

The Herald.

VOL. IV.

CHARLOTTETOWN, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, MAY 20, 1868.

NO. 31.

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 MAY.
MOON'S PHASES.
Full Moon, 6th day, 2h. 24m., even., N. E.
Last Quarter, 14th day, 1h. 3m., even., S. E.
New Moon, 22d day, 2h. 23m., morn., N. E.
First Quarter, 28th day, 7h. 29m., even., N. E.

DAY	MONTH	DAY WEEK.	SUN	High	Moon	DAY'S
			rises	Water	sets.	LENGTH
1	Friday	4	5 17	4 5	45 2	22 14 13
2	Saturday	49	5 6	51	2 54	16
3	Sunday	47	6 7	54	3 28	19
4	Monday	46	7 8	52	4 0	22
5	Tuesday	45	8 9	33	4 29	24
6	Wednesday	44	9 10	18	rises.	25
7	Thursday	43	10 11	16	8 8	27
8	Friday	42	12 11	57	8 59	30
9	Saturday	41	13	even.	9 59	32
10	Sunday	40	14	1 24	10 42	34
11	Monday	39	16	2 7	11 45	37
12	Tuesday	38	17	2 51	morn.	39
13	Wednesday	36	18	3 36	0 16	42
14	Thursday	35	19	4 25	0 50	44
15	Friday	34	20	5 16	1 24	46
16	Saturday	33	21	6 10	1 50	49
17	Sunday	31	23	7 4	2 17	52
18	Monday	30	24	7 59	2 46	54
19	Tuesday	29	25	8 47	3 15	56
20	Wednesday	28	26	9 33	3 48	58
21	Thursday	27	27	10 28	4 20 15	0
22	Friday	26	28	11 13	sets.	2
23	Saturday	25	29	11 58	8 59	4
24	Sunday	24	30	morn.	9 58	7
25	Monday	23	31	0 41	10 53	10
26	Tuesday	22	32	1 39	11 40	11
27	Wednesday	21	33	2 30	morn.	13
28	Thursday	20	35	3 27	0 24	15
29	Friday	19	36	4 26	0 58	17
30	Saturday	18	37	5 27	1 31	18
31	Sunday	17	39	6 28	2 2	20

Prices Current.
CHARLOTTETOWN, May 15, 1868.

Provisions.	
Beef, (small) per lb.	6d to 10d
Do by the quarter.	5d to 8d
Pork, (cassars)	4d to 6d
Do (small)	6d to 8d
Mutton, per lb.	5d to 9d
Lamb per quarter.	4s to 5s
Veal, per lb.	3d to 5d
Ham, per lb.	6d to 7d
Butter, (fresh)	1s 8d to 1s 10d
Do by the tub.	3d to 5d
Cheese, per lb.	9d to 10d
Tallow, per lb.	3d to 4d
Lard, per lb.	3d to 4d
Flour, per lb.	3d to 3 1/2d
Oatmeal, per 100 lbs.	21s to 22s
Eggs, per dozen.	7d to 9d
Grain	
Barley, per bushel.	6s to 7s
Oats per do.	3s 3d to 3s 6d
Vegetables.	
Peas, per quart.	3s 3d to 3s 6d
Potatoes, per bushel.	3s 3d to 3s 6d
Poultry.	
Geese,	2s 6d to 3s 6d
Turkeys, each.	4s to 7s 6d
Fowls, each.	1s to 1s 8d
Chickens per pair.	1s 3d to 1s 6d
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.	100s to 120s
Straw, per cwt.	2s
Timothy Seed,	14s to 17s
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 business 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 **BOX TON COFFEE POT**, which received the Gold Medal Prize, at the Paris Exposition of 1867. Also, **BOX 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.

CORNS & WARTS
Are Permanently and Effectually Cured by the use of
ROBINSON'S
PATENT CORN SOLVENT.
For Sale by
W. R. WATSON.
City Drug Store, Dec. 13, 1867.

