

Parliamentary.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

Debate on the Board of Works and the Road Service.

Mr. McNEILL had formerly been of opinion that a Board of Works was necessary, because a great deal of the public money had formerly been spent uselessly; but the working of the Board had not given the satisfaction which the country expected from it. It was, however, but a new institution, and might yet be made to work so as to give better satisfaction. In reference to the Militia grant, he had always considered it a useless expenditure of the public money, for he did not think there was any occasion to protect the art of war in this country. The grant for military service might be lessened by a thousand pounds, and the money might be employed in the purchase of a Steam Dredging machine, which would be a great benefit to the Island. He had endeavored to persuade the late Government to change the Statute Labor system altogether, but could not accomplish his wishes in reference to it. The roads at present are not made early enough in the spring to do them much good; if the money were expended before they hardened, we should reap great benefit from it, but at present it is almost wasted. If the Statute labor were commuted for a small sum of money, it would do more for that desirable object. Whether Road Commissioners would still be necessary, was not for him to say, but he believed these officers did not always prove very efficient, and that they were not sufficiently remunerated for the services which they should perform. If the Government would incline to this alteration of our present road system, they should have his ready support, for he believed it would be a vast benefit to the country.

Hon. P. SINCLAIR hoped the Government would order the printing of the Statute Labor, in reference to the Statute Labor, to be done in time, so as to allow the labor on the public roads to be done earlier in the season. If the road work were performed about the first of May it would be a great advantage to the country, and it was better to leave the roads as they were, than to perform the labor in the beginning of July. As this is the first year for the present Government, they say they cannot make the necessary alterations; but he thought it would be just as easy now as at any other time.

Mr. McNEILL said the hon. member for New London had made some practical suggestions in reference to the time at which the road work should be performed, and was of opinion that if the regulations were printed earlier, the labor would also be performed earlier in the season; but the hon. member was in error, the printing was done in proper time. In order to have the Statute labor performed earlier, the Act itself would have to be amended.

Hon. Mr. PERRY said that the Road Act bound parties to have the road work done within a certain time. To call the people from their farms in the month of May, would cause a serious loss to the country, but if hon. members thought the time had arrived to tax the people, instead of demanding their labor, the work could be done at any time in the year when required. It was severely punishing people to compel them to work several days upon the public roads every year, and should be abolished.

Mr. A. C. McDONALD said that the manner in which Statute labor is at present conducted, is a mere sham. A small tax of eighteen pence or two shillings per head, would go further to make good roads than the three days Statute labor, under the present system. The change is made in the system the better for the country, and would not require much legislation to bring this about, and it is high time the old system was discarded.

Mr. McLEAN heartily agreed with these hon. members who had spoken in favor of substituting a tax instead of the present Statute labor upon our roads; but eighteen pence per head would be insufficient for the purpose required, and the present Statute labor may now be commuted in three shillings and that sum is sufficiently small. In reference to the Board of Works, he was quite sure it was not giving as much satisfaction as was expected. It was hard that petitions from the different sections of the country, asking for grants of money for the public works, could not be brought before the House, in order that a free vote might be given upon them. These matters were dealt with together with the Board of Works, to do just as they thought proper, while the representatives of the people could do little or nothing for their districts in reference to matters under the control of that Board. The Board of Works should not be altogether composed of members of the Executive Council.

Mr. BEER thought it would be a step in the right direction to remodel our road system altogether. It would be better for all parties to pay a reasonable tax than to spend so much valuable time upon the public roads, when so little labor was performed. It was acknowledged on all sides that the time spent in performing Statute labor at present was nearly wasted, and that no good resulted from it. In Lot 48—which was a part of the District he represented—there were about eighty Volunteers, who were exempted from performing Statute labor, and when that number was reduced, there were not many persons left who were liable to perform road work. At Brackley Point there were forty more who belonged to the Cavalry Companies, and those also were exempted. If, therefore, Statute labor depends upon those men for its performance, it would be left undone. It was high time the old system was discarded, and a new and better one substituted.

