable to be indicted for murder; but, acting under a License from such a Board, they could only be prosecuted for mal-practice. Persons practising contrary to the Act, would be liable to a fine of £10 for the first offence, and £20 for the second.

Mr. HOOPER saw no necessity for such a Bill. Why, if a man set a limb for his neighbor he would be liable to a fine. It would entirely deprive the country of the services of skillful men and women, whose services could not well be dispensed with, and to whom the people in many parts of the country were under many obligations.

Hon. D. DAVIES said it could not be denied but that in Summerside and other parts of the country, there were persons who came there and, by advertisements and otherwise, frequently imposed upon the credulity of the people. Many of those who spent considerable money in obtaining a knowledge of the profession, and having established themselves in the country, did not wish to have their business broken in by unprincipled quacks. He did not think the Bill would apply to such cases as was alluded to by the hon. member for St. Peter's, (Mr. Hooper).

Mr. A. C. MCDONALD enquired why the Bill only contemplated allowing graduates from three of the Colleges in the United States to practice in this Island? There were Medical Colleges in some of the Western States. Why exclude graduates from thence? There were also many useful persons in the country whose services had been of much value to the country, and who, although they had no Diploma, ought not to be deprived from practising as they had hitherto been doing, for it could not be denied but that they possessed much skillful knowledge, from the benefits of which he would not wish to see the country deprived, especially as they were in some places wholly dependant upon them for medical assistance. By the Bill before them those persons would have their business broken into, and the Board of Examiners could deal with them as they saw fit. He would not, however, object giving power to a Medical Board to prevent in the future non-professional men coming to the country from practising.

Mr. MCMILLAN never had occasion to apply much to medical men for himself personally, but had for others, and regretted to say that his experience had not raised them in his estimation. Many of the so-called doctors had, to his own knowledge, been more successful than those who had diplomas. It was the duty of that Committee to see that no injustice was done to any party. He admitted that professional men were entitled to protection but the public required protection also, and hence a scale of fees should be annexed which would prevent exorbitant charges being made.

Mr. RICHARDS thought the Act proposed to be enacted too severe. There was a class of men in the country who gave much satisfaction to the public where they were employed, and who were in many instances more successful than those who boasted of having their diplomas. As he understood the Bill, such men could be fined if they attempted to continue those services hitherto rendered to parties who employed them. To this he was opposed.

Hon. Mr. MCEACHEN understood the Bill was intended to prevent persons from administering medicine who had not duly qualified themselves for so doing. He was therefore glad that such a measure was brought forward, and would heartily support it. Why should any man who choose to do so be permitted or allowed to deal out medicines as he pleased. It was time to preserve the lives of the people from such rascals. (Laughter). Human life was too valuable to be thus dealt with. As to setting a broken bone, or any act of kindness rendered in a case of emergency, the Bill was not intended to apply, but to those quacks, some of whom deserved to be hung.

Mr. MCNEILL said it was a difficult matter to deal satisfactorily with. Men who had diplomas were not those who always proved the most competent. (The hon. member then related an instance of a case which, in his own family, came into the hands of an Edinburgh graduate, who in his treatment of it proved himself as inefficient as possibly could be), and therefore he thought that the graduates, as well as non-professional men, should be brought under the control of the Board, and examined as to their practical knowledge.

Dr. ROBERTSON said a man might say he was a graduate from a certain College, but something further was required.

Hon. Mr. KELLY admitted the propriety of protecting the public from being imposed upon by unprincipled quacks, who were a really dangerous class, who pretended to a knowledge they were ignorant of, and in the practice of which, it was to be feared, did much evil. Yet he would guard against injuring those who, through kindness, or in cases of necessity rendered their services when required.

Mr. MCNEILL could assure the hon. member for Murray Harbor that the person to whom he referred had a diploma, and graduated in Edinburgh.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL understood that any person who had a diploma would merely have to produce it before the Board of Ex-