RONALD McDONALD,
Commission Merchant, Auctioneer,
AND
COLLECTING AGENT.
Souris, Jan'y 2, 1868. 1v

R. REDDIN,
Attorney and Barrister at Law,
CONVAYNER, &c.
Office, ---Great-George St., Charlottetown.
(Near the Catholic Cathedral.)
August 22, 1866. E 1f

W. KOUGHAN,
(Late of the Customs Department)

SHIP BROKER, &c.,
Having rented the **SCALES** on
Queen's Wharf,
He will attend to the weighing of **COAL, OATS**
HAY, &c.
Charlottetown, P. E. Island.

Co-Partnership Notice.
THE SUBSCRIBERS have this day entered into
CO-PARTNERSHIP as BARRISTERS and AT-
TORNIES-AT-LAW under the name, style and firm of
ALLEY & DAVIES,
Office --- O'Halloran's Building,
Great George Street.
GEORGE ALLEY,
LOUIS H. DAVIES.
Oct. 23, 1867. 1f

NOTICE
I hereby give, that a call of ONE PER CENT. on all
sums insured in the Charlottetown Mutual Fire Insurance
Company, between the 25th JULY, 1868, and 25th
JULY, 1867, is hereby required within forty days from the
date hereof, to pay LOSSES, otherwise proceedings will be
taken the next day, to enforce payment from all defaulters.
Dated this 25th January, 1868.
HENRY PALMER,
Feb. 5, 1868 1s1
Sec'y & Treasurer.

SHOP TO LET.
TO LET, one of the Shops in REDDIN'S NEW
BUILDING, immediately adjoining the Drug Store
of W. R. Watson, Esq., Lower Queen Street. For a
business stand this shop is not surpassed in the city.
Possession can be given about the 1st of April next.
Enquire of
B. D. REDDIN.
Ch'town, Feb. 26, 1868.

DR. J. HOMER,
PHYSICIAN & SURGEON,
HAS established a convenient OFFICE in the
building formerly occupied by DR. SUTHER-
LAND, on the corner of Kent and Great George
Streets, Charlottetown, where he may be consulted upon
all the different branches of the Medical Profession
FOR A MONTH OR TWO.
N. B. Special attention given to the most modern
and successful method of treating diseases of the
EYE and EAR.
in connection with all those of a Surgical character.
Surgical appliances, with all the modern im-
provements, in great variety, constantly on hand.
Rooms at Miss RANKIN'S, Corner of Pownall and
Sydney Streets, Charlottetown.
March 11, 1868. 1f

CHARLOTTETOWN MUTUAL
Fire Insurance Company.
Board of Directors for the current year:
Hon. GEORGE BEER, President.
Hon. GEORGE COLES, Mark Butcher, Esq.
Hon. H. J. CALBECK, John Scott, Esq.
Bertram Moore, Esq., Thos. W. Dodd, Esq.,
William Dodd, Esq., Hon. W. W. Lord,
Artemus Lord, Esq., Wm. Heard, Esq.
Office hours from 10 a. m. to 4 p. m.
H. PALMER, Secretary.
Mutual Fire Insurance Office, Kent St.,
Charlottetown, 1st Feb., 1868. } p i

COTTON DUCK,
HAVING been appointed Agent for the sale of the
celebrated
Russell'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.

PACKET
BETWEEN
SOURIS & CHARLOTTETOWN.
THE FAST-SAILING and COMMODIOUS Schooner "A. R.
McDONALD," will run between Souris & Charlot-
tewtown, calling at the intermediate ports, as soon as the
navigation permits.
DOMINICK DEAGLE, Master.
January 29, 1868. 1y

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 occupa-
tion of Edward Reilly, Esq., and used as a Book-store
and Printing Office.
A DWELLING HOUSE, on Pownall Street, occu-
pied by Mrs. Sallenger as a Boarding-house.
A HOUSE, on King Street, in the rear of Mrs. Sal-
lenger's, occupied by Mr. Dunn.
A DWELLING HOUSE, on the rear of Easton
Street, occupied by Mr. Fitzgerald, pensioner.
Also—the DWELLING on Queen Street, occupied by
the subscriber.
HUGH MONAGHAN.
Ch'town, March 4, 1868. 1f

DEBATES AND PROCEEDINGS
OF THE
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.
(Continued.)

