

THE DAILY EXAMINER.

NOVEMBER 22, 1895.

THE HUNTER-CROSSLY MISSION

Several letters and items have reached THE EXAMINER bearing upon the question raised by "Gamallal" whose letter we published to-day. "Gamallal" seems to be an earnest man, sincerely anxious that a needed good work shall be done in this city, but somewhat doubtful concerning the motives of Messrs. Hunter and Crossley. These gentlemen may or may not answer the question which "Gamallal" propounds. It is, in any case, hard to demonstrate a motive; and Messrs. Hunter and Crossley will probably not attempt to do so. They come not here asking money, and no one is required to give them money. The money they receive comes from the free-will offerings of their hearers. It must be presumed that their hearers contribute a larger amount than they ought to give, and it must be presumed that if their collections are large, their work is appreciated. That there is a work for Christian morals to be done in this city everyone will admit who takes note of the signs of the time. A town in which law is continually being violated, in which violations of the law are connived at by many apparently respectable persons, in which there are persons who equivocate and lie under oath, in which there are not a few evidences of bad behavior and incipient crime among the youth, not to speak of a growing irreverence for the Lord's Day and sacred things, and an increasing carelessness concerning the higher life, is surely a town in which such men as Hunter and Crossley ought to be of use. If they can make any impression upon hardening hearts and disobedient wills, or be the means of causing a change of life in some of those who are following wrong paths, we ought not to be too solicitous concerning the amount of money they receive, or the motives which impel them, but rather, after the example of another and greater Gamallal, be willing to judge them according to the results of their work.

THE FARMERS' INTEREST.

In their own interest, our farmers ought to remember the importance of keeping United States products out of the Canadian market so long as the United States persist in keeping Canadian products out of the United States market. This is not commercial hostility. It is self defence. It is self preservation, which is the first law of nature. Many of us are badly enough off as it is, but if the cheap and inferior oats and pork of the prairie states were let into Nova Scotia and New Brunswick free of duty we should be ruined. In their own interest, they ought to maintain and encourage the increase of the volume of home consumption by doing all that they can to promote manufacturing industry in the neighboring towns; for every artisan and labourer employed in these towns is to some extent, directly or indirectly, a customer of theirs. Let our manufacturers be placed at a disadvantage by the free admission of United States manufactures while their wares are denied free admission to the United States markets, and a blow will be struck at the farmers who supply our manufacturers with food. The interest of our manufacturers is the interest of our farmers. In their own interest, also, the farmers ought to encourage the creation of facilities for transport and all movements towards a reduction of freight rates, for cost of transport and other charges and profits come directly or indirectly out of their pockets. In their own interest, too, our farmers will, if they are wise, strive to produce articles of superior quality, and endeavor to put them upon the market in such a state that they will command the preference of the British, West Indian, Canadian and all other purchasers. These propositions are so plain and so manifestly correct that it is not necessary to argue about them.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

—Montreal Star: Mr. Tarte has given the Liberals about the only material upon which to base the Conservative party, and it would be most ungrateful in Mr. Laurier to overlook his very lieutenant if ever he gets a chance to form a cabinet. —Kingston News: When the Liberals were in power, in 1874, they required 410 employes to manage every 100 miles of the Intercolonial Railway. Last year, under the Hon. Mr. Haggart's management, though there were more than twice as many passengers carried and over two and one-half times more freight handled, it only required 332 employes to every 100 miles. This does not look like "Tory extravagance." —The Quebec Government is, it appears, again proceeding against Mr. Pacaud to recover the \$100,000 he received as the price of the transfer by the late Liberal Government, of the Baie des Chaleurs charter and subsidy. Mr. Pacaud is reported as saying that this is persecution. The Montreal Gazette points out that there is, however, a ready way for him to get sympathy in his misfortune. Let him institute suits to recover from Messrs. Tarte, M. P., Pelletier, Langelier, et al., the sums paid for them out of the \$100,000 on account of their election notes made to get funds to help Mr. Laurier's candidates at the last election. Then pretty much the whole Liberal Parliamentary delegation from Quebec will have an interest in his case. —In an article headed "Our Defenceless Lake Cities," the Chicago Times-Herald observes that: "It is sometimes foolishly said that Great Britain could send a fleet into the lakes through the St. Lawrence and Welland canal, but what would be the doing while such an attempt was being made? We could in a day erect fortifications on the banks of those waterways that would stop the most powerful fleet in the world." Upon which the Mail and Empire remarks that: At present the erection of fortifications is entirely unnecessary, for the time seems to be

