

THE EXAMINER

A Weekly Journal of Politics, Literature, and News.

"This is true Liberty, when Freeborn Men, having to advise the Public, may speak free."—Euripides.

Vol. X.

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Tuesday, May 15, 1860.

New Series.—No. 18.

Provincial Parliament.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

THURSDAY, March 29, 1860.

PETITIONS.

A Petition of divers inhabitants of Orwell and vicinity was presented to the House by the Hon. Mr. Forgan, praying that the fisheries of this Island may be fostered and encouraged by the passing of an Act authorizing the formation of companies, that a liberal bounty may be granted to fishermen, and that such steps may be taken as will render the fishery resources available for the same object.

Ordered, That the said Petition be referred to the special Committee appointed to report on all petitions relating to miscellaneous subjects.

Hon. Mr. Forgan also presented a Petition of Emily Harrington, teacher, and the same was received and read, praying for a grant of half year's salary, withheld on account of a deficiency in the average daily school attendance required by law.

Ordered, That the said Petition be referred to the special Committee appointed to report on all petitions relating to Education.

CHURCH WARDENS AND VESTRIES BILL.

Pursuant to order the Bill, intitled "An Act to alter the Act incorporating the Church Wardens and Vestries of the Church of England," was, as amended, read the third time.

Resolved, That the said Bill, as amended, do pass.

Pursuant to order the Bill, intitled "An Act to amend the Act for the purchase of Lands on behalf of the Government of Prince Edward Island, and to regulate the sale and management thereof, and for other purposes therein mentioned," was read the third time.

Resolved, That the said Bill do pass.

FRIDAY, March 30, 1860.

PETITIONS.

The following Petitions were presented to the House, and by the same received and read, viz:—

By the Hon. Mr. Palmer, a petition of divers inhabitants of Charlottetown, praying that Water Lots Nos. 21 and 22, extending Southerly from the breastwork of Major Beecher's property, to the Channel of the Hillsborough, which Lots are still in the possession of the Government, may be granted to the City, as a site for a Market House.

By the Hon. Mr. Walker, a petition of Robert Mooney, Esquire, late Registrar of Deeds and Keeper of Plans, praying the House to grant him the sum of £10, being the balance of his salary as such, for the quarter ending the 30th June, 1858, which sum was withheld by the late Government on the ground that petitioner had left the work of his office in arrears, and that the said sum would be required to defray the expense of bringing up the said work.

Ordered, That the said petitions be referred to the special Committee appointed to report on all petitions relating to miscellaneous subjects.

A Message from the House of Assembly by the Hon. Mr. Longworth:

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, March 30, 1860.

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed to join a Committee of the Legislative Council, to prepare an Address to Her Majesty the Queen, praying that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales will be graciously pleased to visit this Her Majesty's loyal Colony of Prince Edward Island, in the course of his contemplated visit, in the ensuing summer, to those North American Provinces.

Ordered, That the Hon. Messrs. Longworth, Coles, Thornton, Haviland, Gray and Perry, be a Committee on the part of this House to prepare the said Address.

Ordered, That the said Resolution be communicated, by message, to the Legislative Council.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—I move that the House do agree to appoint a Committee to join the Committee of the House of Assembly to prepare an Address to Her Majesty the Queen, praying that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales will be graciously pleased to visit this Her Majesty's loyal Colony of Prince Edward Island, in the course of his contemplated visit, in the ensuing summer, to those North American Provinces. This is a question upon which there can be only one opinion. We must all cheerfully recognise the propriety of uniting with the House of Assembly in their proposed Address to Her Majesty for this purpose. We are all well aware of the deep concern which Her Majesty, the various members of the Royal family, and Her Majesty's Government feel and manifest for the welfare, prosperity, and good Government of the British North American Colonies; and our duty, as Her Majesty's loyal and devoted subjects, calls upon us most cordially to unite in seeking the opportunity which the contemplated visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales to these Provinces may afford us to manifest our loyalty and attachment to Her Majesty's Royal person and family. The more we are known abroad by personages of rank, power, and influence, the more are we likely to be benefited from abroad, by the encouragement and assistance which we may thereby derive, to arouse our energies towards our industry, and urge us onward in a course of social improvement and general progressive prosperity. The Provinces all around us have had, not only their loyalty, but a proper sense of their own interests, reawakened by the promised visit of the Prince of Wales, the heir apparent to the British Crown to Canada; and have all concurred in inviting His Royal Highness to honor them severally with a visit, thereby to afford them opportunities to express their loyalty and attachment to Her Majesty, and their regard for the Royal family in general; and although we are, as to extent, population, wealth, and resources, the least of these Colonies, we claim to be behind none in loyalty and devotion to our beloved Sovereign; and I trust therefore, that we will, with the utmost unanimity and cordiality of feeling, follow the example which has been set us by our sister Colonies.

