The Herald.

VOL. IV. CHARLOTTETOWN, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, APRIL 22, 1868. NO. 27.

THE HERALD

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY MORNING BY

EDWARD REILLY,

EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR,

at his Office, Queen Street.

TERMS FOR THE "HERALD."

For 1 year, paid in advance, £0 9 0

" " " half-yearly in advance, 0 10 0

Advertisements inserted at the usual rates.

JOB PRINTING

Of every description, performed with neatness and despatch and on moderate terms, at the HERALD Office.

ALMANACK FOR APRIL.

MOON'S PHASES.

Full Moon, 7th day, 3h. 4m., morn., S. W.
Last Quarter, 14th day, 6h. 22m., even., S.
New Moon, 22d day, 4h. 7m., even., S. W.
First Quarter, 29th day, 2h. 5m. even., N. W.

DAY MONTH	DAY WEEK.	SUN rises	SUN sets	High Water	Moon sets.	DAY'S LENGTH
		h m	h m	h m	h m	h m
1	Wednesday	5 41	6 24	4 49	2 8	12 43
2	Thursday	40	25	5 56	2 57	45
3	Friday	38	26	7 6	3 41	48
4	Saturday	36	27	8 14	4 18	51
5	Sunday	35	28	9 14	4 54	53
6	Monday	34	29	10 8	rises.	55
7	Tuesday	32	31	10 57	7 9	59
8	Wednesday	30	32	11 41	8 16	13 2
9	Thursday	28	33	even.	9 21	5
10	Friday	26	35	1 6	10 22	9
11	Saturday	25	36	1 50	11 20	11
12	Sunday	23	37	2 34	morn.	14
13	Monday	21	39	3 21	0 6	18
14	Tuesday	19	40	4 9	0 58	21
15	Wednesday	17	41	5 3	1 40	24
16	Thursday	16	43	5 58	2 17	26
17	Friday	14	44	5 56	2 51	30
18	Saturday	12	46	7 48	3 17	34
19	Sunday	10	47	8 41	3 50	39
20	Monday	8	49	9 26	4 18	41
21	Tuesday	7	50	10 12	4 49	43
22	Wednesday	5	52	10 56	set's	47
23	Thursday	3	53	11 56	7 52	50
24	Friday	1	55	morn.	8 51	54
25	Saturday	0	56	0 18	10 6	56
26	Sunday	4 59	57	1 3	11 9	58
27	Monday	57	58	1 52	11 59	14 1
28	Tuesday	56	59	2 44	morn.	3
29	Wednesday	55	7 0	3 38	0 57	5
30	Thursday	53	2	4 39	1 40	9

Prices Current.

CHARLOTTETOWN, April 17, 1868.

Provisions.	
Beef, (small) per lb.	5d to 10d
Do by the quarter.	5d to 8d
Pork, (carcass)	4d to 6d
Do (small)	5d to 7d
Mutton, per lb.,	5d to 9d
Lamb per lb,	4d to 5d
Veal, per lb .	3d to 5d
Ham, per lb.,	6d to 7d
Butter, (fresh)	1s 3d to 1s 5d
Do by the tub,	1s 2d to 1s 3d
Cheese, per lb.,	3d to 5d
Tallow, per lb.,	9d to 10d
Lard, per lb.,	8d to 10d
Flour, per lb.,	3½d to 3¾d
Oatmeal, per 100 lbs.,	21s to 23s
Eggs, per dozen,	9d to 10d
Grain.	
Barley, per bushel,	5s 6d to 6s 6d
Oats per do.,	3s to 3s 2d
Vegetables.	
Peas, per quart	
Potatoes, per bushel,	2s 9d to 2s 10d
Poultry.	
Geese,	2s 6d to 3s 6d
Turkeys, each,	4s to 7s 6d
Fowls, each,	1s to 1s 8d
Chickens per pair,	
Ducks,	1s 3d to 1s 6d
Fish.	
Codfish, per qtl.,	20s to 30s
Herrings, per barrel,	25s to 40s
Mackerel, per dozen,	
Lumber.	
Boards (Hemlock)	4s
Do (Spruce)	4s to 5s
Do (Pine)	7s to 9s
Shingles, per M	13s to 18s
Sundries.	
Hay, per ton,	80s to 90s
Straw, per cwt	2s
Timothy Seed,	15s to 18s
Clover Seed, per lb.,	1s 6d to 1s 8d
Homespun, per yard,	4s to 6s
Calfskins, per lb.,	6d to 9d
Hides, per lb.,	4d
Wool,	1s to 1s 4d
Sheepskins,	5s to 7s.
Apples, per doz.,	
Partridges,	

