# THE EXAMINER

## EXTRA.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., MONDAY, JULY 27, 1868.


TUESDAY, March 31st.

*Morning Session.*

Mr. McNEILL moved that the House go into the order of the day on the Bill to prevent accidents to persons travelling on the ice, and remarked: In bringing this Bill before the House, Mr. Speaker, I may say I believe every hon. member will agree with me that there is a necessity for it. Although as yet no fatal accidents have occurred to my knowledge, yet there have been some very narrow escapes, and it is well to guard against accidents that may take place. I think as to the necessity for the Bill there will be no difference of opinion, but there may be as to the details in reference to the method of marking the holes. I should not like to place any restrictions on the lifting of mud, but there should be some law to prevent persons leaving holes open, and thereby endangering life and property.

House then resolved itself into a Committee of the whole on the Bill—Mr. Howatt in the chair.

The first clause was read.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD.—Mr. Chairman, I think there is an omission in that paragraph. It appears that persons who are actually working at a hole are liable to a fine, unless they have it bushed. Persons should not be put to any unnecessary trouble, and while the mud-digging machine is at the hole I think it is mark enough without bushes, and I would therefore move that the words "*or other mark*" be inserted after the word *bushes*.

Mr. McNEILL.—The hole might be very long, and then the machine would not be a sufficient mark.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON.—Mr. Chairman, before you introduce this amendment I would ask is it not altogether too indefinite? I think the word *machine* might be inserted instead of *other mark* and that would be a sufficient mark to all persons capable of taking notice of anything, and after the machine would be removed bushes should be placed around the hole. My reason for making these remarks is, that if these things are not particularly specified, parties may make a mock of the law. I remember an anecdote which illustrates this. A law was once passed making it imperative on the owners and occupiers of land in the suburbs of London to erect a certain number of lamps, according to the size of their houses and other circumstances. In order to show the ineffectiveness of the law, the witty Earl of Rochester had the lamps placed as the law directed, but put no light in them, as the law said nothing about that.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD.—I would add the words *other sufficient mark*, as the word machine is rather difficult to insert. It would not be well to make the law too strict in reference to the material to be used for marking the hole, as persons might be in a place where no bushes were to be obtained.

Mr. McNEILL.—I think there will be no scarcity of bushes in most places for some years to come. It would be well to have the hole bushed, even while the machine is there, for sometimes holes are dug forty or fifty yards long, and persons might drive in at one end, even though a machine was at the other. It would not be much trouble for persons to carry a few bushes with them when they went to dig mud.

Mr. McCORMACK.—This is an important matter, Mr. Chairman, as it is one in which is involved the safety of human life, and therefore the Act should be very carefully worded and made explicit, in order to provide against the possibility of a catastrophe which might occur through the negligence of any person. I think it would be advisable to compel a person who cuts a hole in the ice to place bushes around it, even while his mud-digging machine was alongside, as it would be very little trouble to the person, and might be the means of preventing serious consequences.

The first clause was then agreed to without amendment.

The second clause was then read, specifying the fine to which persons infringing this law should be subjected. It was moved that the fine be not more than two pounds, or less than ten shillings.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON.—I think, Mr. Chairman, the fine is entirely too small, the life of man and beast is placed too low. I am afraid few would be found to inform for such a paltry sum.

In reference to the time to be allowed for the payment of the fine, Mr. Prowse remarked: I do not see why any time should be specified. I think it would be well to leave it optional with the Justices of the Peace, who will adjudicate upon cases of this kind, to fix the time in accordance with the circumstances of the case. A person might live forty or fifty miles from the County Jail; he might be fined two pounds, and the expenses might be as much more, and if he had not the money just then it would be hardly fair to send him to jail when he could give good security for its payment.

Mr. McNEILL.—There may be a hardship in some cases, but if there is not something to make people mark the holes carefully, there is no use having an Act at all.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON.—If the fine is made too light the protection which will be afforded to the travelling public will be very small. There should be stringency in some point to make the Act effective.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Under the laws, as they are at present, there are six days allowed for taking out an appeal, and I think we should allow the same time in this Bill.