Hon. Mr. CALLECK quite agreed with the remarks of the hon. member for the City in reference to the propriety of performing Statute labor earlier in the season, for roads that had been properly made in spring had always been found to be far better than those made after they had thoroughly hardened. If the soil is thrown upon the roads immediately after the frost leaves the ground, it will adhere, but not after the road hardens. It had always been found that if the streets were not put in good repair in the spring, it was worse than useless to do so at any other time. Mr. Bagnall, an overseer in his district, had called on him to perform their Statute labor early in the spring, and although it was contrary to the Act, that gentleman said he was so thoroughly convinced of the advantage of performing the work at that season, that he would run the risk of the consequences. A much less sum than the price of three days' labor would suffice to make good roads, if the work were performed at the proper season. In many districts not a whole day's labor was performed, and yet the work was not done properly. He was quite aware that such a change could not be brought about

without having the matter well ventilated. In his late canvass through his district he brought the matter up, and found that the majority of the farmers were in favor of the change. They were also in favor of abolishing the labor system, and putting on a tax instead.

Mr. McNEILL said that it appeared strange to him that overseers could not get three shillings worth of work done by each man working three days upon the roads. He thought it surprising that any overseer could make his affidavit that his men had worked three days and done the amount of labor required by law, and yet did not get three shillings worth of labor from each man under his charge. He would like to see the present system changed for a tax, which, however, should not be less than three shillings per man. The Commissioner should also have his work performed earlier; for, unless done in the spring, it was of no use whatever. He thought the work might be done early in the season without interfering with farming occupations, if a tax were levied instead of the present Statute labor.

Hon. D. DAVIES said it was strange if an overseer could not get his men to perform three shillings worth of work in three days, for a man could earn five shillings per day in working for other persons at other employments. If the roads were repaired in the month of May, we should have good travelling; but at present the labor was performed entirely too late in the season. If the Statute labor were performed for a reasonable tax, the labor could be done earlier, and the money expended would enable poor people to procure seed grain. The Legislature was sometimes called upon to grant sums of money to assist the poorer class of farmers for that purpose, and money expended upon the roads early in the spring might render them the necessary assistance.

Hon. Mr. PERRY said the reason Statute labor was not performed earlier in the season was, perhaps, that the publication of the Parliamentary Debates was not completed till about the first of July, and the farmers generally finished their personal before proceeding with the road work. Every road overseer had an office, and received the papers containing these debates, and it took a long time to read them, for they were so long. He saw an item for the salary of an additional assistant in the Post Office, and would like to know why a third assistant was required in that office.

Hon. Mr. OWEN said that it had been formerly found necessary, when the mails arrived to close the office for an hour, for want of an additional hand. Besides this, the officers could not attend to the sale of postage stamps and perform the duties pertaining to the office at the same time. Those stamps had previously been sold at different stores in the town, but it had been found necessary to sell them at the office. The office had formerly been opened at eight o'clock, a. m., and closed at eight o'clock, p. m., but it is now open at seven o'clock, a. m., and closed at nine o'clock, p. m. There was, therefore, a necessity to employ an additional clerk to perform the duties of the office properly and satisfactorily.

Hon. LEADER of the GOVERNMENT said that all agreed that our present road system was not working satisfactorily, and that there was great need of a change. He had the honor to occupy the position of Chairman of the Board of Works, and was of opinion that it was not constituted as it should be. The subdivision of money for the road service between both the members of the House and the Board of Works did not work well. A sum of money was voted by the House, to be distributed by the Board of Works; but the fact was, that hon. members, knowing there was a sum in the hands of the Board, took good care to get as much as they possibly could—each for his own district. The Board continually received applications for large sums from all parts of the country, and it was a hard matter to decide which work was most important to be done, for there was not sufficient to satisfy all. If a bridge broke down, the Board were obliged to attend to it immediately; but if the money in their hands were all expended upon the roads, they would be in a position to meet a case of emergency. The large number of petitions received is fully considered by them, but as there is only a limited sum placed in their hands, they are compelled to keep the greater part of it for contingencies. It cannot, therefore, be expected that the Board could give satisfaction as it at present stands. The whole road service and public works in the country should be placed in their hands, in order to make it work satisfactorily. This was not the proper time to discuss the amount of commutation money which should be paid instead of the present Statute labor. The amount paid the Board Commissioners for their services was ridiculous. It was well known they could not perform their duties properly for that small sum. The present system of performing Statute labor was not fair to the poor man, who has to work his three days upon the roads; but if the labor were commuted for the payment of a few shillings, he would have an opportunity of getting his money back again by taking a contract for the repairing of a piece of road, and thus place himself in a better position than at present. He had just received a letter from an old friend in the County, in reference to this very thing, whose views were in accordance with those just advanced by himself. The commutation money should be nine shillings per head, or three shillings per day; the small amount of three shillings was simply absurd. In another year the whole matter would be taken up, and made to work more satisfactorily than at present. Although he was a member of the Board, he did not at all approve of the working of it. Because it was necessary to have one from each County, he considered it his duty to take the position and do the best he could under present circumstances. He thought it would be well for both sides of the House to consider the matter well before another Session, and devise some better means of laying out the public money next year.

