THURSDAY, February 12, 1852.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

Fish Bounties.—The Hon. the Colonial Secretary presented a Petition from Martin Collins, of St. Peter's, fisherman, setting forth, "That in the summer and fall season of the past year he prosecuted the Mackerel Fishery on the Northern coast of the Island, having cleared at the Customs for the purpose on or about the 11th July: That his vessel of eighty tons, which was built for the purpose, was launched, on or about the 25th day of April, but, being unable to procure the necessary general supplies here, he had proceeded to Boston to procure them; and that though every exertion had been used, by him, to expedite his return to the Island, he was not able to accomplish it, until the time was passed, when, according to the Act, he should have commenced his voyage, in order to have a legal right to the bounty: That he had, nevertheless, immediately commenced a fishing voyage, and continued actively engaged therein for a period of four months: That although he is sensible he is not in a position to say that he has literally complied with the terms of the Act for the Encouragement of the Fisheries, he trusts the House, having a regard to the facts, will consider that he has substantially conformed to the spirit and essence of its provisions, and see fit to extend to him, the benefits contemplated to be conferred on the labour and enterprise of persons, who should engage in the fisheries, after the passing of the said Act."

The statement made in the Petition, is supported by an affidavit of the Petitioner.

The Hon. Mr. Coles presented two Petitions of a similar nature; one from John McLeod, senior, and John McLeod, junior, of New London; accompanied by a certificate of the declaration of the Petitioners, to the effect, that their vessel was fully equipped, manned, and victualled, and that they had prosecuted their voyage without deviation by freighting, and that they had caught on the said voyage, about one hundred quintals of Codfish, and ten barrels of Mackerel; a second from Donald Morrison, of New London, merchant, setting forth, that on the eigth day of July last, the Petitioner fitted out a vessel expressly for the Cod and Mackerel fisheries, agreeably to Collector McNutt's fishing pass hereunto attached: That he remained on the fishing ground till the twenty-first day of October, when she came into port and entered the cargo of fish, consisting in part of 125½ barrels of mackerel, which were cleared for Halifax, with 96 quintals of Codfish, according to the Naval Officer's certificate attached: That his vessel would have been on the fishing ground on the date prescribed by the Statute, but salt, barrels, &c., could not be obtained in New London, and had to be procured from Halifax, which occasioned the delay; That he is of opinion that he had complied with the essentials and spirit of the Act, but, although his vessel was on the fishing ground for three and a half months, as the dates were not identical with the provisions of the Act, the Governor in Council declined granting a warrant for the amount of Bounties to which he considers himself entitled. His remarks, it would be observed, were directed only against the claim for tonnage bounty: the requisite quantity of fish having been caught by him, the Petitioner (Mr. Morrison) was entitled to the Bounty.

MR. MOONEY. He would oppose the Petition, on the ground, that having made a law, they were bound to carry it out. There were many petitions of the same kind; but the House could not entertain them without setting aside the law. It had, heretofore, been the practice for parties to apply to the House for grants; and, if they had a friend or two in it, they would drum up recruits, and carry the day. Was that fair legislation? It was not. When they passed a law, he would wish it to be carried out. It was his duty, as a representative of the people, to know no man who petitioned the House, unless his application was founded in justice.

The Hon. the Colonial Secretary having moved for the appointment of a Committee to whom should be referred all such Petitions, that they might report thereon to the House, a short discussion ensued, touching the propriety of the House's entertaining any Petitions of the kind.

HON. MR. POPE was decidedly of opinion, that it would be best to shut the door at once against the admission of any such demands. The Government, said the hon. member, had spared no pains to enquire fully into the nature of the claims for bounty which had been preferred to them, and they had allowed it in every case in which it seemed to be fairly due. They had no desire to repudiate fair claims. But, for himself, he would protest against the reception of such Petitions, as those which had just been read. Unless they meant to set aside the Law altogether, how could they consent to entertain Petitions for bounty, when the Petitioners themselves declared they had not so complied with the provisions of the Law, as to be legally entitled to what they petitioned for. He sincerely wished well to the fisheries, and was willing to go all reasonable and just lengths for their encouragement; but when the Legislature had just passed a Law in which rules were laid down for the guidance of those who embarked in them, with a view to obtaining the bounty provided by that Law, it was imperative, not only upon the Government, but the House, to grant no bounties, save to those who had complied with the rules so laid down. If those who had not complied with these rules, were to have the bounty awarded to them, it would create much dissatisfaction amongst those who had obtained it only through their observance of the Law. The bounty ought to be allowed only in such cases as it could be awarded by a fair interpretation of the law. The amount of bounty already given was nearly equal to the value of all the fish that had been taken; and, where hundreds had been required, on account of the last season, thousands would be required for the next. But, should such Petitions as those which had just been presented, be entertained, they might, next year, expect to have presented so large a number of similar ones, that were they even to direct the Public Treasury should be thrown open to the Petitioners without reserve, it would be insufficient to satisfy them. With respect to Collins, the hon. member observed, that although, according to his own shewing, he had no claims to the tonnage bounty, and ought not to receive it; his title to the premium on his catch had been allowed.