The Committee rose and reported the Bill agreed to. Ordered to be engrossed.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL moved that the fifth Order of the day be read, viz., resolutions of Supply to be received.

The resolution granting the sum of £1000 for macadamizing the roads leading to Charlottetown, Georgetown, and Summerside, in the following proportion; Charlottetown, £500; Summerside, £300; Georgetown, £200; was read; also the resolution granting £60 to the members for Charlottetown to pay for stone imported last year.

Mr. McLENNAN.—Mr. Speaker, as I was not in my seat when the question was put on the resolution before the House, it may not be out of place for me to make a few observations on it. I am pleased that the Government have granted a large sum for Summerside, but I should like the resolution to be a little more definite, and specify the time when the stone is to be put on the road. There need be no delay in procuring stone, as plenty of it can be obtained on the shore, of a good quality for making roads, as it has been tried and found to answer very well. There is another thing I should like to speak about, as the members of the Government seem to be very favorably disposed towards Summerside, there is a great necessity for a public square in that place.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD.—As regards the grant for Charlottetown, it is left to the discretion of the Government to expend it as they think fit, as stone will have to be imported for the purpose; but if proper stone can be procured in the vicinity of Summerside, there need be no delay in expending the money. As regards a public square I think it would be well to make good roads leading to the town first, and afterwards funds may be procured to buy a square.

Mr HOWATT.—As far as my experience goes in this matter, I may say that at Summerside a sufficient quantity of stone may be obtained, which will stand as well as Nova Scotia stone, and it can be procured at much less cost than by going to other places for it, and it will be expending the money among our own people. The road that has been made there with it stands well. It would be a great advantage to Summerside, and also to the whole country round it to have the money expended there this year.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD.—If stone of the right quality can be procured in the Colony, I can assure the House that the Government are most anxious to get it here, and will not go to the trouble and expense of importing it.

Mr. GREEN.—I may say that there is a good quality of stone to be procured near Summerside, but I would not like to say it was as good as Nova Scotia stone. I believe it can be obtained at a cost of 2s. 6d. per ton. It is a reef of rocks at the entrance of the western side of the harbor, and a sufficient quantity can be obtained to macadamize the whole of the roads in the vicinity of Summerside.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT.—In reference to money placed in the hands of members for the district, the Government are left in the dark, as we have no report from those gentlemen. If we had a report from them it might serve as a guide in making up the estimates. If it is, as the hon. member says in reference to this reef, certainly it would not be worth while to import stone at five or six shillings per ton. I am very glad to hear that stone can be procured at so low a rate. When public money is placed in the hands of Commissioners or members of the Legislature, there should be some report concerning the manner in which it has been expended.

Mr. BRECKEN.—I quite agree with the hon. Leader of the Government that it would be well to have some return to show how the money has been laid out. I would ask what are the intentions of the Government in respect to the grants now under consideration? who is to have the expenditure of the money?

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT.—It is to be laid out by such persons as the Government may see fit to appoint.

Mr. BRECKEN.—When large sums of money are expended it would be satisfactory to have a report, and as I drew one warrant for a hundred pounds, I should be most happy to give an account of how I disposed of it. I do not think representatives can be expected to understand the making of roads properly.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT.—I have heard that the hon. member for Summerside has improved the roads in that vicinity very much, and I should like to hear some report from him.

Mr. GREEN.—I undertook the laying out of the special grant for Summerside last year, and I have no objection to giving an account of how the money has been expended. I have a Report nearly prepared, and will hand it in to the Government, but not officially, for the great salary given for it might cause me to lose my seat in the House.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—Mr. Speaker, before the resolution is put relative to the additional grant for Charlottetown, although it might be to my benefit to have as much money expended here as possible could be got, yet, when I represent another constituency, I do not think it would be right for me quietly to allow the hon. members for Charlottetown to steal a march on the Government in this way. Last year there was £500 granted for Charlottetown, and they overrun this amount and spent £60 more, and instead of being taken out of this year's grant they are to have this amount extra, and since George-town has been dealt with so niggardly I think it is hardly fair, and would therefore move that the £60 be struck out of the resolution.