GEORGE LEWIS. Market Clerk.

A. HERMANS,

GUN-SMITH,

BELL-HANGER AND TIN-SMITH.

BEGS to inform his friends, and the public generally, that he has again commenced Busines on Dorchester Street, next door to the Reading Room Building, where he is prepared to execute all orders in his line with neatness and despatch.

ON HAND,

A neat assortment of Tinware, Kitchen Utensils, &c. &c.

including the patent BON TON COFFEE POT, which received the Gold Medal Prize, at the Paris Exposition of 1867. Also, BON TON LANTERNS, which will surpass everything in the Market, and suitable for either Farm use or on board Vessels.

A few WATER COOLERS on hand, which together with a large variety of other Stock will be sold cheap for Cash.

Mr. HERMANS is Agent for SAWYER'S CRYSTAL BLUE, a new, economical and superior article used in washing, whereby a saving of fifty per cent is guaranteed, and for which he begs to solicit the patronage of Laundry Maids, &c.

Ch'town, July 24, 1867. e

COTTON DUCK,

HAVING been appointed Agent for the sale of the celebrated

Russel's Mills Cotton Duck,

the Subscriber is prepared to receive orders for all the different Numbers, in quantities to suit purchasers.

I. C. HALL.

Charlottetown, May 22, 1867.

FAT HERRING

THE subscriber has for sale, 100 Bbls. Bay of Island FAT HERRING, (Cheap.)

L. C. OWEN.

Ch'town, March 4, 1868. pat

PACKET

BETWEEN

SOURIS & CHARLOTTETOWN.

—o—

THE FAST-SAILING and COMMODIOUS Schooner "A. R. McDONALD," will run between Souris & Charlottetown, calling at the intermediate ports, as soon as the navgaition permits.

DOMINICK DEAGLE, Master.

Januarry 29, 1868. 1 y

FREEHOLD PROPERTY FOR SALE!

THE Subscriber offers to sell, by Private Contract, the following Property, namely:

A SHOP, on Queen Street, at present in the occupation of Edward Reilly, Esq., and used as a Book-store and Printing Office.

A DWELLING HOUSE, on Pownal Street, occupied by Mrs. Sallenger as a Boarding-house.

A HOUSE, on King Street, in the rear of Mrs. Sallenger's, occupied by Mr. Dunn.

A DWELLING HOUSE, on the rear of Euston Street, occupied by Mr. Fitzgeral, pensioner.

Also—the DWELLING on Queen Street, occupied by the subscriber. HUGH MONAGHAN.

Ch'town, March 4, 1868. tf

LAND ASSESSMENT.

Treasurer's Office,

Charlottetown, P. E. I.,
25th January, 1868.

IN pursuance of an Act of the General Assembly of this Island, made and passed in the Twenty-fourth year of the reign of Her Majesty, Queen Victoria, intituled, "An Act relating to the Land Assessment at present imposed by Law on the Town and Royalty of Princetown," and also of an Act made and passed in the Twenty-seventh year of the same reign, intituled, "An Act to consolidate and amend the several Laws imposing an Assessment on all Lands in this Colony, and for the encouragement of Education," I do hereby give Public Notice that I have made proclamation according to the terms of the said Acts, of all the undermentioned Town Lots, Water Lots, Common Lots, Pasture Lots, Islands, or parts of Islands, Townships, or parts of Townships, in this Island, in arrear for the non-payment of the several sums due and owing thereon to Her Majesty, under and by virtue of the above mentioned Acts, viz:—