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL: It was thought, on a former occasion, that the majority of the people would be better consulted in their own houses, and I am of opinion that they would be freer from undue influence than at a public meeting. A person wishing to procure a license might go round the district among his friends and induce them to attend the meeting, while those who were not consulted might remain at home. In that way a man may obtain a license, while otherwise he would not. At the same time, I am willing to support any reasonable measure the temperance people can adopt to suppress the evil complained of. The abuse of spirituous liquors is a great evil, and those who advocate temperance should be assisted and encouraged by the Legislature in every possible way. I believe both Houses are willing to do so. I am willing to support this amendment to the law, and if it does not answer, let them try another. (Mr. Palmer—Hear.) But while I support this bill, I would rather see something done to encourage such houses as his honor from the second district of Queen's County, (Mr. Beer), referred to, for then there would be no need to cavil about suppressing those taverns. That is a matter which the temperance people should take in hand. No man should be forced to have a tavern at his door. If a man has a family of sons, and does not wish to see them frequenting a public house, it is a great hardship to have one opened in his immediate neighborhood against his will. I am willing to assist the temperance people in any reasonable way, so long as they do not interfere with the necessary accommodation of the public.

Hon. Mr. HAYTHORNE: His honor from the City, (Mr. Palmer), referred to the frequency with which bills to amend the license law are brought before the Legislature, but I believe that is not peculiar to Prince Edward Island; and, therefore, we may expect to see other amendments brought forward at a future time. Of course, the principal objections to a public house are made by those in the immediate neighborhood of it, but it is necessary that there should be houses to accommodate travellers, and I believe the majority of people would prefer calling at a tavern for that purpose. It is to taverns that the youth of a community are inveigled—there their morals are contaminated—and, therefore, I think the people should have a voice in opening them. (Mr. Palmer—Hear.) The people should have it in their power to stop a public house if they think proper to do so. This Bill gives power to the people to prevent a tavern from being opened in a settlement if they are opposed to it; but I think it is an oversight that there is no provision in it to prevent the same application from being made to the people an unlimited number of times in the course of a year. If the same question were asked the people twice in each year, I think it would be sufficient. But there is another consideration: while you attempt to stop the evil of the traffic in spirituous liquor, or to make stringent laws, you may incur another danger which is even greater. You may throw such difficulties in the way of getting a license, that parties will be induced to sell privately, and that is a greater evil than having a public house. A public house can be placed under some control, but the illicit sale of the article is an evil of the greatest magnitude. Care should, therefore, be taken, least while we attempt to escape one danger, we should not fall into another still greater. One of your honors referred to Grand Juries, and thought that they might be charged with the control of those houses, but I see objections to that, for all parts of a county are not always represented in that body. There may be localities with which no number of the Grand Jury is acquainted. Then his honor on my left, (Mr. Beer), thought public houses should be limited in number—one between Charlottetown and Georgetown, &c.—but it is difficult to define where a traveller or his horse would require refreshment. We have a severe climate, and sometimes have very severe storms in the winter, so that to place houses of entertainment too far apart, might lead to dangerous consequences. Some serious accident might occur, which would be prevented by a public house being near. This bill will not interfere with the establishment of houses where liquor is not sold, and I do not think a traveller will be put to any great inconvenience by not getting liquor where he stops. If he cannot get along without it, he can carry his bottle with him. Therefore, I think the inconvenience to travellers is only an imaginary difficulty. Though it is not such a measure as I would have introduced, still, it is just to the people, for they will have the matter in their own hands.

Hon. Mr. ANDERSON: In referring to the Grand Jury, my idea was to let that body name the locality where a house of entertainment was required, then, if there were a number of applicants for a license, let a meeting be called, to decide who

should have the preference. There are places at present where you may travel forty miles without finding a house of entertainment, and it is very difficult for people to get along, particularly in stormy weather.

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL: The fault is not so much in the laws as in carrying them out. No law that is passed on this subject is carried into effect as it should be. I believe the present law would have a good effect if it were properly carried out, and that is the first thing the temperance people should attend to, for then the evil complained of would, in a great measure, be prevented.