Hon. Col. SWABY—I second the motion with the greatest pleasure. It would almost amount to an insult to your Honors, were I to enter into any argument to show why we ought to agree to the motion, which His Honor, Mr. Palmer, has just made; and, therefore, I shall use none. We are all equally loyal; and we must all be convinced that such a visit as we anticipate—a visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, the heir apparent to the British Crown—is calculated to draw closer the bonds of union between us and the British Government; and the knowledge of Prince Edward Island which, by such visit, will be acquired by His Royal Highness and the distinguished personages who, to a certainty, will compose his suite, will, undoubtedly, prove a source of future benefit to the people of it. But I am certain that no such prospect of future benefit is necessary to induce us all most heartily to unite with the House of Assembly in an Address to Her Majesty, praying that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales may be pleased to visit this Her Majesty's loyal Island Prince Edward in the course of his visit to these North American Provinces.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Palmer, seconded by the Hon. Col. Swaby, it was then unanimously—

Resolved, That a Committee be appointed to join the Committee of the House of Assembly, to prepare the said Address to her Majesty.

Ordered, That the Hon. Mr. Palmer, Hon. Col. Swaby, and Hon. Mr. Bagnall, be a Committee, on the part of this House, to prepare the said Address to Her Majesty.

DISPATCH IN ANSWER TO THE ADDRESS OF THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY, LAST SESSION, WHICH CONTAINED Sundry COMPLAINTS AGAINST THE FORMATION AND CHARACTER OF THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Hon. Col. Swaby moved that the House do come to a Resolution as follows:—

Resolved, That the following Address be presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, viz:

To His Excellency George Dundas, Esquire, Lieutenant Governor, &c. &c. &c.

May it please your Excellency,—

The Legislative Council respectfully request that your Excellency will cause to be laid before them the Despatch received by your Excellency, in reply to the Address of the House of Assembly which bears date in their Journal, May 16th, 1859, and which contained sundry complaints against the formation and character of this House; and which appears to have been duly transmitted to the Colonial Office.

The Message which your Excellency has been pleased to order to be laid before this House appears intended to give the substance of the reply to this Address; but it neither states what the Legislative Council is supposed to be guilty of, or the nature of the consequences of the threat which it implies.

We respectfully, therefore, trust that your Excellency will be pleased to furnish them with the information they seek on these points, by causing the Despatch to be laid before them, on which your Excellency's Message is founded.

Hon. Mr. Palmer moved, in amendment to the said motion, to strike out all after the word "Resolved," and substitute the following:—

That it is indispensable for the interests and welfare of this Colony that harmony should, at all times, exist between the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council, and that this Branch of the Legislature entertains no apprehension that, in pursuing such measures as will be most likely to insure that harmony, it will ever have occasion to compromise the dignity of their situation, or that respect and independence which appertain to this Council.

The motion having been seconded by the Hon. Mr. Forgan, and the question of concurrence put on the proposed amendment, the House divided:—

Contents.—Hon. Mr. Palmer, Hon. Mr. Forgan, Hon. Mr. Bagnall, Hon. Mr. Johnson, and Hon. Mr. Simpson.—5.