		Acres.			Acres.
Township No.	3	1014	Township No.	36	29½
"	5	542½	"	37	481
"	8	785	"	39	3110
"	11	1384	"	40	2129½
"	13	1863	"	41	2055½
"	15	95½	"	42	2684
"	16	3146½	"	43	3232½
"	17	353¾	"	46	2552½
"	18	166½	"	50	1805¾
"	19	380½	"	51	540½
"	20	900½	"	52	1027½
"	21	781	"	53	1278½
"	22	217	"	54	1722
"	23	1091	"	56	259½
"	24	258¾	"	58	468
"	25	415½	"	59	942¾
"	26	199½	"	60	2778½
"	27	890	"	61	2565½
"	29	1474	"	62	2220
"	31	278½	"	65	1393½
"	32	623	"	66	228
"	33	908¾	George's Island,		566
"	34	26½	Bunbury "		15
"	35	229½	Connelly "		60

First Hundred of Lots in Charlottetown:—three-eighths of No. 6, one-quarter of 7, one-quarter of 16, one-twelfth of 17, one-quarter of 22, one-quarter of 23, one-quarter of 24, one-quarter of 38, one-quarter of 42, seven-twentieths of 43, one-eighth of 44, one-quarter of 48, one-half of 65, one-eighth of 74, one-quarter of 78, one-half of 83, one-quarter of 90, 97, 98.

Second Hundred of Lots in Charlottetown:—five-eighths of No. 6, one-half of 7, one-quarter of 8, one-quarter of 14, one quarter of 18, one-quarter of 19, one-quarter of 20, one-quarter of 21, one-half of 26, one-half of 27, 31, one-half of 43, one-half of 44, one-quarter of 46, one-sixth of 51, three-eighths of 55, one-sixth of 59, one-sixth of 83.

Third hundred of Lots in Charlottetown:—five-twelfths of 21, five-twelfths of 22.

Fourth hundred of Lots in Charlottetown:—one-quarter of 6, one-half of 26, one-half of 29, one-half of 42, five-eighths of 43, one-quarter of 58, seven-twelfths of 59, 60, one-half of 61, one-quarter of 74, one-half of 82, 84, one-half of 85.

Fifth hundred of Lots in Charlottetown:—one-half of 11, one-quarter of 12, one-quarter of 13, one-half of 29, five-twelfths of 62, one-sixth of 73.

Lots in Charlottetown formerly occupied as the Barrack Square:—No. 1.

Water Lot, opposite to Town Lot No. 97, in the first hundred of Lots in Charlottetown.

Lots in the Common of Charlottetown:—one-third of 11, seven-twelfths of 18.

Pasture Lots in the Royalty of Charlottetown:—one-half of No. 23, 47, two-thirds of 28, 35, 39, 43, 44, 54, 63, 72, 145, 291, 297, 313, 339, 340, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 398, two-thirds of 399, two-thirds of 400, 401 402, 431, 499, 531, 538.

Town Lots in Georgetown:—No. 13, 1st range, letter A. One-half of No. 9, third range, letter A. No. 7, 4th range, letter A. No. 3, 4th range, letter D. No. 6, 3rd range, letter F. No. 2, 3, 13 & 15, 4th range, letter F. No. 11, 4th range, letter G.

Pasture Lots in the Royalty of Georgetown:—Nos. 165, 225, 309, 322.

Reserved Lands adjoining the Royalty of Georgetown:—235 acres.

Town Lots in Princetown:—No. 5, 1st row, 1st division, letter A. No. 3, 1st row, 2nd division, letter A. No. 3 & 8, 2nd row, 2nd division, letter B. No. 8, 2nd row, 3rd division, letter B. No. 6, 2nd row, 4th division, letter B. No. 3, 3rd row, 2nd division, letter C. No. 1, 4th row, 2nd division, letter D. No. 1, 2 & 3, 5th row, 2nd division, letter E. No. 3 & 4, 5th row, 6th division, letter E. Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 & 6.