Mr. BRECKEN.—I hope the Government will not withdraw this grant, although strictly we cannot claim it; but when we take into account the great traffic on the roads near Charlottetown, I do not think it is asking too much for this special grant to be given. It is for the benefit of the whole of Queen's County, as trade centres more about Charlottetown than anywhere else on the Island, and all reap the advantage of having good roads near it. I hope the hon. member will not press his motion.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON.—I am sorry the Government has sanctioned this extra grant. It is establishing a bad precedent, for suppose any other hon. member had spent fifty pounds more than was granted for his district, or suppose it had been done in all the districts, what would be the consequence?

Mr. PROWSE.—I shall support the motion made by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, for, if this principle is carried out, we would require an extra grant for every district in the Island. But there is another reason why this sixty pounds should be taken out of the ordinary grant, we have no report about how this money has been spent, and if any other member said he had spent sixty pounds extra, and asked the Government to reimburse him, would they do it?

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON.—Mr. Speaker. I have no opposition to Charlottetown, but I am desirous that all parts should be treated with justice. There is one fact in connection with this matter, if, as the hon. member says, the stone is now on hand, it is an additional reason against granting this extra amount. There is hardly a district in which it has not been found necessary to expend from fifteen to twenty pounds more than what has been appropriated in works of actual necessity, such as cutting windfalls, &c.; but this amount has to be subtracted from the ordinary grant for the next year. This granting the extra amount is quite a different principle, and if it is carried out we all have a right to put in a claim.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—This would be establishing a bad precedent if the method were to be followed out; but this plan of placing the money in the hands of the members for the district is to be closed up forever. If the hon. member for Georgetown could show a heap of stone which he had paid for out of his own pocket, he would be reimbursed for it.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—If they have contracted this liability it should be taken out of their next year's grant. This is the customary method. If the stone is on hand they have it to make the roads with which is an additional reason for not giving the extra amount.

Mr. P. SINCLAIR.—When this was brought before the House I objected to it, because I consider it right to serve every district alike. In the district which I represent £150 extra was expended last year, and it was deducted from the present year's grant.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT.—This money is not for Charlottetown alone, the district in which it is to be expended extends as far as Crabbs on the Malpeque Road, and a long distance in other directions. When we take into consideration the extent of the road, and the state it is usually in, we must consider the grant very small. As the hon. member for the City purchased this stone at a reasonable rate, and as we are going to change the present system, we thought that the House would not say anything against the appropriation.

Mr. McLENNAN.—Mr Speaker, I have no desire to oppose the people of Charlottetown getting a fair share of the public money, but I am opposed to the principle on which this money has been granted. If other hon. members had known that had they expended £50 extra they would have been reimbursed, they would have done so. If this money is to be expended by Commissioners, I trust the Government will appoint better ones than they had formerly. It has been said that there are men who make very good representatives, but very poor road-makers, and I would say there may be very good members of society who are very poor commissioners.

A message was received from the Legislative Council stating that they had passed the Bill to Incorporate the St. Peter's Bay Agricultural Society, without amendment.

Hon. Mr. CALLBECK.—I wish to offer a few remarks in reference to this grant. It is not for the benefit of Charlottetown alone, but for all the country in the vicinity of it.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—This resolution does not say where the money is to be laid out.