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

THE PARK ROADWAY QUESTION.

Sir,—Your correspondent, "An Old Parliamentarian" in Tuesday's issue, displays such an amount of ignorance of the subject upon which he writes, that it really seems almost cruel to expose him; but as facts are stubborn things they cannot be distorted into misstatements. The Attorney-General may have attempted to show the judges that Mr. Bais's plan of the Park Roadway was only "a fancy sketch or a landscape drawing," etc., but all the same the fact remains that the plan was made in 1873, and the roadway to the Park along the shore front of Government Farm was also discussed in the Legislature in 1873, but not until 1876 was the Act passed vesting in the city forever "a strip of shore front of a width not exceeding one hundred feet running from Kent Street along the outside of the existing bank of the Government Farm till it strikes the said line from Brighton Road to the shore, for the purposes of a carriage or roadway to and from the said Park, as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan," so that the plan adopted by the Legislature and referred to in the Act of 1876, and regularly dated, signed, witnessed and recorded in the Registry Office, was prepared just three years prior to the passing of the Act of 1876, and, therefore, it puts it beyond a doubt as to which side of the outside line of the existing bank the roadway should be. Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

PARADE CONCERT AT FAIRMOUNT.

The large and handsome residence of Benjamin Rogers, Esq., M. L. A. was the scene of the most successful of social entertainments which at once employ and develop the talents of our talented youth, afford wholesome entertainment to those who are older, and are the easy means of gathering together contrabands in amounts for charitable and religious objects. A hundred and forty persons could have been seated in the ample drawing room, but owing to counter attractions at the Opera House, Zouave Club, and Y. M. C. A. Hall the audience was not so large. Still the affair was well managed, in admission fees and sums for the purchase of candy, the sum of \$54 dollars towards the purchase of the Opera House, Zouave Club, and Y. M. C. A. Hall, and the recitations of Miss Flora McKenzie and Miss Bertha Brown were all good. The young ladies commanded the attention of the audience. Miss McKenzie's description of the interesting circumstances under which her beloved composed his Moonlight Sonata was, indeed, heard with breathless interest, and evidenced a talent for dramatic interpretation which is worthy of the highest cultivation. After some appropriate remarks by the chairman concerning hospitals and hospitality, a formal vote of thanks to Mr. and Mrs. Rogers, was unanimously carried.

HOME FROM MANITOBA.

Mr Alfred Simpson, son of Samuel Simpson, Esq., of Belmont, Prince County, returned from Manitoba last evening. Mr. Simpson left here with the harvest season in July last and has been in Manitoba ever since working at harvesting and threshing. He says the crop in Manitoba is very heavy, but on account of the light crop of the previous year or three years the farmers are being financially and the present good crop will not be sufficient to make up for past losses. Many of the farms are mortgaged, and the sheriff is in attendance at the elevators taking the farmers' tickets in not a few instances. Not a few of the people live in log shanties and are sadly lacking in many of the comforts of life. Mr. Simpson has come home to stay. A son of Mr. McNeill Simpson of Hamilton returned at the same time.

PERSONAL.