Pasture Lots in the Royalty of Princetown:—Nos. 65, 175, 240, 459, and 460.

And the owners of the aforesaid Lots, parts of Lots and tracts of Land so in arrear, and proclaimed as aforesaid, are hereby notified that in case the sums charged on them as aforesaid, together with the costs which have been incurred, shall not be paid before the next Easter Term of the Supreme Court, which will commence on Tuesday, the fifth day of May next, application will be made to the Supreme Court during the said term for Judgment against the said Lots or tracts of Land respectively.

JAMES WARBURTON, Treasurer.

DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

(*Continued.*)

Hon. Mr. GORDON: I cannot see that there is any provision in the bill to prevent the plundering of wilderness lands. I observe that a question of a similar nature has been agitated in the Dominion of Canada, and I will read an extract from one of their public journals:—

"Thus far, we have discussed this question from a Revenue point of view only. We will now turn for a moment to the question of the value of our forests. Under a free grant system two evils would arise to the forests. First, speculators would go on the lands ostensibly to settle; but, in reality, to cut down and sell all the timber growing on them, and having accomplished that, they would go away. And, secondly, ignorant, careless or mischievous persons would go on the timber lands for the purpose of settlement, and would destroy valuable timber, not only on their own lots, but on neighboring lands, and thereby great loss of valuable public property would take place."

Now, our public lands have been purchased at a high rate, and I think it is just as necessary for us to preserve them from being plundered, as it is for the people of Canada to preserve theirs.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE: I fail to see how the timber can be valuable, as long as it is standing in the wilderness. It is only when it is cut down and converted into something else, that it is valuable, not while it is standing in the forest. A man will not be allowed to go indiscriminately and select the best timber land, but such tracts as will be open for settlement under this act.

Hon. Mr. LORD: This is a Government measure, and of course, I am prepared to support it, but at the same time, I do not hesitate to say that I do not exactly agree with all its provisions. I think it is just and right that the timber should be preserved. I know something about what has been done in cutting and plundering timber on public lands, as well as destroying the trees by taking off the bark. Thousands of pounds worth of public property has been destroyed in that way, and I believe there are many persons who will take 50 or 100 acres of land under this bill, without any intention of settling upon it. They may take the land in the fall, take £30 or £10 worth of timber off it during the winter, and then leave it. It is the duty of the Legislature to prevent anything of that kind. I agree with his honor who spoke last, that a poor man taking a farm, should have the benefit of the timber upon it; but the difficulty is to discriminate between the man who intends to settle upon the land, and the man who does not. The Canadian act is rather a strange one, but I believe a man is only allowed a free occupation for four years, and he is not allowed to cut more timber than he wants for his buildings. If the settler is a poor man, he is protected in this way: a creditor is not allowed to seize his land for twenty years. Neither is he allowed to take all his stock. I think he has to leave $500 worth. Perhaps that would be going too far here, but I think it is the duty of the Government to see that men are not allowed to destroy the property. I did expect to see a clause in the bill for that purpose. I do not approve of the wholesale destruction of Government property. I believe there is a great deal of timber taken off the Government lands in the western part of the Island, as well as at the eastward. In fact, Government property is considered by some parties to be free, and it will be plundered in spite of all the precautions we can take; but this bill is giving the poor man a great privilege; it is equal to making him a present of 100 acres of land. It is said that wood land is very valuable in some parts of the Island, and so it is. Near Charlottetown it is worth from £8 to £12 an acre, but it is not worth so much in the vicinity of Murray Harbor, and very valuable tracts will not be interfered with by this bill. I do not intend to oppose the measure, but I do not like to give a man the privilege of taking away property which does not belong to him.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE: I think his honor's fears are, to a great extent, chimerical. Suppose 5,000 acres are laid off in lots of 50, or 100 acres, that will not entitle a man to go and select a good piece of timber land whereever he pleases; but if a man chooses to settle upon a piece of land, he has a right to take what he can get off it. It is within my own knowledge, that parties from the neighborhood where I reside, went and selected a piece of land on the St. Peter's road where there was good timber. They cut and exported a large quantity of firewood, making a very eligible trade of it, and I am sure it was a very honest one. Indeed, I do not know any better purpose to which the timber could be applied. Firewood can be shipped to Newfoundland, and returns made in valuable commodities. If this bill would enable parties to go indiscriminately to cut timber where they please, I would be as much opposed to it as any of your honors; but the matter is left very much under the control of the Executive Council, and we are not bound to entertain every application for land. We can limit the applications to such parts as do not possess large quantities of valuable timber. Where there are valuable tracts, they can be reserved and offered under the provisions of the "Land Purchase Act;" therefore, I do not think this bill will have the effect of giving rise to wholesale plundering. If it is found to give rise to plundering, it will be as easy for the Government to take some measures to prevent it, as it is now to prevent it under the "Land Purchase Act." I once possessed some wilderness land, when shipbuilding was more common than it is now, and for a series of years I employed a wood-ranger, but I believe I might as well have kept anything else as a man for any benefit he was in preserving the timber. I afterwards adopted another plan, which was to charge stumpage, and that is a course which the Government can have recourse to. For these reasons, I do not think the bill is open to such serious objections as your honors suppose.