Hon. Mr. OWEN moved that the sum of £5,000 be granted for the general service of roads and bridges for the present year, to be apportioned as follows, viz:—

Queen's County,	£1940
King's " "	1280
Prince " "	1480
Road Compensation,	100
Contingent expenses, to be equally divided between the three Counties,	300
	£5000

The resolution gave £500 each to King's and Prince Counties more than last year.

Hon. Mr. PERRY.—Prince County required extensive repairs to several bridges, and if the cost of such repairs were taken out of the road grant, it would be impossible to keep the roads in a proper state. Queen's County had always received more of the public money than the two others, and it had the additional advantage of its local wants being readily brought to the notice of the Government, while the requirements of the other Counties had to be signified through the post office, and consequently they did not receive the same prompt attention as those of Queen's.

Mr. McLEAN.—King's County required more than the additional £0 apportioned by the resolution. The Statute labor in that County was of little importance. Many of the roads and bridges were almost impassable.

Hon. Mr. KELLY.—The members for Queen's County had the best right to complain. The traffic on its roads was far in excess of that in the other Counties, and it should receive at least the same amount as last year.

Mr. BEER.—In the Third District of Queen's County there were no macadamized roads, although the traffic of roads was used for the traffic from Souris, Georgetown, and other parts of King's County, passed through the district.

Hon. Mr. CALLECK agreed with hon. Mr. Kelly that the representatives of Queen's County should not allow the resolution to pass without objection. A great portion of the trade of the Island centered in the Capital. The population of Queen's County was equal to that of Prince and King's combined, and the wear and tear of the roads were proportionate. Queen's was entitled to the lion's share of the appropriation if the division were based on population. The hon. member for the Third District of Queen's County (Mr. Beer) complained of the situation of his District, but he should remember that the steamer on the East River to Koff considerable of the traffic from the roads in that District; and he would find that a large portion of the travel from Rustico and the adjoining settlements passed through the Second District.

Hon. Mr. SINCLAIR hoped the Government would treat Queen's County with more liberality. That County contained one half the population of the Island, and it was but reasonable to suppose that the travel over its roads was a third or a fourth more than that of the other Counties.

Mr. A. C. McDONALD.—King's County did not get a fair share in proportion to the number of miles of roads in it. It was cut up by rivers, and there was a great number of cross-roads, which were in a very bad state, and would require a considerable amount to make them passable. Many of those roads, after having been opened out, had been allowed to become overgrown, and in the spring it was, in many instances, impossible to get to market.

Mr. CAMERON.—Queen's County required more than was provided by the resolution. There was no doubt that the other Counties required more than was provided for them, but the grant proposed for Queen's County was entirely too small. He would rather increase than diminish the grant; but he was not aware that the state of the finances would warrant it. The suggestion to abolish Statute labor was worthy of consideration. It would be advantageous if the repairs on the roads were performed earlier in the season.

Mr. McNEILL had no objection to Queen's County receiving a fair share of the road money; but the soil of that County was of a quality better for roads than that of Prince County, having less of low-lying, swampy land. If any one would travel from East Point to North Cape, he would be satisfied which parts of the Island required most money for their roads. Some hon. members had argued that the greater population of Queen's County entitled it to the lion's share of the road money, but he had always supposed that the greater the number of the population was, the greater would be the amount of commutation money. There had been some little macadamizing done in Prince County, and he hoped to see more performed. Queen's County always had liberal appropriations. When any public money is required for Queen's County, it can be easily obtained; and as the Government was to build a railway, he hoped they would give liberally to Prince County. In case of an accident to a bridge in Queen's County, the Board of Works attended to it at once. The case was, however, very different with the other Counties.