Hon. Mr. CALLBECK.—These roads are not travelled by a large portion of the citizens of Charlottetown once a month, but persons living in the country are travelling over them almost every week, therefore they are more benefit to the people living outside of the City than to those living in it. These roads extend as far as Poplar Island Bridge in one direction, a distance of over three miles, and it is well known that it is as hard to keep three miles in repair near the city as it is twenty miles in some parts of the country where there is very little travelling. My constituents will not say that too much money has been expended on this road, for they have all to travel over it in coming to town. If the Island were divided into municipal districts, and each district was required to keep its own roads in repair, the argument might be good, but this is not the case; and while the streets of Charlottetown are kept in repair by a direct tax upon the citizens, I think the roads leading to it should be kept up at the public expense. I think it is just and right to give this grant, although it may be a little out of order. In different districts there has been a large outlay to repair damages caused by storms, and when large special grants have been given for this purpose, I do not think it is wrong to reimburse the city for this small outlay. The members for the city embraced the opportunity of purchasing the stone when it could be had at a cheap rate; the stone is on hand, and it amounts to the same thing as granting £60 more this year to purchase it.

The question was then put on the amendment proposed by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and negatived on the following division:—

*For the Amendment*—Hons. Haviland, Macaulay, Henderson; Messrs. Prowse, Cameron, Owen, McLennan, Ramsay, P. Sinclair—9.

*Against it*—Hons. Attorney General, Leader of the Government, Davies, Kelly, Laird, Callbeck; Messrs. Arsenault, Green, G. Sinclair, Reilly, McNeill, Kickham, Brecken, McCormack, Howatt, Yeo—16.

BALDERSTON, Reporter.

Mr. REILLY from the Committee of the whole House, on the further consideration of a supply, reported the following resolution, which was again read:—

*Resolved*, That the sum of one thousand pounds be granted and placed at the disposal of the Government to deepen Tignish Run, and other works, in the nature of a Breakwater thereat, &c.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—Mr. Chairman, It would be a waste of the public money to grant a thousand pounds for the improvement of Tignish Run. As the sand gathers in such immense quantities, we know that no permanent structure can be built that would be a benefit to the country. However much we may have had the rights of the fishermen dinned into our ears, there are many other ways in which the money might be employed. It would be better to give a bounty to fishermen to try experiments, than to absolutely waste that sum; therefore, I move that the clause relating to Tignish Run be struck out.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD.—The hon. leader of the Opposition has given us his opinion on this matter against that of the engineer, who has given us such an able and satisfactory report. He goes by hearsay, which leads him to affirm that the engineer may be wrong; but we must receive his opinions with a few grains of allowance. There is no occasion for a bounty to the fishermen as they have exported mackerel equal in value to a quarter of a million bushels of oats. We wish to facilitate the catching of fish, for in case of a change of wind, there is at present no harbor near enough to the fishing grounds into which boatmen can run for safety, and out of which, when the storm is over, they can go immediately into the fishing ground without loss of time; but Tignish Run, if improved as recommended by the engineer, would answer all the purposes required. If we make other improvements, we may bend for once, to enable enterprising fishermen to get to the fishing grounds, in season. Considering the importance of our fisheries, we should afford those engaged in them, all the facilities in our power. Almost everything a fishermen consumes is dutiable, and therefore, he should receive his share of the revenue as well as the farmer. I maintain that the grant is a very just one, and that the improvement proposed is worthy of experiment. We know that large sums have been granted by the various Governments of this Colony, from time to time, for matters which are mere experiments. As we have the opinion of a skillful engineer, we should consider that it is a better guide than the opinion of the hon. leader of the Opposition, when we know that he has never seen Tignish Run, and consequently, speaks from hearsay.

Hon. Mr. McAULAY.—The remarks made by the hon. member for Tryon (Mr. Laird) are disingenious, for it is well known that when a matter of this kind is submitted to a professional man, he only gives his opinion, but cannot tell whether it will be a failure or a success. I agree with the remarks made by the hon. member, when he says that the report made upon Tignish Run, bears the marks of a master mind; but would this report justify the Government in expending a thousand pounds upon the proposed works. I can perceive that a good deal of judgment has been exercised in the making out of the plan which accompanies the report; but I maintain that there will be an accumulation of sand that will ultimately render the whole affair useless, and, therefore, the outlay of the money will not be rewarded by increased facilities for carrying on the fisheries. There is a new channel to be formed and a new breakwater to be constructed, which may cost a great deal more than has been estimated by the engineer, and after all it may be destroyed by a tremendous freshet; therefore, I must oppose the grant.