The object of the House, in passing the Bill, had been the promotion of the general good, by the encouragement of our fisheries; but that object would be lost sight of, should they allow bounties or premiums to any who were not legally entitled to them, by having complied with all the provisions of the Act. The bounties came out of the pockets of the farmers; and they could receive nothing in return, unless the fisheries should be both extensively and successfully prosecuted; and, to that end, they who purposed to engage in them should be made positively to understand that their claim to the bounty, and chance of success in the business, would depend altogether upon their entering upon it, and faithfully prosecuting it according to the law.

MR. LAIRD. If such Petitions were to meet with the favorable consideration of the House, they might as well say at once that all who applied for the bounty should receive it.

MR. PALMER. They had passed a law for the encouragement of the Fisheries, and that law clearly pointed out, to all who wished to entitle themselves to the bounty provided by it, when they were to commence their fishing voyage, how they were to be provided for it, and how long they were to prosecute it. Was that law to be observed, or was it not? If it was, it was surely very improper that either the Government or individuals should be allowed to prefer Petitions, to that House, for the allowance of the bounty to those who had failed to entitle themselves to it by a compliance with the law.

HON. MR. WARBURTON replied to the observations of the hon. and learned member of Charlottetown, that hon. members frequently felt it to be their duty to present Petitions, although they were not prepared to support the prayers of them. It was his opinion, with respect to such Petitions for the tonnage bounty as he expected would come before the House, that some of the Petitioners, even although they had not been able to comply with the strict letter of the law, were yet fairly entitled to the bounty, whilst others of them had no just claims whatever to it: and the best way of dealing with them all, he thought, would be to refer them to the consideration of a Committee, to be reported upon according to their different merits. It would surely be a better way than for the House to waste their time in a discussion concerning the merits of every such not only in support of Collins's Petition, but also in favor of all who had fitted out vessels, as prescribed by the Act, with the *bona fide* intention of prosecuting the fisheries, and who had actually done so for the period specified by the Law, although, they had not been able to clear out on the appointed day. These two hon. members maintained that the claim of Collins was a fair one. He had, they said, built a good vessel expressly for the purpose of fishing, and had successfully prosecuted a voyage for the prescribed period. He was a fisherman who understood his business, observed Mr. Davies, and he had gone to Boston to fit out in the same way as the American fishermen, and the success which had attended his prosecution of the voyage, was a proof that all that was wanted to secure the prosperity of our fisheries was that they should be prosecuted in suitable vessels, properly fitted out, by men acquainted with the business. Mr. Thornton observed that the bounty of a few shillings per ton was as a matter of mere moonshine compared with the benefit conferred upon the country by the prosecution of the fisheries. The law was a new one, and, for the first year, they ought not to be too rigorous in the interpretation of it. It had not been promulgated in sufficient time to afford all a fair chance of complying with the very letter of it. They had not always adhered to the literal interpretation of such laws, as witness that for the encouragement of the seal fishery, as also that to encourage the export trade in Codfish to the West Indies; and it would be unwise and unjust to do so now, if they really wished to encourage the fisheries, as they all professed they did.

MR. CLARK believed that some who had exactly complied with the law, might have very strong claims; but where parties had fitted out their vessels with a double intention of first securing freights and then trying the fishing, they could have none. If the House, this Session, entertained the Petitions of parties who were not legally entitled to the bounty, they would, next year, be in a manner flooded by such applications. He would vote against such Petitions altogether.