Non-contents.—Hon. Col. Swaby, Hon. Mr. McIntyre, Hon. Mr. Bagnall, Hon. Mr. Walker, Hon. Mr. Craswell, and Hon. Mr. Hutchinson.—6.

So it passed in the negative.

The question having been put on the original motion, the House again divided:—

Contents.—Hon. Col. Swaby, Hon. Mr. McIntyre, Hon. Mr. Bagnall, Hon. Mr. Walker, Hon. Mr. Craswell, and Hon. Mr. Hutchinson.—6.

Non-contents.—Hon. Mr. Palmer, Hon. Mr. Forgan, Hon. Mr. Bagnall, Hon. Mr. Johnson, and Hon. Mr. Simpson.—5.

Resolved, accordingly.

Ordered, that the said Address be engrossed.

Ordered, That the Hon. Col. Swaby, Hon. Mr. Craswell, and Hon. Mr. Hutchinson, be a Committee to wait upon His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor with the said Address.

R. B. INVING Reporter.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

TUESDAY AFTERNOON, March 27, 1860.

LAND COMMISSION DESPATCHES.

HOUSE IN COMMITTEE.

Hon. Mr. COLES objected that the despatch did not contain anything to justify the assertion in His Excellency's speech at the opening of the Session, nor did the action of the House last year warrant the statement made by His Excellency in his letter to the Duke of Newcastle, to the effect that it was not intended to adhere to the matters of relief on which the address was founded. The speech told them that the address had been graciously received, the despatch said that the Colonial Minister could not advise Her Majesty to entertain the application. The address had been carried almost unanimously, because a general desire was entertained that the question should be settled, but the Commission would effect no good if its action was not founded on the resolutions of the House. If the proprietors had the right to sanction the appointment of the Commission, the result would be merely the confirmation of their titles. The Secretary perceived that it the resolutions were assumed as the basis of a Commission, it would be equal in effect to a Court of Equity; so it was deemed prudent to get rid of them by the plea that they would fetter the action of the Commission. Had any subsequent despatch been received, it should have been submitted. He had delayed going into Committee, having heard that the Leader of the Government in the other branch had stated that such was the case but a contrary statement was made in the House that morning.

He repeated that proprietary influence would render the Commission nugatory, for the Journals of the House showed their constantly repeated protests against measures of a character remedial of the position of the tenants. The delay which had taken place in the appointment of the Commission had caused a great deal of dissatisfaction, and the hon. member for Belfast, Mr. Douce, had been told, in answer to his applications for rent, that although parties had the money in their possession, they would not pay until the question should be settled. He had prepared resolutions which he would read, and although he did not expect that the majority would support them, he would submit them as expressing disapproval of a Commission on any basis other than that of the address of last year.

Whereas, the present House of Assembly did, on the ninth of May last, agree to an address to Her Majesty the Queen, which was transmitted in the usual way, accompanied by a series of resolutions, introduced to this House in the form of a Government measure, recommending the appointment of a Commission, to investigate the long agitated question regarding the Land Tenures, and to settle the same to the satisfaction of all parties concerned. And whereas one of the principal objects of the Commission aforesaid was to secure, through amicable intercession with the Land Proprietors, a remission of the arrears of rents, where they appeared to press heavily upon industrious tenants; as well as to determine the rates at which tenants might be enabled to purchase the fee simple of their farms, and to give time for completing the purchase, without causing inconvenience or embarrassment to the tenant. And whereas His Excellency the Lieut. Governor was pleased to inform the House of Assembly, at the opening of the present Session, that the Address and Resolutions, as aforesaid, had been graciously received by Her Majesty, and that arrangements were in progress for instituting the Commission immediately. And whereas it appears by a despatch from Her Majesty's Right Honourable Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated 6th September, 1859, that Her Majesty's Government disapprove of the action taken by the Government of this Island with regard to the appointment of a Commission, as aforesaid, His Grace the Duke of Newcastle expressing his conviction that there is no prospect of a beneficial result from the labors of a Commission if its action were fettered by conditions such as those proposed in the Resolutions adopted by this House; and His Grace further states that he "cannot advise Her Majesty to entertain the question" thus raised.