Hon. Mr. SINCLAIR wished to ask the hon. member if he would be willing to deduct from the road appropriation for Sandemside and increase the amount at present given to the wilderness tracts in the western section of Prince County? It was unfair to take from Queen's County and increase the grants to the others. Government should have given £500 more than they have.

Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN.—Montague bridge was scarcely safe. £1000 would probably be required to put it into a proper condition. That sum could not be taken from the road money. It should be referred to the Board of Works. All important public works should be under the management of that Board. As the amount of the appropriation for the road service had been settled by Government, they must, he supposed, be content.

Mr. HOWE.—In the vicinity of shipping places, the roads required to be macadamized. He had expected a larger appropriation, and hoped that the Government would yet see the propriety of giving it.

Mr. McNEILL.—The amount of population afforded no argument for increased appropriation for this service, but the extent and nature of the traffic to which the roads were subjected. There was more travelling on the roads in the Second District of

Queen's County, than in any other part of the Island. It was difficult to keep up the roads in that district. He had expected that as the revenue had increased, the appropriation for Roads and Bridges would be larger. Such a course would be only returning part of the taxes to those who paid them.

Mr. HOOPER.—King's County had not had a fair share of road money for the last four years. He was glad that there was a small improvement this Session. He would not object to Queen's County getting a little more than the others, if it were expended more generally over the County, where required. For instance, Mount Stewart Bridge was an important shipping-place, and the roads in its neighborhood were in a very bad condition. The roads from Mount Stewart to the County line, at Saint Andrew's, is the worst to be found between Charlottetown and Souris. King's County generally to travel to places of shipment a greater distance than those of the other Counties. The people of St. Peter's were under the necessity, on account of the state of the harbor, to carry their produce to market at Mount Stewart, Cardigan Bridge, or Grand River. The Road from the head of St. Peter's Bay to Cardigan Bridge, was in a very bad state, and was much in need of being macadamized. Some of the farmers on the North Side, had to travel a distance of twenty miles to market.

The resolution was agreed to, and Progress reported.

Hon. D. DAVIES presented a petition of Alexander Brown, Artemas Lord, and others, praying the establishment of an additional Bank in Charlottetown. Referred to special Committee of Hon. D. Davies, Mr. Lefurgy, and Hon. P. Sinclair.

WEDNESDAY, March 15th.

Hon. the Speaker in the Chair.
Hon. Attorney General presented a petition from the Trustees of the Union Bank, which was ordered to lie on the table.

On motion of the Hon. Attorney General, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole House on the Bill intituled an Act to amend the Act relating to

Vaccination.

Mr. Richards in the Chair.
Hon. LEADER of the GOVERNMENT said the Bill had been so fully discussed yesterday, he thought he might be excused from making any extended remarks thereon. The Bill having been read clause by clause, the House resumed, when the Chairman reported the Bill agreed to without any amendment, when, on motion, it was ordered to be engrossed.

Hon. D. DAVIES presented a petition from certain Tavern-keepers in Charlottetown, praying for an alteration in the License Law, which was, on motion of the hon. member, referred to the Committee of the whole House on the Act relating to

Tavern Licenses.