Mr. McNEILL.—I must admit that one thousand pounds seems a large amount to expend for the construction of a harbor, but I know something about the locality, and believe that a harbor for the boats could be formed. The hon member for Tignish stated in this house last evening, that the fishing in that part of the country is carried on by boats; therefore, they should be provided with a harbor, if the construction of one is practicable. Some encouragement should be given the fishermen in that locality, for when the tide falls, it is very difficult for them to get their boats out of the Run to the fishing grounds. I think the proposed improvements will really benefit those engaged in the fisheries, and that they will be able to get in and out with their boats. This grant appears to bring about a connection between the Agricultural and commercial interests, for there has been a jealousy between those engaged in these two pursuits for some time although they should go hand in hand. We know that when there were three thousand barrels of mackerel are exported, there must be a large quantity of goods consumed. Fishermen consume a large quantity of goods for their numbers, because they have to buy everything they consume, from their coats to the bite which they eat. All the articles which they consume are dutiable, and consequently, they contribute a considerable amount to the general revenue. I am inclined to support the grant, because I think a good boat harbour could be constructed, and is really necessary.

Mr. KICKHAM.—I think that the thousand pounds would be well applied if it will accomplish the objects proposed, namely, to construct a boat harbor and breakwater, and at the same time give employment to the people, thereby enabling them to purchase seed grain. It would be better to assist the people in this way than to give them that amount in money.

Mr. P. SINCLAIR.—When we take into consideration the object intended, we cannot think the sum granted a large amount. We have neither canals nor railroads, and unless we stimulate our industrial enterprise, we cannot prosper as a Colony. I have been informed by persons competent to judge in these matters, that this will be money well expended. The people in that section of the Island have no harbor from Cascampec to the West Point, and, therefore, harbor accomodation should be provided if possible. It seems strange that the Opposition should use such strong language against the grant, when there are so many good reasons why the proposed improvements should be made. I think the Government are fully justified in voting the money, for the increased trade caused by these improvements will bring into the revenue far more than the interest would amount to. For these reasons, I will heartily support the grant.

Mr. PROWSE.—I do not agree with the hon. members who have so strongly advocated the construction of a harbor and breakwater at Tignish Run. I think any man who looks calmly on the plan, will have doubts as to the practicability of the work contemplated, for a temporary breastwork cannot be made to stand in such an exposed situation. We have ample proof of this assertion in the destruction of the West Point Wharf by the force of the Gulf storms. Although the hon. member for Tignish is not in his place, I must say he has let the cat out of the bag, that the people are in want of seed grain. To open this run for the free passage of boats, and to construct a breakwater, would require more than the sum proposed. If I understand the matter, a very large sum would be expended in dredging out the harbor alone; and then the construction of the breastwork would require another large amount. After the whole is finished it might prove a failure, therefore, I consider it would be a great waste of the public money, to grant it for that purpose.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—The hon. member for Murray Harbor (Mr. Prowse) adduces arguments which we have always heard made use of by the Opposition in questions of this kind, and when he hears what the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Kickham) says, he twists the subject and goes on in another strain. A sum was granted last Session for a survey of the Run, and we have the Report of the engineer now before us. The Report says that it is a practicable work and one which will be of real service if it is completed, and that is all the information we can wish for on the matter. We have had the necessity for such a work clearly shown by one of the members of the district in which it is required; and I am perfectly satisfied that the work is practicable. The hon. member for Georgetown (Mr. McAulay) says that the money might be laid out more advantageously in other parts of the country, but we cannot think so, when we find that this work would confer a great benefit upon the fishermen in Tignish, who have no harbor accommodation; we should encourage their industry and enterprise. I see no good reason against the grant, and I must prefer to take the opinions of the engineer, on the utility of the proposed works before that of any hon. member of this House.