HON. MR. COLES. There was a difference between not complying with the very letter of the law, and an actual violation of the law. Parties who had obtained fishing passes, whose vessels were properly equipped and manned, who had actually cleared out before the Officers had received their instructions under the new law, and who had prosecuted their fishing voyages for the time prescribed, were, in his opinion entitled to favorable consideration. But the case was different with those who had taken freight, under pretence of procuring supplies either in the United States or at Halifax, and who had not commenced the prosecution of their fishing voyages, until a fortnight or a month after the appointed day. By such delay, the Island was a loser, as respected the quantity of fish taken by them, which could not be so great as if they had commenced at the appointed time, and continued fishing during the prescribed period. If the bounty should now be granted to such parties as had not commenced fishing until a month after the appointed time, the number of such irregular claimants would be greatly increased next year. They must convince them that to succeed they must be out in time. The Act has been passed for three years, and they who were not prepared in time last year, and who have consequently missed the bounty, will most likely take care to secure it by timely preparation and action in each of the next two years. He would not object to the appointment of a Committee by whose consideration of the Petitions and their report concerning them, the House might be informed which were, and which were not, entitled to their favorable consideration.

MR. MCNEILL said, when the Bill for the Encouragement of the Cod and Mackerel Fisheries was before the House last year, he opposed it, because he thought the bounty policy a bad one. The Bill, however, passed into a Law; and, that being the case, parties, both within and out of that House, should be governed by it; but, to entertain Petitions for the tonnage bounty, from individuals who were not legally entitled to it, would be for the House itself to set aside the law.

MR. FRASER would not object to the appointment of a Committee, but he would object to the prayer of Collins's Petition, because his not having commenced his fishing voyage at the appointed time, was owing to his having gone a trading; and he would oppose the allowance of the bounty to any who applied for it under similar circumstances. Mr. Yeo said, if they were to entertain the Petitions of such parties as had not commenced their voyages until a fortnight, three weeks, or a month after the time appointed, it might appear that they were in some measure pursuing an example set forth in the Scriptures, by admitting parties at the ninth and tenth hours; but it did not seem to him a right way of doing business.

The question was then put on the Hon. Mr. Warburton's motion, and the same having been agreed to,—Hon. Mr. Warburton, Mr. Thornton, Mr. Montgomery, Hon. Mr. Jardine, and Mr. Beaton were appointed a Committee accordingly.

The Bill for the Incorporation of the Sons of Temperance was read a second time, committed, and reported agreed to.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

HOUSE IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

ROAD SERVICE.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN submitted the following Resolution, and in doing so, he observed, that there was still due on Notes of Hand, given to Road Commissioners for seed grain, &c., in the years '47, '48, and '49 a very large sum, amounting he believed, to £3000 or £4000; for the recovery of which, there appeared to be no means but the acceptance of work on roads and bridges, by which amount, or at least, by so much of it as could be made available, it was proposed the specified grant for the road-service, should be increased.

Resolved, That the sum of Two thousand Five hundred pounds be granted for the Service of the Roads and Wharfs for the present year, in addition to the amounts which may be realized in labour on the several Promissory Notes due to the Government by destitute settlers for seed grain, &c.

Hon. Mr. COLES. He presumed, the honorable member who had submitted the Resolution, contemplated an additional grant of £100 for Charlottetown Royalty. He was truly surprised at the large amount still due for seed grain and meal, and he was of opinion, that the best way of recovering it, would be to take it in work upon roads and bridges, on liberal terms; say at 5s. a day, or otherwise on contracts There were now thirty-one Road Commissioners, and with respect to these outstanding debts, he thought, the best plan would be to give to each Commissioner, all the unsettled Notes of Hand, given by individuals in his district or neighbourhood, with instructions to take work in payment of them on liberal terms. There was, he believed, an inclination on the part of the people to pay; but it was utterly impossible, as respected the majority, to raise money for the purpose; however, should they be allowed to give work in payment as he proposed, the principal part of the amount due, would, he thought, be recovered. It might, by some, be objected to his proposal, that any work so taken in payment would be very apt to be slighted, but he would remind such honorable members, that the Commissioners were not now as formerly remunerated by a commission of 5 per cent. on the amount expended, but were properly paid for their services. Formerly on a contract, say of £20, which required a week for its completion, a Commissioner received no more than 20s., although he spent nearly a whole week in superintending the work. The effect of the new system would be, to secure a faithful performance of labour and contracts. He would propose, that the whole amount of the grant for the Road Service, should be £2750, over and above all that might be recovered on the Notes of Hand.