Mr. Richards in the Chair.
Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL said it was desirable that the several Acts should be consolidated, and rendered more intelligible. The Law, as it then stood, placed the power of granting Tavern Licenses in the County, in the hands of the people in the respective School Districts, and provided that two public meetings should be held in any district for that purpose in any one year. The practice had been, in some districts, to allow two meetings to be held for each class of Licenses. Last September a dispute arose respecting that interpretation of the Law and he (Hon. Attorney General) was consulted. On looking at the Act carefully, he came to the conclusion that but two meetings in all, could be held in any school district for any one year, which it was thought was too stringent, and it was, by the Bill under consideration, proposed to allow two meetings for Store Licenses, and the same for Taverns, to be held in any school district requiring them in any one year. The petition which had been submitted by his hon. colleague had reference to the Act of 33rd Vic. cap. 9, which prohibited Licensed Tavern-keepers from selling or allowing spirituous liquors to be drunk by minors on the premises, and when that Section would be read, it would be for that hon. Committee to consider what decisions it would come to on that point. An application had recently been made to the Government by a party for the renewal of a License which had been cancelled by the Grand Jury, but he (Hon. Atty General) came to the conclusion that the Government ought not to interfere, because the Act said: "The Grand Jury shall be, and they are hereby empowered to suspend, or wholly to annul and make void the License of any retailer of spirituous liquors, in like manner as Justices of the Peace are empowered to do by this Act; and no right of appeal from any judgment or order of the Grand Jury, shall be granted or allowed." Had the License in the case to which he referred been suspended, the Government might have considered the application, but it had been cancelled.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN said whether they wished it or not, the fact was that much liquor was drunk in the country. People would have it, and they were not there to say what they were or were not to drink. The Government were empowered and commanded to collect a revenue from spirituous liquors, and it appeared to him that they had then to do with one of two things: either to prohibit its sale altogether, or to extend and simplify the law relating to its sale. In all parts of the country, persons were continually being fined for selling spirituous liquors contrary to Law. In other places, those who make due preparation for its sale according to Law, find it impossible to obtain a License, while others, when not expecting it, have, for the same reason, to close their houses. In some instances, the power was, to a great extent, in the hands of one or two Magistrates, who from opposition to the traffic, or prejudice to the individual, withheld their signatures from the necessary certificate. The Law should allow any two of the four nearest Magistrates to sign these certificates. He was pleased to hear the learned Attorney General say that he proposed to allow two meetings in each school district, to be held in a year for each class of Licenses. He was entirely opposed to throwing too many restrictions

in the way of the business. Make the Law as strict against gambling, selling to those whom they ought not, and all such importunities, as they thought was required; but so long as the Legislature legislated the business, its prosecution by those who engaged in its sale, should not be surrounded with barriers which amounted almost to a prohibition of the sale of spirituous liquors altogether. The act of last Session respecting minors was, he believed, often used for purposes of revenge, and was liable to be used unfairly to the prejudice of the Licensed Tavern-keepers.

Hon. Mr. CALLECK was glad the Hon. and Learned Attorney General had undertaken the consolidation of the License Laws, and hoped they would be simplified as much as possible. He did not doubt but that extremes were sometimes resorted to by parties on both sides, in carrying out the law. With respect to the petition of the Tavern-keepers, presented by the Hon. member for Charlottetown (he (Hon. Mr. Calbeck) believed it was necessary to have a law to prevent spirituous liquors from being sold to minors. A man, in some instances, might be imposed upon by a minor representing himself older than he was, but no Magistrate would impose a fine if such was made plain to him.

Mr. HOWLAN thought the Statute was imperative, and that it could be shown that a Tavern-keeper had violated the Law by selling to those he ought not, or refused those to whom he was allowed to sell, that he could be fined.

Hon. D. DAVIES thought the legislation of the last eight years had not improved the Tavern License Laws. He agreed with the Hon. member for Alberton, that if the traffic was legalized by Statute, it should not be surrounded with too many difficulties. Too stringent a Law had the effect of increasing illicit selling, which had a worse effect upon society than Licensed Taverns. Those engaged in the business, say it was difficult to tell who was, or was not a minor, on many occasions, and that they may have their License, in this way, suspended for an infraction of the law, which was most disastrous to their business. It was not fair to legislate a business, and then to hamper it with restrictions which might be ruinous to a man who had made due preparation for carrying it on.

Hon. Mr. PERRY did not doubt but that those engaged in the selling of spirituous liquors as Tavern-keepers, found their business somewhat hampered by the legal restrictions placed around them. But it was annoying also for parents, guardians, and masters, to have their children or servants going to Taverns and spending their time a day there, without their knowledge or consent. He (Hon. Mr. Perry) believed that it could be remedied by providing that, when parents or guardians did not wish liquor to be sold to any one under their charge, that they should serve a notice in writing upon the Tavern-keeper, who, if he violated the requirement, it involved, should then be liable to a fine under the Law imposed.

