

session, and gives as a reason why he should not vote for the address to the Queen, that he saw among the names of the minority who voted against it, those of three hon. members (Messrs. Cooper, Laird and McIntosh) who had always voted for measures to benefit the tenantry. This is a somewhat novel position, Sir, for the hon. member to assume, when we can recollect that at the time they voted for an escheat, that hon. member was one of the most strenuous opposers. He was not then guided by their views. But last session he would vote for them if he were here! That would, indeed, be an unnatural alliance! The position the hon. gentleman has taken, reminds me of a renowned speech of his, when the Prohibitory Liquor Bill was under consideration. On that occasion he (Mr. Haviland) supported the measure, because it was supported by liquor dealers, who had signed the petition. I want better reasons than the hon. member has given, to convince me that the loan does not give general satisfaction. The fact of the Government having the lands in their possession, and enabling leaseholders to purchase, is, I think, the greatest benefit that could be conferred upon the tenantry. The credit of this colony is not sufficient to warrant Government in purchasing all the lands that might be offered; but the Home Government have proposed to back this Government in a sum of £100,000 sterling, which shows they have faith in the propriety of our course in this matter, and are willing to give us credit. He thought the objection of the hon. member was based upon a mere caviling at words, as far as he could judge from the reasons given. When the question of a loan was first mooted, the hon. members of the opposition laughed at the idea, and said, "Don't you wish you may get it." But they must have changed their minds since. He was in hopes this course of the Home Government, in granting what was asked, would enable them to purchase all the lands on this Island, that would be offered by the proprietors, and thereby put an end to this vexed question. But, behold! the result is the opposite! The object of the Government should be properly understood—they wished to turn all the leasehold properties into freehold—and thereby secure the people in independence. And if the minority were to bring in a measure which had for its object, a similar consummation, he would be among the first to support them.

Mr. YEO.—One reason why he should not vote for the paragraph under consideration, was because it would say an unjust tax upon the whole country, gave general satisfaction, which was likely to have a result similar to that of the Worrell Estate—and of the money thus expended, we should never see one penny back. He alluded to a petition now under consideration, signed by a number of the tenants on the Sullivan estate, two thirds of whom have never paid a penny of rent for the last fifteen years. And these are the people whom we think to make freeholders of—whom we expect to purchase farms of the Government! The idea was ridiculous. If we sent to England and got £100,000, and bought up all the lands in the Island, the chances would be that this Government would never see a farthing in return. Before another estate is bought, we should wish to see the accounts of the Worrell Estate made up, and this was the general wish of the country.

Hon. the SPEAKER.—As to the petition alluded to by the hon. member (Mr. Yeo), two thirds of the signers of which he said did not pay rent for fifteen years—part of the statement only was true. Many of these tenants never received leases, and he was assured if they had, they would pay their rent. He was in favour of the grant, and thinks it a measure calculated to promote the good of the colony. When the question came up for discussion, he was in the chair; but if he were on the floor of the House, he would support the measure. He did not deny but there may be some losses to the country in the end; but he thought when hon. members anticipated such results, they were looking too far ahead, and it would be better to wait a while, for just cause, before we complain, should there be a loss. He was prepared to bear a share of the loss, as well as others, should such an event come to pass. A great cause of complaint, and a just one, with many of the tenants on a portion of Lot 61, under the hon. member's (Mr. Yeo) management, was that the gentleman, he believed, had no power to lease or sell, and this created much dissatisfaction and ill-will on the part of the tenants; and the sooner such a system was at an end, the better. The hon. member (Mr. Yeo) was the mere recipient of the rents which he transmitted to his principal on the other side of the Atlantic; and he, (the Speaker) repeated, that such powers as that of agent, which Mr. Yeo held, were calculated to create great discontent, not only among the tenants on Lot 61, but upon other properties similarly situated. This was not a proper state of things; and he contended the only way to remedy it was the course pursued by the Government, to buy out the land from the proprietors, and dispose of it on such terms as would leave it within the reach of all to purchase. He might not live to see the consummation of such a desirable object, but he was assured if any present loss would accrue to the colony, it would eventually be again. The hon. member (Mr. Yeo) laid great stress on the assertion that two thirds of the signers of the petition did not pay any rent for fifteen years. He would not allow that hon. member to disparage his constituents in this manner. If he said one-third, he would be about correct; but that two-thirds of the signers of that petition did not pay rent for fifteen years, was false. The reason why any of them did not pay their rents, I have already stated—because they could not obtain leases.