Mr. WIGHTMAN, The sum proposed by the Resolution, was entirely too little. Much more was required for the internal improvements of the country. As to looking for the realization of any thing of consequence on the Notes of Hand, either in the shape of Money or of Labour, without litigation; the Hon. Mr. Coles, must know as well as himself, that it would be useless. At the best, in any way, the Notes of Hand would be found to be next to valueless. The grant for the Road Service ought to be £4000 at the least.

Hon. Mr. POPE maintained, that the roads generally were in very good order, and that the House could, with propriety, economise with respect to that service. The ordinary grant—on an average about £3000 a year—would, he was persuaded, be found quite sufficient. With respect to the Notes of Hand, an idea had he believed, got abroad, that the amount due on them would never be called for; but if orders should be given for its collection, he was opinion, a very considerable sum would be received. The whole amount due, he thought, might be about £4000 or £5000; and if the list were looked over, it would be found, that many could afford to pay.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN. The amount proposed was a very liberal one—£2500 in cash, besides what could be recovered on the Notes of Hand. Should the amount recovered on the Notes of Hand amount to only £1000—a fourth or fifth of the amount due—they would have £3500. Under all circumstances, the proposed sum was as liberal as any honorable member could reasonably desire.

Mr. DOUSE. The Notes of Hand were worth nothing—not worth the trouble of looking after. And did not that speak volumes? What could be more absurd than to propose an additional land tax, when on all hands, it was admitted, that the poverty of the people generally was so great, that it would be the extreme of folly to look to them for the payment of the Notes of Hand which they gave for seed grain, &c., in '47, '48, '49? The grant proposed was far from being sufficient: there were considerable sums due on account of contracts performed on Wharfs and Bridges; and nothing but statute labour had been expended on the roads last year.

Mr. PALMER. He had expected, that now Responsible Government was established, the members of our local Administration would, in all their proceedings, copy the practice of Great Britain; for the country had long been assured, that that would be the case, when once the Responsible System should be conceded to the Colony. He had therefore, expected, that at the opening of the Committee of Supply, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have stood up in his place, and have stated, what amount of Revenue was required for the contemplated expenditure of the year, and what amount of taxes would have to be raised to secure the requisite revenue. He had expected, that he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) would have shown the Committee how much could be raised from such and such sources of revenue, and have given good reason why no more could be realized, before they proposed such a very inadequate sum for Roads and Bridges, as that named in the Resolution just read. Before the reign of Responsibility commenced, the "Liberals" could never raise the Road Service vote high enough for their liking; their cry was then, "Oh, it's not enough—it's the People's money, and the only way they get any benefit by it, let it be increased,"—such was their cry, when the country was deeply in debt and the Revenue faling off—and financial prospects bad; but now, liberality and Liberals seemed to be quite different in their signification. Should no larger amount be granted, than that proposed by the Resolution, the cry throughout the country would be, that it was not enough. The money granted for the Road Service, was all that returned to the people out of the taxes paid by them; the amount in the Resolution under present prospects as painted by the Liberals, should be doubled. Even when the revenue was small, a very liberal grant was always made for the Road Service; and now when they were told by way of a flourish, that the Colony was in a state of financial prosperity, its credit good, and its revenue increasing, were the people to be put off with the paltry sum of £2700 for Roads and Bridges? It was not enough, and the people would not be satisfied with it. It was known too, and admitted by all, that the Statute Labour System did not work well. It was true, there were more Road Commissioners than formerly; but there was no improvement in the working of the system; the labour was, every where, more or less slighted or evaded. The people, themselves, saw that it would be much better, and operate more equally and justly, even should the whole amount annually required for the Road Service, be taken out of the Revenue, than that the service should be provided for by a direct labour tax, falling so inequitably as it now does on the poor; and he expected, that unless some miraculous improvement should take place in the working of the present system, the Legislature would soon be driven to confess, that it would be much better to provide for the whole of that Service out of the general Revenue, than partly by grants and partly by labour, as at present, even if to meet it, they should be obliged to increase the *ad valorem* duty. The poor man, were this the case, would pay no more than the amount of the indirect tax included in what he paid on his limited expenditure, for the dutiable articles consumed by him; and the rich man who might consume to the amount of £400 or £500 a year, of such articles, would be compelled to contribute in proportion to the amount of his consumption. So long, however, as the House should not feel disposed to adopt that system, the only course left them to approach towards it would be, to grant a large sum out of the revenue, whether on the increase or not. But, until it should be demonstrated to the Committee, by some calculation from Government members, what the revenue and what the expenditure of the year were expected to be, and that a large sum could not be granted, he would vote for an increase; and if the country was really as flourishing as they were told it was, a sum, very much larger than that proposed, might surely be allowed.