Mr. CAMERON thought the grievance complained of on the part of Tavern-keepers, was not well founded, for it was to him quite clear that if a Tavern-keeper sold liquor by mistake to a minor in one case, and refused to do so in another, under the same impression that he was younger than he supposed, in either case, no Magistrate or Court would impose a fine upon him. Instead of altering the law relating to minors, provision should be made to extend it to stores where goods were sold, as was done in the case of Taverns. Young men were in the habit of collecting at such places, where they often contracted habits that were very injurious. If any difficulties arose in Charlottetown about selling liquor to minors, who went on an errand after it, he thought, as they had so many Licensed Taverns in the city, it would be quite easy for any man who wished to have any, to go for it himself. Strict as they might suppose the Law to be, it was clear it was frequently violated. If any alteration was to be made, it should be to make it more stringent.

Hon. D. DAVIES believed that many evasions of the Law took place, and if the Act was made more stringent, these would increase. People in the country, as a general rule, did not care to become informers, and as regards minors, those in the business were frequently as a loss to know what to do respecting them. He knew a respectable house that had been closed on that account, the proprietor having had his License suspended.

Mr. McNEILL saw no difficulty in the matter. If a parent or other person wished to obtain liquor, and sent a minor after it, they had but to send an order, or note. He thought the Tavern-keepers knew their position, and would not be so careless as to have any doubts on their mind as to whether they should, or should not sell liquor to it. Magistrates did their duty properly, he thought there would not be as many Licensed Taverns in some places as there were, for he knew where there were parties who had obtained License to sell spirituous liquors and open a Tavern, whose houses and stables did not come up to what the law required. It was not fair to place so many restrictions upon the Tavern-keeper, and none upon the man who obtained a Store License. In the latter place, people frequently got drunk, and then went and annoyed the Tavern-keeper. He would place more restrictions around the Store Licenses than there were at present.

Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN said the Act under discussion required a good deal of consideration. It was one that affected the interests of the people of the whole Island. The Law was a very complicated one, and it was often difficult to understand, and so much in need of being simplified. It was also cumbersome and hard to comprehend. The section requiring a two-third majority of a School District to obtain a Tavern License was, he thought, unfair. A few might form a prejudice against an applicant, and thus prevent him from obtaining the number required. As was said by the hon. member for Alberton, if the traffic was to be legalized, surround it with all necessary safeguards required; but, while they lowered those persons having or obtaining Licenses, to continue to sell, as long as they continued to have the necessary accommodation, let them not be annoyed in the prosecution of business, with cumbersome Statutes so difficult to understand. The Act of last Session was, the most difficult for a licensed Tavern-keeper to observe. Under its provision it was easy for an evil-disposed person to annoy and impose upon any man who kept a Licensed Tavern. Although those men are following a legalized calling, yet the Law hampered them in carrying on their business. Those, and other complainants against the Law were generally made, and it was the duty of that hon. Committee wisely to consider them, and to simplify the Law, so that while such guarantees as society may require may be embodied in the Act, yet to see that no unnecessary obstructions were thrown in the way of those who engaged in that business.

Mr. CAMERON thought that if a Tavern-keeper sold spirituous liquors to a minor, not knowing he was one, he would not be fined in any Court. The complainants made against Tavern-keepers for selling to minors, did not relate so much to persons as old as twenty and sixteen. He thought that no person who took a right view of the matter, would object

to the Act prohibiting the sale of spirituous liquors to minors.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN thought if a Tavern-keeper sold liquor to a minor, under any circumstances, he did so at his peril, and that, as the Law read, the Court before whom he would be arraigned would have to fine him.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL said a Tavern-keeper would not be held as having violated the law, unless he sold to minors with a view to the liquor being consumed upon his premises. And, in doubtful cases, where he might, in ignorance of the age of the applicant for liquor, sell to a minor, it would have to be shown that he did so knowing he was a minor.

Hon. Mr. PERRY.—How could that be proved?

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Much, of course would have to be left to the discretion of the Court, which would draw a conclusion from the minor's appearance, and other circumstances.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN thought, where the head of a family became a confirmed drunkard, some provision should be made by law, whereby his wife, children, or friends, might step in and prevent him from bringing them all to ruin. It was true they might, as the law then stood, notify a Tavern-keeper not to sell liquor to him; but they had no legal means of preventing him from obtaining as much as he chose in other ways. It appeared always to him as a hardship that the children of such men had no legal remedy by which they could secure themselves from impending poverty in such cases. He thought such men should be treated as lunatics, which, in one sense, he considered they were.