Mr. YEO would inform the hon. member that these tenants have had leases, and the reason they did not pay their rent was not because of their not having leases, but an unwillingness to pay anything for their land. On a recent occasion, which the hon. gentleman no doubt recollected, those honest people whom he says I want to dispossess, actually rose in arms, and a riot might have ensued, merely because I wished to collect the rents due by them. What kind of stories does the hon. gentleman want us to believe, when he tells us the tenants are willing to pay their rent if they had leases. I have offered them to forgive all the back rents if they would pay, or commence to pay the rents now due. But they would not listen to such a proposition, but mobbed me. They were not Irishmen, I believe, but Monaghas.

Mr. COOPER was hardly prepared for so lengthy a discussion on the Land Question as he had heard to-night, and how far such a discussion would forward the adoption of an answer to the Governor's Speech, he would not attempt to say. He thought it was uncalculated for.

Hon. Mr. PALMER.—When he first read the Address in answer to the Governor's Speech, the paragraph under consideration did not strike him as alluding, in a pointed degree, to what the result of the Loan Bill would be, or that it gave general satisfaction; therefore, he was unprepared for the lengthy discussion which has ensued. But upon reading it a second time, he was convinced of his mistake, and was prepared to go even farther than the hon. gentleman who opposed it. He would like to see the main principles of the Loan Bill before he would agree to the paragraph now before the House, which says the Bill gave "general satisfaction." He did not think he was warranted in subscribing to any such pledge. He had no objection to the paragraph so far as "It is with pleasure we receive the information that Her Majesty's Government have come to the determination to aid our endeavours to convert the leasehold into freehold tenures;" but when it says, "by such means as cannot fail to afford general satisfaction," that is the part he found fault with. Before hon. members subscribe to that doctrine, they should be well assured whether they were warranted in doing so or not. He felt as the hon. member (Mr. Cooper) did, and was not inclined to go into the discussion of the Land Question; but he could not let the passage go by in silence, and did not feel himself warranted in voting for the paragraph. Although he did not represent an agricultural district, still he was aware that his constituents were not ignorant of the fact that they are to be taxed as well as the agriculturists for the support of this measure. And it will be found that the measures taken by the Government, do not at least satisfy them. The Land Purchase Bill is not self-sustaining, he was sure; but if that objection could be removed—if the land purchased could be made to pay for itself, then he should have no objection to it. But has such a result been brought about? Past experience says it has not. What are the measures proposed by the Government to purchase the lands? To tax the freeholders to pay for the leaseholder's lands. Is this right? He was sure such a course would not produce general satisfaction. 'Tis true, we have a large body of leaseholders in this Colony—we have also many thousands of freeholders, and we must pause and consider whether we are justified in taxing them for the purpose of purchasing out leaseholders for those who have not been able—perhaps not disposed to purchase for themselves. Freeholders are at least as independent as leaseholders—a fact more independent, and no whit less entitled to fair consideration than they. I have heard it suggested that the Land Purchase Bill will pay for itself; but I have my doubts on that head. If money enough could not be raised from such lands as are already purchased,