Hon. the PRESIDENT: His honor who has just spoken, admits that the Govment holds some valuable tracts of wilderness land, and if a man is allowed eight years free occupation, he may cut and export what timber he pleases; then he may leave the land when it will be almost valueless. It will not cost much to build a house twenty feet square, and perhaps cutting off the timber will be considered improving the land. For the benfit of the country, I think some provision should be made in the bill to guard against fraud of this kind as much as possible. In Canada they derive a large revenue from public lands, but it is not so here. Our public lands have been purchased at the expense of the Colony, and the timber upon them should be preserved as much as possible. I do not intend to oppose the bill, but I think it should be better guarded than it is.

Hon. Mr. BALDERSTON: The principal reason why new settlers often get on so slowly, is, that they have not the means of raising anything on their farms for their support; and if we give them the privilege of cutting and selling timber, they may earn something in that way in the winter, which will enable them to devote the summer to the improvement of their land. It has been said that they might take off the timber and leave the land comparatively valueless; but if a poor man takes a hundred acres of good hardwood land, it will take him more than eight years to take all the timber off. Then if he were required to improve two acres a year, that would be a sufficient guarantee that the Government would be able to sell it for more than when the wood was upon it.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL: I apprehend that the object of the bill is to encourage the settlement of the land, and it is not to be supposed that men would be induced to settle upon it, if you impose unreasonable restrictions upon them, and, therefore, the object of the bill will be defeated. I am willing that the settler should be required to cultivate one acre a year, instead of improve it, as the bill states. Perhaps cutting down the wood would be considered improving the land, but he should put some crop in it. Then, if a poor man has to pay the land tax, to build a house and to cultivate one acre a year, I think that is quite enough, without restricting him in the use of the timber. It will only be inferior tracts of land that will be offered under the provisions of this bill, and what is the use of the Government having large tracts without any person settling upon them.

Hon. Mr. LORD: I do not think there is any necessity to bind a poor man to clear the land, for if he intends to remain upon it, he will have to clear it for his own benefit, and, therefore, I think it is quite enough to say, he must improve one acre. What I object to, is, that parties will be allowed to take the timber off the land without giving value for it, and then leave it.

Hon. Mr. BEER: The best guarantee that the settler would leave value for the timber taken off, would be to require him to cultivate two acres a year. Then he would find he had something else to do than cutting away the timber. If that were done, at the end of eight years there would be sixteen acres clear, so that if it should be thrown on the hands of the Government, they would be able to sell it without any difficulty. The settler must have the privilege of cutting the timber, or he cannot live on the land. I am willing to do anything reasonable to encourage the settlement of the wilderness lands, and to induce our young men to remain on the Island.