Resolved, therefore, that, in view of this expression of opinion by the Duke of Newcastle, it appears doubtful whether the Address and Resolutions of this House were presented to Her Majesty; and it is advised to this House that Her Majesty the Queen is not yet advised to listen to the suggestions of the People's Representatives in this Colony as detailed in their Resolutions of last Session; and that the action of this House upon the question has therefore, as yet, been rendered nugatory.

Whereas it appears by a Despatch from His Excellency the Lieut. Governor of this Colony, to His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, dated the 3rd October, 1859, that the Executive Council unanimously assured His Excellency "that nothing could be further from the wish of the House of Assembly than to impede the free and independent action of the Commission," as His Grace seemed to think would be the case if the Resolutions of this House were to be regarded as the basis of the said Commission:

Resolved, That, as the House of Assembly has not authorized the Executive Council to give advice to the Lieutenant

Governor, such as that which is referred to in His Excellency's Despatch of the 3rd October last, with respect to any deviation from the spirit of the Resolutions agreed to by this House in the last Session, the Executive Council have, therefore, exceeded their constitutional authority in giving such advice to His Excellency the Lieut. Governor.

Hon. Col. GRAY—It was not to be supposed that the Lieut. Governor had not ample correspondence to justify the language he had used, and it was not customary to disclose correspondence pending the negotiations of preliminaries. Such correspondence might involve the names of individuals, and its premature publication might materially retard the progress of the question. It might suit the Leader of the Opposition to take up the time of the House in making speeches about the delay in the appointment of the Commission, but if he consulted the interests of the people, as he did his own, he would show his patriotism by not obstructing the efforts which were being made for the substantial benefit of the people. If the delay prevented the Leader of the Opposition from proceeding with any measure in lieu of the Commission, there might be some ground for complaint; but what did he propose to substitute for the Commission? He had proposed to substitute for the Commission the hon. gentleman had referred to the despatch of the 6th December, relative to the objection of the Colonial Minister to the House fettering the Commission by their resolutions. It was the intention of the House to provide a court to enquire into the relations between landlord and tenant, with a view to ameliorate the condition of the latter, without interfering with the legal rights of the former, and to propose what they might consider a fair and equitable mode of adjustment. The Duke of Newcastle stated that the enquiry, if any, must be free, and the Governor said that no wish was entertained to fetter the action of the Commission which he hoped would keep in view the objects suggested by the House. The delay which had taken place was not extreme, nor by any means unprecedented. The hon. member, Mr. Cooper, had been promising the people Escheat for, he hardly could say, how many years; and it was a wonder how they could have waited so long. Eight or nine years since, Responsible Government was to settle the Land Question, while it was but nine months ago that he had prepared the resolutions, and good reasons could be assigned for the delay which had taken place. It was necessary that the proprietors should be consulted, and they and the Colonial Minister had good reasons to be cautious in dealing with any measure emanating from the Island. The correspondence on the subject of the Loan Bill had taught the Colonial Minister to proceed with caution. He had told his constituents that the proprietary titles were good, and had been recognized by our own legislation and purchase of the Worrell Estate—that he would do all that lay in his power to obtain favorable terms for the tenants; and when the hon. member, Mr. Sinclair, stated on a previous occasion that he would not ask favors of the proprietors, he could have stated that he would ask from any party favors to ameliorate the condition of the great body of the inhabitants. Before moving the following resolution in amendment, he might add that he had seen a communication stating the Commission would be appointed.