Hon. Mr. HENDERSON. This Report is certainly creditable to the engineer, and must have satisfied every one who listened to it. The sum named in the grant seems large, but my fear is that it will not be sufficient to accomplish the object intended, for it is doubtful whether he has taken all the contingencies of the case into consideration, in making out the report. Have the effects of the frosts of winter been taken into consideration? My principal doubt is upon this point. As far as the fisheries are concerned, I must say I wish to see them encouraged, and if I was sure that the proposed improvements would prove a permanent benefit, I would gladly support the grant. I do not lose sight of the general fact, that if any portion of the Colony is improved, the whole population indirectly reap the benefits of the improvement. But the principle referred to by the hon. member for Souris, (Mr. Kickham) would make it a very different case, if viewed in that way. By giving the people employment they may be assisted to a considerable extent in purchasing seed grain, but I cannot say what view I shall take on the matter till I hear more on the subject.

Mr. BELL.—I will make a clear statement of the whole affair from beginning to end. For my part, I should be the last man to vote against any measure that would do good; I believe the construction of a breakwater and the dredging of Tignish Run would be a great benefit to that part of the Island. The engineer has laid the probable cost, and I have heard a prominent American gentleman who was capable of judging in such matters, affirm that the plan can be carried into execution. As to the remarks made about seed, there was a meeting held in Tignish, which I attended, where it was stated that there was a general want of fodder and seed grain, and as matters looked rather dark, the people intended to petition the Legislature. But if the Legislature would grant one thousand pounds for Tignish Run, they would repudiate the idea of asking for a sum of money to purchase seed grain. They would rather work and earn the money by shipping timber and other materials for the construction of the breakwater, &c., than petition this House for aid. The grant is not asked for, to enable them to purchase seed, but to open up the harbor; although it will answer two purposes. When a storm arises the tides are high, and the fishermen can then get into the Run; but if they wish to get out to the fishing ground after a storm, they cannot, as there is not sufficient water. When we take all the circumstances in connexion with the matter into consideration, we must allow that the grant is a just and reasonable one. Fishermen consume a greater quantity of dutiable goods than an equal number of any other class of men in the country, and therefore, they are entitled to a share of the revenue as well as others. A harbor in that locality would benefit all classes, and therefore, I hope the hon. members will offer no factious opposition to the grant. The money would be well expended, and would effect the object for which it is intended.

Mr YEO.—I have much pleasure in supporting the grant, for if the proposed improvements can be effected, they would prove a great benefit to that neighborhood; but whether the works would stand or not, I do not know. The hon. member for Murray Harbor (Mr. Prowse) has opposed this grant because he believed the works, like the West Point Wharf, would not stand the force of the storms; but he must remember that the wharf was not ballasted in any way, and therefore, it could not be expected that it would withstand the breaking up of the ice. If the remaining part of it is finished properly and well ballasted, I hope to be able to report, when we meet next session that the wharf is still there, and doing good service to that part of the country. I am glad to find that the Government are so liberal to the Western section of the Island.

Mr. GREEN.—Since this question has been mooted, I have been on the spot, and after examining the plan of the engineer, I have come to the conclusion that the improvements will be practicable, and, if carried out, the harbor will prove a great benefit to that section of the Colony which is large. The people have no other harbor through which to export the productions of the soil, and out of which fishermen can proceed directly to the fishing grounds. There is one difficulty which attends these improvements, and that is, sandbanks are very apt to rise at the head of the breakwater, which no engineer will be able to overcome; but if a counter current of water could be caused it would carry away the gathering sand, and I believe there would be such a current. I will support a grant to carry out the proposed works, and as the Government are responsible for the undertaking, we will have the opportunity of bringing up the matter at some future day, if the improvements are not properly carried out.