Samuel Simpson, Esq., of Belmont, was in town to-day. Hon. J. W. Richards, of Bideford, is among the guests at the Hotel Davies. William Campbell, Esq., Sea View, is among the guests at the Hotel Davies. Mr. Charles E. Thorne and bride arrived here from Picton on Wednesday night. Mr. Chas. F. Gorham, of Halifax, who was the Queen Hotel yesterday, went east to-day. J. Albert Brennan, of Tisbury, was in town yesterday, coming by bus and pleasure. He went West to-day. Miss Alice Coyle, of this city, left this morning on a few months' visit to friends in Boston and other cities in the United States. Mr. W. C. Kennedy, Inspector of the London and Lancashire Life Insurance Co., left this morning via Point Du Chene on a business trip through New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. 5 special bargains in ladies' warm, heavy winter suits—25c, 45c, 50c, 65c, 75c. See them—Moore & McLeod. At the W. C. T. U. coffee rooms on Gratton Street lunches are served from 10 a. m. to 10 p. m., Sunday excepted. Also oysters.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR.

ANOTHER STATEMENT.

Sir,—I see by THE DAILY EXAMINER of the 19th inst., that the contract for building Mr. Macdonald's summer residence at Tracadie, has been awarded to Rhodes, Curry & Co. for something in the vicinity of \$11,000. I also see in your issue of the 20th a correction that the sum referred to is reduced and that it is now in the vicinity of \$10,000. Had it been put about \$10,500 it would have been nearer the mark. I have reason to know that the tender of Rhodes, Curry & Co. was for the sum of \$8,900, plumbing included. Ours Who Knows.

WE LEAD IN MEN'S ULSTERS, OVERCOATS, REEFERS, SUITS, PRICES RIGHT, GOODS THE BEST, PLACE PATON & CO'S.

BORN. In Charlottetown, on the 21st inst., the wife of A. B. Warburton, of a daughter. At Kensington, on the 16th inst., the wife of W. A. Leslie, of a daughter.

MARRIED.

At the residence of Mrs. (Rev.) James Allan, Prince Street, Nov. 20th, by Rev. T. F. Fullerton, Mr. Hedley V. Buntin, Charlottetown, to Miss Annie McDonald, Chatham, N. B.

DIED.

At Grand Tracadie, on Thursday, the 7th inst., Mary Eliza Martin, relict of Alexander Martin, and daughter of Donald R. McDonald, in the 27th year of her age. R. I. P.

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law; and therefore he (Mr. C.) could not be expected to report the fact to the City Council. "An Old Parliamentarian" must know, if he has read the debates, that the amendments to the Act of 1876, to which he refers, related to the battery fill, and he could also have ascertained, if he had desired, that the City Council did not report the debates on the day he refers to, although one of the reporters of the House in 1876; so that his argument on that score amounts to nothing. Mr. John Ball, who as clerk of the Legislative Council, read to that chamber the bill as passed, was the same gentleman who had previously prepared the plan which was then and there adopted as part of the Act of 1876. The late Hon. T. H. Haviland certainly was of opinion that the public had a right to travel along the shore front of Government Farm on the bank, and in proof of this he stated that on a few occasions, when a former Lieutenant-Governor refused to allow citizens to walk along the bank to the Park, Mr. Haviland, as then Mayor of the city, sent a policeman down to countermand the Governor's order, and so from that day to this the public have continued to assert their rights by walking along the bank without fear of molestation. In conclusion, I may be permitted to ask "An Old Parliamentarian" when Mayor Dawson sat at the Council board with the late Mayor Haviland?

Why did "An Old Parliamentarian" leave out of his description of the strip of land the words "viz.," as the said carriage or roadway is delineated upon the said plan." Your correspondent is also wrong in supposing that the City Council got together the Legislature to have the Act of 1887 passed, for it was not so. A citizens' committee petitioned for that Act, with a request that a grant of \$1,500 be made towards the construction of the roadway. The latter not having been conceded, no further action was taken, and so the matter was allowed to drop. Not until the present City Council took hold of the question did any person know that the Act of 1876 was in force. In fact Mr. Cundall, like nearly every other citizen, including His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, the Attorney General, Judge Fitzgibbon, the Hon. Mr. Stipendiary Magistrate, and His Worship Mayor Dawson, was not aware of the fact that the act of 1876 had become law