Whereas, by a Despatch from His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, bearing date 6th September last, in answer to the Address from the House of Assembly, on the appointment of Commissioners to enquire into, and report upon, the Land Tenures in this Colony, His Grace was pleased to state that he had opened a correspondence with the Proprietors on the subject of the desired appointment of such Commissioners. And whereas, a though, from unavoidable causes, therein referred to, at the date of the said Despatch such progress had not been made in the matter as this House had hoped for; Resolved, nevertheless, that sufficient therein appears to warrant this Committee in entertaining every confidence in Her Majesty's Colonial Minister will give effect, at the earliest period, that the circumstances of the case will admit of, to the prayer of the Address.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN—The resolution of Hon. Mr. Coles was based on an incorrect statement of facts made by the head of the Government with the sanction of his advisers, to the effect, that the address had been "graciously received." There was in the documents before the House nothing to justify the statement, and the resolution goes to show that there was no foundation for it. The Leader of the Government had stated that the delay was not unreasonable. He (Hon. Mr. Whelan) did not complain of the delay. What he did complain of was the misrepresentation made six weeks ago, that the matter was in a course of satisfactory settlement. That misrepresentation he charged upon the official advisers of His Excellency, and they had practised deception upon the House and country. The Colonial Minister's despatch did not justify the entertainment of the hope expressed in the speech. The despatch plainly showed that the Colonial Minister had turned the back of his hand upon the resolutions, and "would have none of them." When he said that he would not advise Her Majesty to entertain the application, because the Commission would be fettered, were they to find in that language a justification for the statement that Her Majesty had graciously received the address? True, there might be other correspondence, but with that the House had no concern; they could only deal with such portion as was before them. If the Government were in possession of more correspondence on so important a question, they should produce it, and he believed that if they had received a single line holding out the hope that their policy would be practically adopted, they would have produced it long ago. The House had been asked to wait for the arrival of successive mails from England, each of which was expected to bear the important communication; but three mails had been received since the commencement of the Session, and not a syllable had been received. The Leader of the Government had stated in the morning that they had nothing more to submit on the subject.

Hon. Col. GRAY denied having made such admission.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN—Then it was to be presumed that they had more than they had brought down, and it was unfair to the House and country to withhold it. The amendment states that a correspondence had been opened by the Duke of Newcastle and the Proprietors. It is true that there was a letter from Mr. Merivale to Sir Samuel Cunard, but there was no evidence that the latter had deigned a reply to it. The House would stultify itself by voting for the amendment when they are told that their resolutions must be set aside, or the application cannot be entertained. The only result of their legislation last year appeared to be that the Government and House had been snubbed, and the amendment asked to lick the hand that had struck them. There was nothing in the despatch to warrant the amendment.

Mr. COOPER was of opinion that a Commission should be unlogged, if a settlement, final and satisfactory of the Land Question, were anticipated from its labors. The Crown could appoint one Commissioner, and the proprietors and tenantry each one. These parties should have full power to enter at large into the whole question, in all its details, and report such suggestions as would fairly and justly settle the relative rights of all; and their report would then be adopted and sanctioned by Parliament.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH—The Opposition sought to make the people believe that the majority had not acted fraud on the public—that the Government were not sincere in the course they had pursued in this matter—that they had deceived the tenantry for the purpose of benefiting the proprietors. There was nothing to warrant such impressions, and it was unfair in this early stage of the negotiation to make the charges which had been adduced against the Government. The arrangements would soon be completed, and the Commission would be in operation before the lapse of many months. This result would reflect great credit on the hon. Col. Gray, who was animated by a sincere desire to alleviate the condition of the tenants as far as could be done consistently with equity, and his promises to his constituents had been carried out with good faith. It had been said that the despatch did not warrant the expression in the Speech