Hon. Mr. GORDON: I do not rise to oppose the bill, but I think it will be found to have a different effect from what is intended. In fact, I think it should be termed: "A bill to grant facilities for obtaining license to sell spirituous liquors." It will save a great deal of trouble and inconvenience to parties asking for license. The history of legislation upon this subject shows that there is only one remedy for the evil, that is, total prohibition. My colleague (Mr. McDonald) says the prohibition is a greater evil now than it was a hundred years ago, and I dare say he is quite right. By this bill, the people in a district will be liable to be called together every time there is an application made for a license, and I think it will be found to be a very serious interference with their private business. If only a few individuals should attend a meeting—and perhaps there might not be half a dozen—then a public house may be opened, contrary to the wishes of the sober part of the community.

Hon. Mr. PALMER: With respect to the amendment proposed by his honor on my right, (Mr. MacDonald) I must say I think the bill is susceptible of improvement in that respect. As the bill now stands, when a license is applied for, a meeting is to be called in a certain manner, but it does not define who it is that sets the law in motion. As it is worded, it appears to be set in motion by the magistrate, but it does not say that he is to give notice of a meeting on application of the party desiring a license. Neither does it appear to be at the discretion of the magistrate to call one or more, or refuse one or more meetings. The amendment requiring a meeting to be called upon the first of May and the first of November in each year, is very well as far as it goes, but it does not meet the objection which we all appear to see, for a good and useful house of entertainment might be closed by the death or removal of the occupant two or three weeks after the license had been obtained; then no license could be obtained by another man till the annual, or semi-annual period for holding the meetings had arrived. I quite agree with your honors that it should not be left uncertain as it now stands, for if by the construction of the bill, the magistrate will be bound to call a meeting whenever an application is made, how is he to distinguish between a bona fide application and one that is spurious. A man might go to the magistrate and say that he is going to be married, and that he intends to keep a house of entertainment, but when the time for holding the meeting arrives, the hero may be away out of the country, and laughing at the joke. If three or four applications were made to a magistrate, what would he do? Would he say, "I have enough now, and will not entertain any more applications." He would feel himself in an invidious position. I think there should be some mode pointed out by which the law would be set in motion, and I therefore suggest the following amendment:—

Hon. Mr. DINGWELL: As there are so many applications for alterations in the license law, I am willing to let this bill pass as it came before us. I do not wish the temperance people to have it in their power to say that "only for such and such persons we would have a good law." I do not think that any alteration we can make in the law will make it much more serviceable than it is at present, but still, I am willing to let those people have their own way. If they go to extremes and shut up necessary houses of entertainment, or prevent others from being opened, that course would work its own cure, for the law would have to be altered.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD: I agree with my colleague (Mr. Gordon), that this Bill will enable parties to obtain license for the sale of spirituous liquor with greater facility, and it is rather extraordinary that, upon a petition of the temperance people, such an Act should be passed. I am still inclined to think that to limit the number of times which the people could be called to attend a meeting would benefit the temperance people, and I, therefore, submit the following Resolution. If it should meet your honors' views, a clause can be drawn up to embody the idea more fully:

Provided, nevertheless, that no more than two of such meetings, as aforesaid, shall be convened in any one District in any one year, unless any Licensed or Store Tavern shall cease to be used as such owing to the death or removal from the District of the licensed owner or occupier of such Tavern or Store, within the said year.

As the law now stands, there is a certain duty devolving upon the Grand Jury. That body is expected to say who have license, and who are selling without? I know myself from experience that it is a very onerous duty, and one that is difficult to perform. They do not wish to give information against any person when they have not evidence enough to convict him, and they have frequently to act upon hearsay. I believe it would be better if the duty now imposed upon the Grand Jury were made to devolve upon the Trustees of the school, or upon the Justices of the Peace; in fact, when it is left to the people to decide upon once or twice, they will soon know who has license and who has not. It is possible at present that a man may have license and not many in the district be aware of it. At present, a man may represent that he has the consent of a majority of the householders, when he has not, and it is sometimes difficult to decide whether persons have a right to sign a requisition or not; but if the plan I have suggested were adopted, the parties who had obtained license would be better known, and the law could be more easily enforced against those who had none. In fact, I think selling without license would be almost done away with.