Hon. LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—I think the hon. member for Cascumpec (Mr. Bell) used a curious term when he said that this was a factious opposition, for he must know that this is not a party question. He has heard the two hon. members (Messrs. Yeo and Green) state that they would support the grant, which will show him that the matter is not supported by one party, but by hon. members on both sides of the House. Civil engineers are not always correct in their views and calculations, for we know from history when the celebrated George Stephenson invented the Railway, all the eminent engineers of that day pronounced his plans impracticable, and yet he, without education, carried out the Railway system. Although he was ridiculed in the British House of Lords, he went on with his invention, and rendered it a complete success, in the very teeth of those who laughed at him. Therefore we should not always trust to the opinions of engineers, however eminent they may be. I have quite sufficient grounds for taking the course I am pursuing; and notwithstanding the remarks which have fallen from several hon. members, they will not alter my action on this matter. The Attorney General censured the hon. member for Murray Harbor (Mr. Prowse) very strongly, because he was of the opinion that the principal object in granting the money was not to construct a harbor for the people of Tignish, but for assisting them to purchase seed grain. The Attorney General may refer to the address of the people of that section of the Island to His Excellency in Council, and he will see that the grant for this work was proposed by the people themselves, in order to enable them to purchase seed grain. Although the proposed work would prove to be one of great utility to the country, when I consider the object of the grant is really for another purpose, I cannot support it in the way it is now before this House. If the Government intended to carry out this work under the inspection of Mr. Boyd, and all the details were connected with the grant, in re would be some reason why the House should support it. This money may be placed in the hands of parties who are not scientific men, and who may not carry out the views of the engineer. Who is to have the superintendence of the work? If the Government will do honor to Mr. Green by intrusting him with this business, we should have a guarantee that it would be carried out, but at present we have reason to conclude that the proposed improvements will ever be executed.

Mr. BELL.—I will give an explanation. The people did not ask the Government for anything except that for which they intended to give an equivalent, for they would rather work for their money than ask for a grant to assist them in purchasing seed grain. I think they have a just right to a portion of the revenue of the Colony to carry out the proposed improvements, and for my own part I should be happy to see the hon. member for Summerside (Mr. Green) appointed to superintend the work, for I believe that he is well qualified for that responsible position.

Mr. McLENNAN.—I do not wish to oppose a grant which will improve the condition of the Colony, but I believe too much money has been spent by the Government in manufacturing harbors, for our revenue is not large enough to do so. I have been informed by intelligent persons that the proposed scheme is impracticable, and if constructed would prove a complete failure. I believe that the engineer has not been long enough on the spot to give a correct judgment on its practicability or its permanency, as he had not seen the effects of the winter and the moving of the tide in that harbor. I have heard that three cheers were given to the members of that district at a public meeting for their promise to use their efforts to procure a grant for Tignish Run. We should improve the harbors we have when we can, and not undertake to create harbors, as our revenue will not admit of such large outlays.

Mr. HOWATT.—I have no acquaintance with that part of the country, but I believe the proposed improvement is an experiment. I will not raise any objection to the grant, as it seems to answer two purposes, viz., to enable the people to purchase seed grain and the construction of a harbor. There should be a considerable amount of money granted for the relief of various portions of the Colony, for many of the people are hard pushed for seed grain, owing to a failure in last year's crops. The Government should assist them as far as the revenue will warrant them in so doing, and I should be most happy to give them my support. I highly approve of the plan adopted in the present case.

Dr. JENKINS.—I am happy to hear that the hon. member for Tryon (Mr. Howatt) supports this movement; but the great question in this case is, whether the scheme is practicable or not. According to the report of Mr. Boyd the work can be successfully carried out and will be a great benefit to that section of the Island. On the other hand we should assist the poor farmers by giving them employment, thereby enabling them to purchase seed grain. Instead of being a reason against the grant, I think the opportunity of assisting the poor is a strong inducement and an argument in favor of it.