that the address had been graciously received. It was not to be supposed that His Excellency would have made a statement which he was not warranted in doing, and it must be believed that when he penned the paragraph containing the passage referred to, that he was in possession of information which fully justified the language which he used, and it was not the province of the House to pry into all the means of information which His Excellency might possess. The letter of the Lieut. Governor to the Colonial Minister had been strongly censured, as superseding the resolutions of the House, and the Opposition say that the Duke of Newcastle positively refused to sanction the Commission. On reading the prayer of the address, that Minister considered it impolitic to grant a Commission with fettered powers, and having taken this common sense view of the matter, he stated the objection to the Lieut. Governor, who replied, on the responsibility of his constitutional advisers, that the object of the Assembly was not to fetter the Commission, so as to impair their efficiency, but that it was hoped that the remedial measures suggested would receive their favorable consideration. The Minister did not refuse to grant the Commission, nor did he at any time intimate any objection to their recommending the measures proposed. He merely said:—"I cannot advise Her Majesty to entertain the question, unless it is fully understood that the Commission are at liberty to propose any measures which they may themselves judge desirable." It is a correct opinion that the Commissioners should be at liberty to propose any measures calculated to effect a final settlement on terms mutually beneficial to proprietors and tenants. The hon. Messrs. Coles and Whelan said that the Government and the Commission should be bound by the details of the Address; but the hon. member, Mr. Cooper, himself objected to that idea, and said that the Commissioners should be untrammelled. They had been told that Sir Samuel Cunard had not replied to the letter asking him if he had any suggestions to offer on the subject of the Commission. It might be sufficient to answer that he had replied to it. There was nothing in the Governor's letter inconsistent with the facts and objects of the Address. The resolutions pointed out certain evils which it was desirable to have removed, but they were not considered as binding conditions. It was not to be supposed that the powers of the Commission should be confined exclusively to the particular subjects alluded to in the resolutions. No injury could result from the Commission being invested with the most ample powers; and it was absurd to charge the Government with nullifying the act of the Legislature. The Government were anxious to carry out the views of the Legislature. The Opposition might endeavor to create the impression that the Government had sought to practise deception towards the people, but he was not afraid that they would be suspected of having withheld information from improper motives.

(To be continued.)

W. M. HOWE, Reporter.

SATURDAY AFTERNOON, 24th March.

SUPPLY RESUMED.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND introduced the Road Scale for the current year. He proposed to grant £5000, to be apportioned as follows, that is to say:—

Queen's County,	£1,700 0 0
King's County,	1,500 0 0
Prince County,	1,500 0 0
Charlottetown and Royalty,	200 0 0
	£5,000 0 0

Mr. CONROY moved the reconsideration of the Scale. His district would require a special grant of £200 or £300 for a Bridge at Ca-napper, on which some £1200 or £1300 had been already expended.

Hon. the SPEAKER was opposed to reconsider the scale, £5000 was as much as the revenue could afford for the service. When the division should be agreed to, the members of each County should meet and decide the apportionment to the different districts. When a particularly large outlay was required for any one district, it was usual for the rest of the County to contribute proportionally from the general funds. As to the bridge spoken of, the Government ought not to appropriate any sum until its locality and the benefit to result to it from the public were ascertained.

Hon. Mr. COLES—The members of the district should ascertain the relative cost of removing the bridge to another site, or of finishing it where it is at present located. Had the right of way to the bridge been given!

Mr. CONROY—the bridge could be finished and the right of way secured for £250. He had no personal or political interest in the matter. The fact was, the bridge would accommodate, principally, his political opponents. His only motive was the advancement of the interest of the district.

Hon. Mr. YEO had always been opposed to the present situation, but his late colleague, hon. Mr. Warburton, had settled the matter, and there was no use his offering opposition to that gentleman at the time. He had himself subscribed £10 towards it.

Mr. OWEN—Political considerations should not interfere with the distribution of road money. The bridge at Montague, for instance, would require a special grant this year. Patches from all directions resorted to it with produce, and the public interest required that it should be put into proper condition without delay. He thought the scale should be reconsidered and the main vote reduced to £4000, and then have special grants to the amount of £2000, to be applied where circumstances rendered them necessary.

Mr. HOWAT would not alter the scale. £5000 was quite enough in view of the state of the revenue. It exceeded the road appropriations of last year; and a large amount would involve the necessity of an increase of tax on the general revenue.

Hon. Mr. THORNTON—An increased grant was required for the general road services of the whole Island. He supposed Mr. Owen's proposal would not be carried. Last year £4000 only were appropriated.

Hon. Mr. POPE—The amount expended last year was £4,700.