The House was then resumed and progress reported.
Adjourned till four o'clock, p. m.

AFTERNOON SESSION.
LIQUOR LICENSE BILL.

Committee resumed—
Hon. Mr. LORD: I think it is better to pass the bill as it is, for I do not approve of the amendment. In some of the Colonies licenses are only applied for once a year. In Nova Scotia they are granted by the magistrates in each Parish. They advertise for the inhabitants to meet upon a certain day, and the matter is decided by vote. I presume that this bill is only a trial for one year. We have been legislating upon this subject ever since I had a seat in the Legislature, and yet the temperance folks are always asking for some change. No doubt they do some good, but in some cases I think they go too far. It is for the advantage of the public to have houses of accommodation good houses, fit to accommodate travellers; are very scarce. We should see who has a right, or who is a proper person to obtain license to keep a tavern. There was a resolution introduced in the House of Assembly to have a house of entertainment established every ten or twelve miles, but I do not see how the Legislature could carry out that idea. It has been said that those public houses are a great injury to our young men, and the cause of a great deal of drunkenness; well, I do not dispute that, but I do not think we are any worse in that respect than our neighbors; in fact, we are fifty per cent. better than they are in the old country; therefore, I do not think our young people are to be condemned as far as that goes. I have been in the habit of travelling, and I seldom meet young men in any of those houses spending an evening. There is a clause in the bill to prevent a post office from being kept, or a small debt court held, in a public house, and as far as the latter is concerned, I quite agree with it, for I have been at those places and have seen nearly half the people the worse of liquor before the suits were tried; but I think a public house where the stage stops is the proper place for a post office, particularly if the house is well conducted. A great many people in the country are several miles from a post office, and where there is a public house there is often a store where they might be going upon other business.

Hon. Mr. BALDERSTON: I am sorry that I was not present in the forenoon when this bill was discussed, but my opinion of it is that it is a very meagre affair. There was not much asked for in the petition, and there is much less granted by the bill. An amendment is certainly necessary in the law, but I do not think this bill will have much effect. Temperance inns, I understand from the opinion of the late Attorney General, are under the same restrictions as licensed taverns, as far as the accommodation of travellers at all hours of the night or day is concerned. I know it is the general impression in the country that such is not the case, and that is one reason why there are so many applications for tavern license. I have known instances of travellers being refused accommodation at temperance inns, and they had to go to private houses. I am of opinion that parties calling at an inn to get themselves warmed, or to get other accommodation, should be compelled to pay something, for houses cannot be kept up and fires kept on without some expense. Otherwise, I would propose to give temperance houses a subsidy. His honor from Prince County, (Mr. Lord), said he had not seen any of those disastrous results which are said to follow the vending of liquor at taverns, but I have seen them. I have seen very young lads congregating at those houses, where a great deal of evil was done and where they were fast becoming drunkards. If there is not something done, to keep up temperance houses, tavern licenses will be applied for and they will be obtained.

Hon. Mr. LORD: Is his honor going to ask for money to keep up those temperance inns? Every trade should support itself, and keeping houses of entertainment is not an exception. But whether a man keeps a temperance inn or a tavern, he has a right to accommodate travellers at all times, and I do not think it is necessary to give him any assistance, for there are very few who would go into a house without giving something. I presume it is merely a speculation with him, for no man would open a house of entertainment without expecting to be remunerated for it. I am not exactly of opinion that a man who opens a temperance house and keeps a little ginger beer is obliged to take out a license. It would be well for his hon-

Hon. Mr. BALDERSTON: I think it is a good provision that no Government office, or Court of Justice, should be held in a tavern. It is true that there are certain post offices now kept in taverns with which this bill will not interfere, but they are very few, perhaps not more than half a dozen, and they are in localities where it is difficult to get suitable places and persons, other than those who

The question of concurrence was then put upon the amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr. Palmer, and it passed in the affirmative.
The clause relating to public offices in taverns was then read.
Hon. Mr. MACDONALD: I think it is a good provision that no Government office, or Court of Justice, should be held in a tavern. It is true that there are certain post offices now kept in taverns with which this bill will not interfere, but they are very few, perhaps not more than half a dozen, and they are in localities where it is difficult to get suitable places and persons, other than those who

or to let his friends understand this, for perhaps they are liable to a fine.