Hon. Mr. WARBURTON. He disagreed altogether with what had fallen from the hon. member for Charlottetown, who seemed to desire that a large amount should be annually granted and expended upon the roads, whether required for the repairs of them or not. In urging the Committee to agree to a larger grant, the honorable and learned member appeared to have forgotten, what would be required for the payment of the Fish Bounties. A very large sum would be required to pay the tonnage bounties—perhaps thousands. The sum proposed to be granted for roads and bridges, was quite sufficient, and quite as much as, with a due regard to economy, the Government could propose, or the House agree to give.

Hon. Mr. POPE. The Government could very well afford to bear the taunts and jeers of the honorable member for Charlottetown; they could well afford to give him full scope, and laugh at him, when he had done. The present Government, in the space of two years, which had elapsed since the General Election, had done more for the country, than any Government that had ever preceded it. They had reduced the Colonial Debt £11,000, and they had effected a saving equivalent to £700 per annum, without any material increase of the Revenue being available. The honorable member for Charlottetown seemed to think that, because the Government had proposed a tax for the support of schools, the country had a right to expect, that a large amount should be granted for the Road Service. But all knew, that if money was to be spent, it must be raised. It became the Government to set an example of economy, and if they did so, and persevered in so doing, they would soon pay off the balance of the Colonial Debt, and establish the credit of the Colony on a firmer basis, than it had ever yet heretofore stood. But should the House choose to pursue an opposite course, the Government could not prevent their doing so. The Government had done their duty by proposing the lesser sum; and must leave the issue with the House. But he maintained, that under the present system of management, more could be done with £2,500 than with twice the sum formerly. When Treasury Warrants were presented, it was now no longer, "Call again to-morrow." The holders of such Warrants were now no longer obliged to submit to usurious discounts, and to take half their amount in goods. Now no one had to call twice; the money was there; and the warrants were cashed as soon as they were presented. Much general good was effected by this system; contracts were taken on lower terms, and the outlay was greatly diminished. He was sorry to hear one of the honorable members for Princetown, (Mr. Clark) say the sum proposed was not enough; but his wanting £100 or £150 for the building of a Wharf, might be sufficient to account for his doing so. The honorable and learned member for Charlottetown had told them, that in the British Parliament it was the practice of the Government, first to propose the taxes and then to propose the expenditure; he, (Mr. Pope) however, thought the reverse was the practice, that the Government shewed, what would be the nature and probable extent of the expenditure, and then developed their scheme of taxation. An increased expenditure could only be sustained by increased taxation; and nine-tenths of the people were opposed to any increase in the taxation of land. To propose an increase of the appropriation for roads and bridges, on the plea, that the money would go into the pockets of the people, was to propose an increase of the expenditure under a false pretence; for it was very well known that, of the moneys so expended, very little found its way, at any time, into the pockets of the people: the individuals whom it directly benefited were country dealers, and, in most cases, the people who did the work were ill rewarded for their time and labour. The Government had nothing to fear from the people, through any dissatisfaction which might arise amongst them, on account of a limited grant for the road service; but, on the contrary, their desire to economise would be their best recommendation to the people. If the Government seriously set about the introduction of economy in the public expenditure, and steadily pursue it, they will be upheld by the people. It ought to be remembered that the increase of the revenue last year was only £150, and that the amount which would be required this year to meet the claims of the Fish Bounties, might very probably be set down as high as £2,000; although, as there were no data for calculation, that would be mere conjecture. £7,000, besides, would be required in aid of the education scheme; and it was quite clear, that if the House should consent to increase the appropriation for roads and bridges, they would be entering upon a course, the direct tendency of which would be to plunge the Colony back into the financial difficulties from which it was just emerging.