to pay the Government, the prospect is poor indeed for any future operation of the kind being successful. Suppose a tenant wants to purchase his land, and tells the landlord he wishes to become a freeholder. If the land is worth £100 Let us suppose he gives £50 in hand, and secures the remainder by mortgage on the farm. In time he raises the balance of the purchase money on the land itself, and becomes independent. This is what I call self-sustaining. The farmer does not call on his brother freeholder to assist him; but makes it out of the farm itself. If the Government will undertake to raise money on the new Land Purchase Bill after this manner, it would be self-sustaining—unobjectionable. £100,000 sterling is no small sum to borrow, and it should not be forgot that it bears a heavy interest. If we only take £50,000, the interest is £6,000 per year, and that is no mean sum. It is a large tax to be paid by the people of this Colony—by freeholders as well as leaseholders. I will not go into details, however, but merely give a rough estimate of what this loan will cost the people. I was in hopes the hon. member from Princetown (Hon. T. H. Haviland) would go farther in his amendment than he has done. It does not pledge the House on any definite course of action; and, therefore, I conceive it to be inadequate. I have heard it reported that the people believe it for a fact that £100,000 is to be advanced, and paid out of the funds of the British Exchequer, and the Island is not to advance anything; but the fact is far otherwise. Others again talk of the magnanimity of the British Government—that John Bull is so generous that it is ten chances to one if he will ever ask for payment. If the people believe such stories as these they deserve to suffer all the taxation that can be laid on them. The truth of the matter is, England does not intend to advance one farthing. The way I understand the case is, the British Government say, "You are to issue so much scrip, and we will guarantee its payment." I don't see much magnanimity in this! They have the appointment of a Lieutenant Governor to this Colony, and they will take good care not to appoint any other than one who will look after their interests. He will be carefully instructed by his Sovereign not to assent to any Revenue Bill of the Colony, unless the money thereby to be raised shall be first charged with the Land Purchase Debt; and this he will be bound to do at the peril of his situation to obey. That being the case, it is a sufficient guarantee that the Exchequer will never be called upon to pay a penny of the loan. If the people know they will have to pay £6,000 interest on this loan, and the principal itself when it becomes due, it is not likely the scheme will give "general satisfaction." I do not think it will. I don't see why leaseholders and freeholders should be taxed, in equal degree, for the interest of such a large amount. "O," it may be said, "it will make all the people freeholders." But when it becomes a matter of pounds, shillings and pence—when freeholders find all is to be borrowed out of their pockets, as well as out of the pockets of leaseholders, and are compelled to pay interest, too, on their own money, they will not be so ready to agree to it. The scheme is founded on class legislation. It may be that the Home Government have another scheme in view. However, I hope these matters I have touched upon, may be gravely considered by the House before they conclude upon adopting that paragraph, with its erroneous assumption.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—I do not wonder at the country being alarmed, if such stories are propagated and believed, about the affair of the loan of the British Government to this Colony. Why, sir, it would be enough to frighten the people indeed to pay £6,000 interest on a loan of £50,000!