Hon. Mr. BALDERSTON: A man who keeps a temperance inn is not required to take out a license, but I understand that he is under the same obligation to entertain travellers as a man who keeps a tavern. He is also liable for any loss or damage of a traveller's property. We know that there are persons travelling who will not pay anything for accommodation at those houses, and there should be some fee fixed that they would be obliged to pay. His honor from Prince County, (Mr. Lord), also said that a tavern was a proper place to keep a post office, but I think it is just the reverse. It is a good excuse for young men to go to the tavern where they spend their time to their own injury.

Hon. Mr. PALMER: With respect to the amendment proposed by his honor on my right, (Mr. MacDonald) I must say I think the bill is susceptible of improvement in that respect. As the bill now stands, when a license is applied for, a meeting is to be called in a certain manner, but it does not define who it is that sets the law in motion. As it is worded, it appears to be set in motion by the magistrate, but it does not say that he is to give notice of a meeting on application of the party desiring a license. Neither does it appear to be at the discretion of the magistrate to call one or more, or refuse one or more meetings. The amendment requiring a meeting to be called upon the first of May and the first of November in each year, is very well as far as it goes, but it does not meet the objection which we all appear to see, for a good and useful house of entertainment might be closed by the death or removal of the occupant two or three weeks after the license had been obtained; then no license could be obtained by another man till the annual, or semi-annual period for holding the meetings had arrived. I quite agree with your honors that it should not be left uncertain as it now stands, for if by the construction of the bill, the magistrate will be bound to call a meeting whenever an application is made, how is he to distinguish between a bona fide application and one that is spurious. A man might go to the magistrate and say that he is going to be married, and that he intends to keep a house of entertainment, but when the time for holding the meeting arrives, the hero may be away out of the country, and laughing at the joke. If three or four applications were made to a magistrate, what would he do? Would he say, "I have enough now, and will not entertain any more applications." He would feel himself in an invidious position. I think there should be some mode pointed out by which the law would be set in motion, and I therefore suggest the following amendment:—

No meeting shall be convened by any such Justice of the Peace, unless upon a requisition in writing addressed to him, and signed by at least three resident Housekeepers of the said District which requisition shall be in substance according to the form in the Schedule to this Act annexed marked C:

We, the undersigned, respectfully request that you will convene a meeting of the resident Householders of this District, for them to decide on the necessity of granting a Tavern License or Licenses to such person or persons as shall, at such meeting, apply for the same.
Dated this day of 186
G. H.
J. K.
L. M.

To N. O., Esq., J. P.
Now, there is no difficulty in that. It only requires the signatures of three men, and the magistrate will then have something to act upon. No three men would sign such a certificate unless they saw there was an intention to make an application for a license. One man may go to a magistrate and require a public meeting to be called, half a dozen may do so, and how is he to act? I think the amendment I have proposed will remedy that objection.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD: The amendment just proposed by his honor carries out the object I had in view, except that it does not fix the time for holding the meetings. I thought it was desirable that the days for holding the meetings should be fixed, and though I am still of that opinion, yet I will withdraw the amendment I proposed, as the principal provisions contained in it are embodied in the one just presented by his honor from the city.

The question of concurrence was then put upon the amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr. Palmer, and it passed in the affirmative.
The clause relating to public offices in taverns was then read.

Hon. Mr. MACDONALD: I think it is a good provision that no Government office, or Court of Justice, should be held in a tavern. It is true that there are certain post offices now kept in taverns with which this bill will not interfere, but they are very few, perhaps not more than half a dozen, and they are in localities where it is difficult to get suitable places and persons, other than those who

(Continued on fourth page.)