Hon. Mr. THORNTON—Yes, because the Government found that bridges were tumbling down, and the extra amount for repairing them would have to be deducted from this year's appropriation. He had not the slightest wish to embarrass the Government, but the improvement of the roads would have the effect of augmenting the revenue and promoting the general welfare. There was no reason to anticipate an increase of taxation, for last year the crops were so abundant that the amount of exports last fall exceeded that of former years, and the case would be similar this spring. These facts justified them in asking more. Besides, the bridges referred to at Cassempie, Cardigan and Bellast had a strong claim for aid to a local work of great importance.

Hon. Col. GRAY—The grant included nearly £1000 more than the state of the revenue would justify, if they were to avoid the charge of extravagance preferred against the late Government.

Mr. BEER did not anticipate an increase of revenue. Last year the impositions were greater than usual, and consequently they would be less during the present, and the revenue would be proportionately diminished. He was opposed to reconsider the grant. £5000 was as much as we could afford.

Mr. OWEN only asked an increase of £1000. He was as anxious to retreat as any hon. member, but the greater the facilities of communication, the greater would be the amount of trade and the larger the harvest. He was accordingly in favor of the increase.

Hon. Col. GRAY—Did the hon. member recommend a course which would bring the country to the state in which it was last year, or did he wish an increase of duties to 10, 12 or 15 per cent?

Hon. Mr. POPE—This discussion was but a waste of time. It had been decided in the morning that £5000 was as much as could be afforded.

Hon. Mr. COLES—This subject always gave rise to discussion, and the original vote was frequently reconsidered. The main argument against any increase of the vote, was the alleged debt of the Colony, which was not worth talking about. For the improvement of roads and bridges it was but fair that succeeding generations, who would participate in the benefits of improved facilities of communication, should bear a portion of the cost, and a moderate degree of public liability was as serious an evil as some might imagine. The national debt of Great Britain had a great influence in attaching the people to their institutions. He approved of Mr. Owen's suggestion that £4000 be granted for the general service, and that £2000 be voted for special grants, which

were rendered necessary by the state of several bridges besides that mentioned by Mr. Owen. Mount Stewart and Poplar Island bridges were instances as out of repair, being places where large quantities of produce were exported it was necessary that they be put in proper order.

Mr. MONTGOMERY—It was unnecessary to ask the Government for any more than £5000. They were the best judges of what the revenue could afford. He regretted that more could not be given to the roads. He had received petitions from his own district, but the people would rather forego the benefits they asked, than have the country plunged into a debt.

Mr. SINCLAIR had hoped that a larger sum would have been voted for the roads, and that special grants would have been made. He had expected £2000 for Princeton wharf, but if the Government thought that an additional thousand pounds could not be granted without involving the country in debt, they should not attempt to do it, or if they did, should come out honestly and impudently sufficient to meet the expenditure. He was opposed to the expenditure being allowed to exceed the revenue, highly as he appreciated the benefits accruing to the people from improved communications.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH—Mr. Sinclair's views did credit to his judgment. It was unwise in a Government in an individual to exceed their means and get into debt. The national debt of Great Britain might have the effect attributed to it, but that would afford no grounds for a small and poor Colony like this to incur heavy liabilities. We could not raise money in Britain on our public credit, and we would have to meet our engagements by taxing ourselves. The principle advocated by the hon. Mr. Coles, of devolving the burdens on succeeding generations, had been illustrated by the State of Pennsylvania, where the succeeding generations repudiated the obligations contracted by their ancestors, and by so doing, degraded the credit and character of the State.

Mr. COOPER—Taxation for roads, if properly administered, was not objectionable. The money raised for such purpose was expended in the country, and the people got the benefit of the expenditure and of improved roads. In countries there was little or no taxation, there was little or no improvement. He was opposed to an increase of the Tariff, and advocated the principle of an income tax as being the most equitable mode of providing for the public works. The question was then put on the motion to reconsider the scale.

Ayes.—Messrs. Owen, Thornton, Conroy, Doyle, Sutherland, Sinclair, Kelly, Coles and Perry.—9.

Nays.—The Speaker, Messrs. McAnlay, Pone, Douce, Ramsay, Yen, Montgomery, Gray, Beer, John Yen, Longworth, Haviland, Laird, Howat and Holm.—15.