Hon. Mr. PALMER.—It was a mistake, I inadvertently stated the interest of £100,000 for that of £50,000.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—The hon. member (Mr. Palmer) said £6,000; he even repeated it. Now, sir, the fact is, the interest on £50,000 would not amount to more than £2,000, which is only one-third of what the hon. member tried to frighten us into the belief, the country would have to pay. Indeed, it would not be more than £2,500, even at the rate of interest allowed by the Land Purchase Bill. But the hon. member seems to labor under the impression that we are going to draw the whole amount at once. Let me reassure him, and those who are misled by such like false conclusions. It is not the intention of the Government to draw in larger sums, than perhaps, £10,000 at a time, which will be invested in such a manner as to ensure that hon. member, or any of his apprehensive constituents, from danger of the slightest loss. But, sir, it is time these "will-o'-the-wisps," who are misguiding the people with their false light, should be exposed—it is time these croakers were listened to no longer. They grasp at everything to support themselves in their false position. They stop at nothing to secure their ends. They have raised a great hue and cry about the Worrell estate, and how it has been a source of loss to the Government through mismanagement, and that, after all, the people on that estate are not satisfied. Let them ask the people on that estate if they have cause to complain; and they will have "No" for answer. But, sir, let them ask the tenants on the property of the Earl of Selkirk—let them ask the tenants on the property for which Mr. Yeo is agent. The tenants on the first have petitioned their landlord to allow the Government to purchase—that they may have a chance of becoming freeholders. And those on the last have signed a similar petition which will involve the hon. member's (Mr. Yeo) removal. This shows how contented the tenantry are under their present disabilities. It shows, sir, that it is high time for the Government to take the matter in hand, and see strict justice done the tenant. Then, sir, after all, we come to see that this loan is not such a frightful affair as we are led to believe it is, by that infamous and slanderous sheet, the *Islander*, or the lying scribbler who is hired and paid to malign, libel and misrepresent, the Government through its medium, and put a false construction on all measures brought in by the majority. And then, sir, there is a great outcry made that the freeholders will be taxed to help the leaseholders to obtain free lands. Sir, this is only on a par with other equally foolish allegations those croakers have been pleased to make—there is not a word of truth in it. The tenant under the Government is allowed ten years to pay for his land, and surely, in that time, he will be able to pay it without having to sacrifice his ox or his cow. The Government is not exacting; but gives ample time and opportunity for the tenant to purchase and become a freeholder. This has been the result in the case of the Worrell estate. The Land Purchase Bill provides that it shall be self-sustaining. Thus it may be seen that the leaseholder is not placed in an embarrassed position, but has sufficient time allowed him to become independent, and that without asking the help of the freeholder. But to hear what these croakers say, you would think they expected the Government to do wonders, and when they (the Government) did perform wonders they were their efforts. They build up a wonderful story on the mismanagement of the Worrell estate. But can they expect the Government to effect a revolution on an affair that ruined its former proprietor? Besides, sufficient time has not elapsed to show the good results which we certainly anticipate. The tenantry on the Worrell estate, as well as its affairs, have been misrepresented, and it is said they are dissatisfied—but these libellers take good care to seek for no foundation for such reports. And this is the way the people have been misled by these croakers. And the very parties who should have given every assistance to the Government, to make the purchase of the Worrell estate a self-sustaining affair, are the very parties who have persuaded the tenantry not to attend to the Government. But this is not such a losing affair altogether as some hon. gentlemen would have us think it is. I can inform those hon. members that there has been upwards of £10,000 worth of land on that estate sold, and there is still 50,000 acres to be disposed of. The tenants have the deeds of their lands on payment of ten per cent. of the purchase money, and every deed is equal to a bond to the Treasury of this Island. Look at Lot 11, which was purchased by the Government only a short time since, at a cost of £2,500. And land to the amount of over £2,000 has already been taken up, which is nearly equal to the whole purchase money of that estate. This, I think, sir, ought to be sufficient to convince hon. members that the Land Purchase Bill is self-sustaining, and to show the people what has been done by the present majority for the good of the Colony. When the majorities of the Governments of the other Colonies (Nova Scotia and New Brunswick) applied to the Home Government, a few years ago, for assistance to carry out their Railroad schemes, they were refused. And it shows, sir, with what approbation the Home Government view our efforts, when they at once, and without hesitation, accede to our request, and grant us their credit and their countenance. Here, also, a few years ago, when the minority were in power, a loan was asked from the Home Government to purchase the warrants held by their opponents, but it was refused. If we borrow £50,000 at 4 per cent. it will be only £2,000 a year. Contrast this with the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Palmer), and see if there is cause to apprehend such terrible