Hon. Mr. WARBURTON. He did not think the sum proposed was quite sufficient. He was most friendly to economy; but still he thought they might, without extravagance, give £500 more than the sum proposed by the resolution. He would be glad to vote £4,000 or £5,000, if the revenue could afford it. He could not, however, shut his eyes against the necessity of economy, when he considered the large demands which would be made upon the public Treasury.

Hon. Mr. COLES. It was the first time he had ever found the minority in favour of a larger sum than that proposed by the majority; and he fancied it would be accounted a very strange occurrence in the British House of Commons, should the minority propose to increase the amount of expenditure contemplated by the Government. Should an increase of the expenditure, in accordance with the demands of the minority, create dissatisfaction among the people, he did not suppose the minority would be very ready to bear the blame. He would not, for one, however, object to an additional £500, if it could be fairly shewn, that it was required by the country. Such was the good state of the roads, however, last year, that the Commissioners were greatly puzzled to know how to expend the money and labour at their disposal, upon them. In order to find work, they had caused men needlessly to break up the roads and turn up sods to throw upon them, and the consequence was, that they left the roads worse than they found them. In the neighbourhood of Charlottetown, it was true, that the roads were bad; but in the country districts they were good. It was quite a mistake to suppose, that they were bad in consequence of no appropriations having been made for their repairs in 1850. The rains which fell had washed off all loose materials which had lain upon their surface, and they were left firm and good. All that was required was the filling up of a few holes here and there. It was his opinion, that there was too much, rather than too little, labor expended on our roads: little more was required, in general, than to fill up holes. The making roads and bridges might benefit a few contractors; but he could not be persuaded, that it would be right to increase the amount of taxation upon the people, either by an increase of the *ad valorem* duty or otherwise, for their benefit. The House must be aware, that to promote the success of the education scheme, £2 000 would have to be taken out of the general revenue; and in all likelihood, £2,000 more would be required to meet the demands for Fish Bounties.

Mr. CLARK was persuaded that as much money would be required this year for the road service, as had ever been required in any previous year. It was well known that the road money was the only public money that went among the people, and the only way in which they received any direct benefit from the taxes. £3,000 at least, would be required this year, and he would move, that that would be the amount inserted in the resolution before the Committee.

Mr. HAVILAND seconded the motion.

Mr. DOUSE, in allusion to the state of the wharfs and bridges at Belfast, observed, that so much money as was now needed to put them into a proper state of repair, would not have been required, had a proper grant been made in time. He should like to ask, with what face honorable members expected to be able to meet their constituents, unless they agreed to make a sufficient appropriation for roads and bridges. He, for one, would insist that a much larger amount than that proposed, was required for the road service. He should not be doing his duty to his constituents unless he did so.

Hon. Mr. COLES. If the hon. member for Belfast would only consent to pay what was due to the Government, by Lord Selkirk, under the Road Compensation Act, it might be possible to allow him a little more to be expended upon the roads, bridges, and wharfs of Belfast and Port Selkirk, for the improvement of the noble Earl's property, and to enable him the hon. member, Mr. Douse to collect some of the rents with a little more ease.

Mr. DOUSE. He wished the hon. member (Mr. Coles) would confine himself to facts. Lord Selkirk required nothing from the public purse, either to enable him to open roads or otherwise improve his property, or to enable his tenants to pay their rents. A more liberal proprietor, than he was, had never had connexion with the Colony: not one allowed more advantageous terms of payment to his tenantry; for he was willing to take labour or any thing in liquidation of rent and arrears.