Hon. Mr. WALKER: I do not agree with his honor who has just spoken. The fact is, that any man taking a wilderness farm has a hard task before him. The labor of clearing land in this country is almost incalculable, and there are many disadvantages. Where is a man to raise hay? Some years must elapse before he can raise any quantity, and without hay he cannot keep horses. It is a mere fallacy to suppose that land is so easily cleared in Prince Edwasd Island. Most young men would rather go fishing, or they will go to Cape Breton, where they can get land very cheap, and it is much easier cleared.

Hon. the PRESIDENT: Perhaps one acre a year is as much as we should insist upon being improved. There is a good deal of labor in putting crop in one acre among the stumps, where the land has to be burned and hoed. Any man settling upon the land will clear as much as he can, and perhaps one acre a year is as much as we should insist upon.

Hon. Mr. PALMER: I am not changed in my opinion, for I think it is our duty, irrespective of whether it is a liberal or illiberal measure, to guard against a fraud upon the public, and as the bill is now, they are liable to have fraud practised upon them. The bill will apply, not only to lands now held by the Government, but to others which may yet be purchased, and more may be purchased before the year is out. I conceive that there is nothing to prevent parties from plundering those lands. Suppose five persons should club together and select a good tract of timber land; then they straggle, one at a time, to the office of the Commissioner, and get 500 acres all in one block. They have to put up a little house equal to 20 feet square on each hundred acres, which can be built for £25, or £125 for the five. Then they have to cut down an acre on each hundred, which can be done at £3, making £15 for the five acres. Thus, they will get possession of 500 acres at a cost of £140, and then they may turn round and laugh at the Government, who cannot have any recourse upon them, while they sweep the timber off the whole block, which may be worth £1000. Twenty miles is considered now-a-days no great distance to draw valuable timber. They may employ as many teams as they please, and how is the Government to prevent it? It is no use saying we can adopt the same course as under the Land Purchase Bill—that we can employ wood-rangers—for it is not the unlet wilderness land that we are considering, but what will be taken possession of under the provisions of this bill. A precautionary measure is demanded, and we would be negligent of our duty if we did not endeavor to prevent such results as I have anticipated. We see that in Canada they find it necessary to use precautions against the destruction of timber on public lands, and I do not see why we cannot and should not do the same.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE: I cannot but admire the great zeal of his honor from the city, who has just spoken, least the colony should suffer loss by the cutting of timber on wilderness lands, but the case which he has supposed is only imaginary, and is not at all likely to occur. He says that more land may be purchased by the Government, but even if that should be the case, it will not be immediately offered for settlement under the terms of this bill. If it is found to possess great intrinsic value, that great value will urge people to offer higher prices for it. The lands offered under the provisions of this bill will be limited, and we can reject applications which we do not consider eligible. He says five men might club together and select a good tract of land—that they might apply to the Commissioner of public lands, comply with the terms and get possession of it—then strip it of £1000 worth of timber, but if such valuable land existed, it would be disposed of under different terms. If his honor thinks there is such danger of having the land plundered, I would like to hear him suggest some amendment to the bill. For my part I have very little fear of anything of that kind; and if a man settles on this wilderness land, he has a right to the privilege of selling the timber off it. It should be his own property and for his own benefit.

Hon. Mr. LORD: I think his honor who spoke last is under a mistake. He says the wilderness land will not be offered under this bill indiscriminately; but I understand that the whole of the land in the possession of the Government will be offered.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE: No, only such parts as the Government think fit to offer.

Hon. Mr. LORD: Well, even so, how are you to discriminate? When a man applies for a piece of land, are you to say, "We will not give to you." It will be left in the hands of the Land Commissioner; it will be his duty to lay off the land in tracts of 50 or 100 acres. If you interfere with him, he will, perhaps, snub you, and quite right he would be in doing so. I believe the bill is a suggestion of that gentleman. I do not take any credit for it as a member of the Government. I hope the young men of the country will be induced to take up and occupy those lands, but I doubt very much if they will do so. I know something about clearing land, and it is dearly bought when a man clears it. However, I am prepared to support the bill as it stands, but there should be some way to prevent the land from being plundered.