results as he endeavours to convince us of. As I said before, the leaseholder will have the opportunity of becoming a freeholder, by paying a trifling sum every year. Under this system there will be nothing to complain of; and when all are freeholders, and enabled to work to some advantage to themselves, the revenue will increase, and general prosperity will be the result. The hon. member from Princetown (Mr. Yeo) will not then have an opportunity of inveighing against the tenantry for their backwardness in paying their rents. The hon. and learned member, from Charlottetown, has said we did not want the guarantee of the Home Government. But, if a poor man wanted £100 out of the Bank, he would not get it. But if the hon. and learned member signed his name to the document, there would be no questions asked, but the money would be instantly forthcoming. And so, by asking the guarantee of the Home Government, we will obtain the money much sooner and with less hesitation in the Home market. It is said, in reference to the purchase of the Worrell Estate, that I got £1000 for making a good bargain for the late proprietors; and they had not the honesty to contradict such a foul falsehood. But if I did get a penny, it would soon be known and published far and wide. We all know what the Land Purchase Bill is; it has been circulated freely. And if it is not self-sustaining, I think I have enumerated facts in vain. If we can show we do right, is it for the minority and their attendant croakers to say we are wrong? Give us another ten years, and believe me, sir, it will only confirm what we are endeavoring to effect. As to the stories in circulation about our getting money out of the Exchequer, it is all nonsense; and I, for one, don't believe they are credited by the people, some hon. members to the contrary notwithstanding. The hon. member (Mr. Palmer) would like to see the Loan Bill. The Loan Bill, which the hon. and learned member wishes to see, before he could be assured it would give general satisfaction, is only an extension of the provisions of the Land Purchase Bill; and when it is passed this House, the Imperial Parliament will have to enact a Bill to carry out its own guarantee. When the present Government came into power, they had the interest of a debt of £30,000 to shoulder, but we succeeded in clearing it off in a few years; and, no doubt, we will be able also to surmount the difficulties which the minority seem to see in our present position.

Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN.—The hon. member from Princetown (Mr. Yeo) said when he went to collect the rents, the people threatened a riot. The truth is, a few of the tenants on Lot 61, assembled to welcome the hon. member, as it was about the time he was in the habit of coming to collect rents on the property he was agent for; [Laughter.] and they having heard that the sheriff was to accompany him, in order to distrain, I suppose they had some weapons of resistance, expecting that he would be induced to offer better terms. But, as to mobbing the hon. member, I do not imagine their intentions would have been so bad as that. Nor yet, ought the whole of the tenants on Lot 61, be censured, because a few do not pay their rents; there are many, the hon. member must admit, who pay him well. At a public meeting of tenants and freeholders on the same township, at which my hon. colleague and myself attended, after explaining our views to the meeting, on the propriety of the Loan Bill, a petition was agreed to, asking the proprietor, Lawrence Sullivan, Esq., to dispose of the property to the Government, or otherwise to allow his agent to sell at a reasonable price to the tenantry. Now, sir, there was not one dissenting voice to the method proposed. A few days after, a meeting took place at Murray Harbour, at which there were many of the tenants of the Hon. S. Cunard, present, where we attended also, to ascertain if our constituents had any measures to entrust us with, as the House of Assembly was soon to meet. The Loan Bill, for the purchase of land, was explained by my colleague and myself. They all appeared satisfied that the scheme of borrowing the money would give general satisfaction, and we did not hear from them the "hue and cry," which some hon. members would wish us to believe existed in the country, that they were to be taxed. During the meeting, from all that was expressed, they did not appear to dread taxation, as they had petitioned the proprietor themselves, to place them on the same footing as other proprietors had done their tenants, who had disposed of their lands to the Government. But, Sir, why should we not be prepared for objections to this scheme, as well as to others. The hon. member from Princetown (Mr. Haviland) thinks the Loan Bill does not give general satisfaction; but Sir, we should recollect that all bills brought in by the Government, are objected to by that party. I think, and will maintain it, that the loan is a great boon to the country. [Hear.] It will be recollected that when the Education Act was first brought in by the Government, the same cry was raised: "O, it will not be well received by the people! They will never consent to be taxed for the support of Free Education! It will be received with dissatisfaction by the whole country!" But, Sir, has not the event proved how unfounded their objections were. It will be the same in this case, depend upon it; and the Loan Bill will give general satisfaction as the Education Act has given. The affairs of the Worrell Estate, which have been so harped upon, and misrepresented, are not so bad as is imagined or represented. Although there may be a few refractory people residing on a portion of this Estate, especially on Lot 66, who have not attended to the Government; still the Government will not have any trouble with them, as the property will be handed back to the parties it was purchased from. If we borrow money to assist the tenant in becoming a freeholder, is it to say we are to tax freeholders to pay interest on it? I think not. They have not as yet been called upon to do it, for what has been bought. The hon. member for Charlottetown, (Mr. Palmer) says his constituents are apprehensive of being taxed, to pay for tenants becoming freeholders. They may rest satisfied on that score—they will not lose anything by it. With regard to my constituents, freeholders as well as tenants, they are all satisfied that this measure, (the Loan Bill) is one of the best ever originated by the present Government. But, Sir, time is required to bring about the result we aim at. We can not expect that the money will at once return into the Government; but still, there will be a continual income, until the remainder of the money is paid, and then there will be many hundreds more independent men in the Colony. In the conclusion, I repeat it, Sir, this measure will give general satisfaction.