Hon. Mr. THORNTON then proposed to apportion the sum as follows, viz:—£1800 to Queen's County, including Charlottetown and Royalty, and £1600 for Prince and King's Counties, respectively.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH thought the resolution was unjust to Queen's County. Charlottetown required an expenditure on the wharves, and the amount the City contributed to the revenue gave her a claim to their consideration. The wharves and bridges near Tava were large and in a dilapidated state. So far from approving of the motion, he considered hon. Mr. Haviland's scale as too low for Queen's County, which would not receive justice by it.

Hon. Mr. BEER would not dissent from the scale. The population of Queen's County, exclusive of Charlottetown, was a more favorable consideration. The whole Island was interested in keeping up the wharves and bridges in the County, and Pownall wharf, which was almost exclusively devoted to the service of the Mail Steamer, was on that account entitled to an allowance from the public funds.

Hon. Mr. POPE would support the motion. Members for Queen's County complained that they were getting fair play. They seemed to have peculiar ideas of the meaning of the words. In Queen's, as the oldest settled part of the Island the roads and bridges had been all made, but in certain districts of Prince County, such for instance as Mr. Conroy's or Mr. John Yen's, the difference was greater than some were aware of. The western road had not a house for a mile, and it was a great disadvantage to the mail steamer on account of that, for it received it as a more general Government, and its occupation by a goods depot was more than compensated by the wharfage and quota deposited from that vessel. If members for Queen's had been satisfied with the same proportion as they received last, he might not have opposed it, but he would resist the spirit of enmity which was being manifested.

Hon. Mr. PERRY—One would almost suppose, judging from the remarks of the hon. Mr. Longworth and Mr. Beer, that no person lived out of Charlottetown. Time, Queen's County paid a large portion of the revenue, but it should be remembered that she receives the benefit of the official salaries. Prince County required several large appropriations. The public wharf at Summerside required repairs, and a bridge in his district would take about £600 or £700. The expense of the wharf must be made payable. He would therefore support the motion.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—What had the people of New London, Belfast, Cassempie, and other places in Queen's County to do with the expenditure of official salaries? They should not do injustice to Queen's County, and although he was the representative of a King's County constituency, he honestly considered Queen's County entitled to more than was proposed.

Mr. CONROY would not be satisfied with less for Prince County than the sum proposed last year. Mr. Thornton's scale was an old and well settled County, and although he had been stated, the western road was unsettled and unfinished. If members from King's and Prince Counties were omitted on the subject, they could easily carry their point.

Mr. MONTGOMERY—From what had fallen from certain members for Prince County, it would appear that they considered that no roads or bridges were required in any other part of the Island. He trusted that there was too general a spirit of justice to allow Queen's County to be deprived of her just claims.

Hon. Col. GRAY could have no objection to the members of two Counties uniting and asking for themselves what they were entitled to. The fact was, the members of the combination would not show the justice of their proceeding. As to King's County, the only case which aroused the zeal of its representatives appeared to be that of Montague Bridge. The greater travel over the bridges in Queen's County rendered their condition a matter of safety to life and limb. Mount Stewart Bridge, in which a large section of King's County was directly interested, would require about £400, but if the members from that and Prince Counties should decide that it should be allowed to go down, there was no help for it, and a complete work of much utility, but as they could only provide for matters of urgent necessity, it could not be afforded at present. He thought that the equitable nature of the claim preferred on behalf of Queen's County would commend itself to the consideration of the committee.

Hon. Mr. LAIRD—As to the salaries of Government officers, he thought they had been set down pretty well, and that the amount of the road grant for Queen's County should not be affected by the argument drawn from that subject. Queen's County had more roads to keep up and more travel over them than the other Counties, the members for which, if they clubbed, as suggested, might be, comparatively to Queen's, the representatives of swamps, mud, or population.

Hon. Mr. YEO—The original scale awarded more than its fair proportion to Queen's County, which as it had more population, so also it could apply more statute labor or congested money to the roads. He was opposed to the suggested union of King's and Prince Counties against Queen's. Such a combination, for such a purpose, would be an act of injustice. The House