Hon. D. DAVIES admitted that there was much good reason in the remarks of the Hon. member for Alberton, but to meet the views of the hon. member, a separate bill would have to be introduced. Nor did he know if such a Bill could well be brought in, inasmuch as it would be interfering with that personal freedom which was the inalienable right of every British subject. He had no hesitation however in saying that he believed such men were even worse than lunatics. With respect to Store Licenses, he thought they should not be granted for so long in less quantities than a quart. Making the law too strict, would defeat the end it was intended to subvert. Nor did he deem it necessary to impose the same regulations for obtaining a Store License which were required for a Tavern. For the former he did not know that it was really necessary to hold a public meeting to obtain the vote of the people, while in the latter, a majority of a School District should be sufficient to say whether a Tavern was required or not.

Mr. McNEILL would impose as stringent regulations respecting Store Licenses as he would for Taverns. He was aware of the pernicious influence which such had upon the youth in some places, and thought, while the liberty of the subject should not be too hastily interfered with, yet, as in the sale of spirituous liquors there was much that led to ruin and madness, it should be regulated by law, in accordance with the well-known results of the traffic.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL said, as he had no wish to press the Bill through in the absence of hon. members who were not present, he would move that the Speaker should take the Chair, report progress, and ask leave to sit down.

He resumed, progress was reported, and leave granted accordingly.

Tin for Manufacturing Purposes.

Hon. D. DAVIES presented a petition from John Carns and others praying that a drawback would be allowed on all tin imported into the Colony, which was manufactured into cans for preserved fish, and re-shipped from the Island. In doing so, he requested that a duty upon any article used in the country for manufacturing purposes, was, he thought, a wrong policy, and merited the consideration of that hon. House.

The petition was received, and ordered to lie upon the table.

House adjourned until 3 o'clock. G.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Spirituous Liquor Bill.

House in Committee of the whole, to consider the Bill to consolidate and amend the several Laws regulating the sale by License of Spirituous Liquors.

Mr. Richards in the Chair.
The clause relating to Store License was read.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL was of opinion that as licensed Taverns were restricted in so many different ways, a large quantity was purchased at the stores, which retained liquors by pint license. It should be considered by the Committee whether the Store License should not be more restricted than at present. He thought it should be more restricted, and he moved that the quantity of liquor retained in stores, be not less than one quart.

Hon. Mr. OWEN thought that if the pint license were substituted by the quart license, the cost of the license should be lessened.

Hon. Mr. PERRY had been hoping to see the pint license abolished altogether, for it was the cause of a great deal of harm to the country, and productive of no good whatever. It was well known that the license law was very deficient in many respects; for the taverns were very much restricted, while the stores licensed to sell by the pint were scarcely restricted at all.

Mr. A. C. McDONALD said that there were many strong objections to be urged against stores being licensed to sell liquors by the pint. He believed there was more drunkenness caused by it, than by the ordinary tavern license. Several young men often clubbed together and purchased a quantity of liquor, and as it could be purchased more cheaply than in public houses, they could more easily get intoxicated. There would, in his opinion, be less objection to quart licenses if the law were properly enforced; but as the license to sell by the pint evaded the law as it now stands. The cost of license is not at all too large, and should not be reduced.

Hon. P. SINCLAIR said there was a great amount of evil done through allowing stores to sell by the pint, for very young lads would club together and purchase at any time, while they could not do so in taverns. Our present pint license was not at all required, for it was productive of no good. He would not favor the low ring of the price of a license, for it was sufficiently small. He had no objection to the amendment submitted by the hon. Attorney General.

Hon. Mr. HOWLAN could not see the force of the arguments advanced by those hon. members who had just spoken in reference to pint license for stores. If a member of a poor man's family became ill, and required a pint of sherry wine, he would not be able to procure it, if the amendment which had been submitted were carried out. As poor people did not keep wines or liquors on hand, they would not be able to procure them except in large quantities which they did not require, and could not afford to purchase. If a poor man's friend visits him, and the man wants a pint of liquor of any kind in order to treat him, he would be compelled to purchase a quart, which was double the quantity he required. He (Hon. Mr. H.) knew certain cases where Sons of Temperance have been under the necessity of sending a shop for a pint of wine. The quart system would not, in his opinion, make people any more tem-