Mr. ARSENAULT.—I believe the construction of a harbor at Tignish Run will be a feasible undertaking, and one of vast importance to the fishermen and farmers in that locality. Whatever the people of that section of the Colony undertake, they accomplish with credit to themselves, and give general satisfaction. For instance, they have built a large new Lighthouse and a splendid Cathedral. If they undertake to construct a harbor they will carry out the work satisfactorily to all concerned. It is supposed by some hon. members that this grant is asked solely for the purpose of aiding the people to purchase seed grain, but it is not so. They have petitioned this House for a grant to improve their harbor, and to construct a breakwater. It is true they will supply timber for these works, for which they will obtain cash to enable them to purchase seed grain, but whether they required seed or not they would have petitioned this House for a grant to improve their harbor. I believe they will accomplish what they have in view.

Mr. BRECKEN.—I do not think an objection can be raised to this grant, on account of its accomplishing two objects; if it can be properly expended let it be done. If the people are in want of seed grain this is an additional reason why a grant should be given, and as we have the report of a thoroughly competent engineer to convince us that the proposed improvements are practicable, we should grant the sum mentioned in the resolution. I think the Government are quite right in voting a sum of money for that district, and I have no objection to see a thousand pounds expended on this work; for I believe it is time something was done for the fishing interests of this Colony. If this money will facilitate these interests, I will give my support to the grant; but if all is correct that I have heard on this subject, I would rather see it expended upon the roads. I have great doubt whether this Run can be converted into a harbor, on account of the shifting of the sands; however the Government are the best judges, and they have the report of the engineer as a guide. I will not offer any objections to the grant, although I have heard that even a boat cannot be formed. I could agree on the advisability of granting a sum of money when the people are in want, provided any public benefit is to be derived from the expenditure of that grant. I do not intend to allow what I have heard influence my vote, for the remarks of the hon. member for Summerside have had great weight with me. It is a work requiring a man of skill to overcee.

Hon LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION.—The work is to be carried out by a Committee to be appointed for that purpose.

The Resolution was then agreed to.

House adjourned.

ISAAC OXENHAM, Reporter.

### TEMPERANCE PETITION.

Mr P. SINCLAIR presented a petition of G. W. Millner and others, praying for an amendment to the License Act. He said the petition was signed by 3,317 of the most enlightened and intelligent men in the Island, and hoped that a petition which had been so generally signed would be equally well supported by hon. members in the House.

The Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL, in seconding the motion that the petition be received, remarked that among other things the petition recommended an alteration, the consideration of which had been before the House on a former occasion. The petitioners desire to prevent those applying for Tavern Licenses from going from house to house to have their papers signed by the inhabitants of a school district, and consider that it would be an improvement to have this done at public meetings, but that it was not necessary to go into the details of the measure, as an opportunity would be afforded to the House to do so again. He had, in looking over the petition, noticed that several who signed it, were not temperance men, but they desire to keep the selling of spirituous liquors within certain bounds.

Ordered to Committee of the whole House to-morrow.

### BAPTIST CHURCH AT LONG CREEK.

On motion Hon. Mr. Callbeck, House went into Committee on Bill to Incorporate Baptist Church at Long Creek.

Mr McLennan in the Chair.

When last clause in Bill was read, "That the Act be and continue in force for ten years," the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said that an Act vesting property in a body, as this one was doing, should be permanent, and not for a definite time.

The Hon ATTORNEY GENERAL fully concurred in the opinion of the Leader of the Opposition that, although it was not the custom to make such Acts permanent, yet it was very inconvenient to have them otherwise.

On motion the eighth clause was then struck out, when Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair, and the Bill reported agreed to with an amendment.

### CHARLOTTETOWN INCORPORATION ACT.

Mr. BRECKEN, in moving that the House go into the order of the day for the second reading of this Bill, said it was not necessary that he should then go into the principles of the bill as he had done so when he introduced the petition, asking leave to present the Bill.

Hon. LEADER OF THE GOVERNMENT.—Mr. Speaker, this Bill grants far greater privileges than did a similar one which was introduced here last year, and which this House would not then agreed to. With respect to the taxing of freeholders, if the taxes are paid, I do not see that it is necessary to know who pays them, and as to