Mr. MOONEY. He fully agreed with the hon. member for Belfast (Mr. Douse) that the House ought to be liberal on this occasion. They ought to vote a large sum for the road service this year. It was the first in which the people would partake of the fruit of the Responsible Tree in this Island, therefore it should be served up to them as sweet as possible. Let not the hon. members of the Government be stingy on this occasion. He would not blame them for being economical; but let them not bring their economy to bear on this point: it would be dangerous as regarded their popularity. He had never heard any person in the country complain of the extravagance of the Legislature, as far as the appropriation of moneys for the repair of roads and bridges. Why there was a gentleman in his Electoral District who petitioned the House for a sum of money to build a bridge, but they were so careful of the Iron Chest that they would not unlock it for him. What was the consequence? Why, with much spirit, he resolved that he would not consume any dutiable articles until he should economise to the amount he had prayed for; and he built the bridge independently of the stingy Government. But that was not in the days of Responsibility. The Government was then independent of the people. It was not so now, however, of which he was very glad. (The hon. member then proceeded humorously to descant upon the possibility of a change in the Government.) If the Honble. the Treasurer would be advised by him (Mr. M.) with respect to this vote, it would tend to the permanency of his position. If he did not the key might change hands. Whilst he had it in his power, he (Mr. M.) wished him to be liberal, lest at the next general election the people should become enraged at his parsimony, and put the hon. member for Belfast (Mr. Douse) in his stead. O, Sir, let the present Government keep the people on their side: they owe a great deal to them; they have sustained them well. How it would grieve him to see Mr. Palmer once more the leader of the Government, and for Mr. Douse to have charge of the Iron Chest; when, in all probability the hon. member for the First District of Prince County (Mr. Yeo) would be the Colonial Secretary. To ward off these evils, let them give £3500 this year. Let it not be laid to our charge, continued the hon. member, that we were the cause of some persons losing their lives, through the bad state of the bridges. He saw by a Petition from Lot 15 that a woman actually lost her life, in consequence of the unsafe state of a bridge in that quarter; and another woman and child had almost been killed in the same locality. These cases might seem points of minor consideration to some, but yet they were of great importance. Let us, concluded the hon. member, vote freely on this question, whatever we may do with respect to others; and the people will pray for us when we are sleeping ourselves.

Hon Mr. COLES. He hoped the Government would never purchase popularity at the expense of the country.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN explained that £150, which it would be proposed to grant for contingencies, £200 for the winter roads, and £300 for altering highways, &c., added to the £2500 in the original Resolution, would make up the amount demanded by hon. members. And then there would be besides what could be realized in work upon the Notes of Hands; but if it was thought the amounts due on them would never be paid, it would be best to cancel them at once. He, however, believed there was a sense of honor and honesty among the people, sufficient to induce them faithfully to discharge their obligations should they be allowed to do so in work. The hon. member then stated, in order to prove the necessity of economy with respect to the amount of the appropriation under consideration, that £1000 would be required for the Post Office service, besides an additional £3000 or £4000, for the support of schools, and £2000 at least for fish bounties.

Mr. THORNTON thought they could afford to give more than £2500. As to the Notes of Hand, he held them to be of very little or no value. If labor were to be given for them, as it would generally be unwillingly performed, it would scarcely be worth any thing. What had been advanced by the hon. member for the second District of Queen's County (Mr. Whelan) was, he believed, pretty correct; although he (Mr. T.) did not think they would require £3000 or £4000 from the general revenue for the support of Education. The hon. Treasurer was not now a Road Commissioner, or perhaps he would not have spoken as he had just done. When he (the hon. Treasurer) was a Commissioner he insisted—he (Mr. Thornton) would use his own words—that the only benefit derived by the people from the taxes was what was afforded them by the appropriations for roads and bridges. Let them look to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, and see what appropriations they made for roads and bridges. In Nova Scotia, it was never less than one seventh of their revenue, and in New Brunswick it was not less than one fifth. In duty to their constituents, the House were bound to grant at least £3000. It had been said by the hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Coles) that the Commissioners, last year, had not been able to expend the labor and money at their disposal. In his neighborhood, he (Mr. T.) knew that the case was quite the reverse; for the Commissioner (Mr. Walker) had not had enough of either money or labour. The fact was that the Commissioners could not get the statute labour, and he was of opinion that the sooner the system should be done away with, the better. Although they had reduced the commutation money for individuals to 3s. yet if the people could get money to commute for his labor, 1s. 6d. would be preferable to the labor now performed. Considering what would be required for the Post Office service and for the support of Education, it would not be fair to ask more than £3000; for a larger appropriation might cause embarrassment to the Government.

Hon Mr. COLES. He agreed with the hon. member for Murray Harbour that £3000 should be granted. £100 would be required for the roads in Charlottetown Royalty alone; and, unless it should all be expended upon the main roads their state would be far from being sufficiently improved. He hoped, however, that if £3000 should be granted, it would be with the understanding that no applications for special grants would be entertained.

Mr. CLARK remarked that he did not think the Education scheme would take effect till next year; and, when it did, nothing would be required for the payment of teachers salaries, until after it had been in operation for six months. It, therefore, did not appear to him, that the road service appropriation would require to be more limited than usual on that account.

Mr. FRASER. They must set their faces against private grants altogether. He would go, with Mr. Thornton, for £3000. That