Hon. the PRESIDENT: His honor from the second district of Queen's County, (Mr. Haythorne), wishes to insinuate that those who spoke against some of the provisions of this bill, would restrict a man in taking timber off his own farm, but it should be remembered that the farm will not belong to the settler till the end of seven years, and not even then, if he does not comply with the conditions on which he obtained his occupation. If the settler paid a certain amount on getting possession of the land, he would feel a greater interest in it, but all he will be required to do will be to clear one acre a year, and build a small house.

Hon. Mr. WALKER: If a man is to be restricted in taking timber off his farm, the probability is, that the land will not be taken at all; therefore, I would rather leave the bill as it is.

Hon. Mr. BALDERSTON: I think a young man going into the woods to settle, can very easily clear two acres a year, and if he is not prepared to do that, it would be better for him to go fishing, or something else. I think there is very little danger of five persons taking £1,000 worth of timber off a piece of land, as his honor from the City said, but if a man gets possession of a tract of land it will be very little use to restrict him in the use of the timber, for he will take it. If he has honesty enough to keep off adjoining lands, that is as much as need be expected.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL: I think there are plenty of restrictions upon a young man taking a wilderness farm, and I would be sorry to see any more imposed upon him. You must give a man an opportunity to live, and he cannot live on a farm without clearing and cultivating it, neither can he clear it without cutting the timber. I am, therefore, prepared to support the bill as it is.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD: Some of your honors have been speaking on the assumption that a man will take 100 acres of land for the purpose of plundering it; but I do not think there will be much chance for a man to get a large tract of land with valuable timber upon it, under the provisions of this bill, and even if it were the case, the very fact of the timber being cut down would make it of more value to a man who would take it for the purpose of settling upon and cultivating it. I believe it costs about 20s. an acre to cut down the trees, and therefore, the Government would have no difficulty in selling land on which the timber had been cut down. The fact of the land being laid off in tracts of 50 and 100 acres goes to show, that if one individual should take a farm for the purpose of plundering it, and his neighbor takes another for the purpose of settling upon it, the one would be ready to take up the land which the other had plundered and left; or if he would not, there would be plenty others who would be willing to take a farm in the midst of a settlement. We know that Government lands are sold in the neighboring provinces, as well as in the United States, at a much lower rate. In Nova Scotia they are let at a merely nominal price, and if they were let here on more favorable terms, I believe there are many persons in poor circumstances who would settle upon them. Those inclined to plunder the timber have a much better opportunity of doing so now where there are large tracts unsettled, than they will have when they are laid off in farms and some of them settled upon. It would be the interest of those settlers to see that those lands were not taken for the purpose of plundering them. I am not inclined to make it compulsory upon the settler to clear two acres a year, for I think one is quite enough. It will be optional with him to clear as many as he likes.

Hon. Mr BEER submitted an amendment, seconded by the Hon. Mr. Balderston, to make it compulsory upon the settler to clear two acres a year instead of one, as proposed by the bill, which was disagreed to by the Committee.

The House was then resumed and progress reported.

SMALL DEBT COURT—PETITION.

Hon. Mr. Muirhead presented a petition of certain inhabitants of Egmont Bay and vicinity, praying for the establishment of a Small Debt Court in that locality, which was received and read.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD said he thought it was a great blessing to the people in that section of Prince County to be so distant from a Small Debt Court. He believed the nearer people were to a court, the more litigation there would be, and if a court were held every day, the business would be increased in a corresponding ratio.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL said he was glad to hear such views expressed by his honor from Georgetown, and he hoped he would bring in a bill for holding the Small Debt Courts quarterly, instead of monthly.

Hon. Mr. LORD could not coincide with is honor from Georgetown, though he had no doubt but his views were borne out by his experience in the town where he resided. He thought the petitioners were entitled to have a court where they desired it. Unfortunately, many of the people in that locality were in poor circumstances, and had a practice of running small accounts in stores, to settle which, they were often taken to Summerside, or somewhere else, and if they had a court nearer home it would cost them less money.

Hon. Mr. PALMER remarked that he had not much faith in the virtue of petitions respecting Small Debt Courts, for he remembered that, a few years ago,

(*Continued on fourth page*