Mr. YEO.—I am certainly surprised to hear what has just fallen from the hon. member (Mr. Wightman) respecting the tenants on Lot 61. He says they did not assemble for the purpose of resisting the agent or sheriff, or to get up a riot. Does the hon. member forget that he told me, in his own office, that a number of them had assembled for the avowed purpose of driving me off, but that he had seen several of them, advised them to relinquish the idea, and pointed out the consequence that would ensue, if they persevered in such a course? He said he pointed out to them the dangerous results which were likely to follow, if they were to kill a sheriff, constable or agent. He also said, he understood they were all armed with guns, pitchforks, &c. This is what the hon. member told me, and I am greatly surprised that he will stand on the floor of this House, and make such an assertion as he has just made, that it might appear I had made a wrong statement. If I can not stand on the floor of this House, and speak what is the truth, I nor any other member ought never to appear upon it again. What I stated before, in regard to many of the tenants on Lot 61, not paying rent for fifteen years, was correct. As to this Loan scheme, if the tenants can not now pay rent for their lands, is it likely they will be able to purchase those lands from the Government? Will the money obtained by the Loan raise crops for them? It think not, Sir. If the tenants can not pay a rent of 50 shillings or £2, is it likely they will be able to purchase their lands free? Look at Lot 11, for instance; (the agent of which has helped to deprive himself of a salary of £150 a year,) the proprietor of that estate never got a shilling of rent from it. Some of the tenants on that estate have had to sell their last horse or cow

to pay for the first instalment. If Mr. Warburton had acted lenient with the tenantry, they would be now in a better position, and himself as well.

Hon. COL. TREASURER.—I am glad to hear that the hon. gentleman, (Mr. Yeo) gave me credit for acting disinterestedly with regard to the purchase of Lot 11, a thing he never done before. But, Sir, I am surprised to hear what the hon. member says about the settlers on Lot 11 having to sell their last horse and cow to pay their first instalment. I can inform the hon. member to the contrary. Lot 11 was the last property purchased by the Government, and I was surprised to see persons come forward and purchase so eagerly as they did. There was one farm sold for £300, and many others at prices corresponding to their value. Some of the hon. members object to the words "general satisfaction." I think, sir, if it was expressed *universal* satisfaction, there might be some grounds for complaint; but I am confident it gives *general* satisfaction, from the East Point to the North Cape. There was some talk of purchasing Lot 13, the property of Sir George Seymour, for which Mr. Yeo is agent, and for which as far as I know, he (Sir George Seymour) does not get much rent, and would be glad to sell to the Government. But Mr. Yeo said the Government could not purchase it. The Attorney General wrote to Mr. Yeo on the subject, but never received an answer. And no wonder, Sir, it is against the interest of agents to sell those lands because they get their living by the agency; and in this case, I believe, Mr. Yeo intended to purchase the property himself. If the Belfast Estate was owned by the Government, the tenants on that estate would be willing to purchase if they had to sell their last cow or horse in their stable—Ay, if they had to sell their last shirt! I will support the paragraph as reported by the Committee.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY.—I did not think the amendment proposed would open such a lengthy discussion. There is one part of the paragraph under consideration which I consider objectionable. I mean that part which alludes to the Land Purchase Bill giving "general satisfaction." I am well aware, Sir, that among a large portion of the people, whom I have the honor to represent, the measure is not received with general satisfaction. I have no doubt it would give more satisfaction if the whole of the lands were owned by the Government; but there are many of the Proprietors who are not willing to sell out. I would be glad to support any measure that might be brought forward, that would make every tenant become a freeholder. But then, Sir, we cannot compel the proprietors to sell their lands; and that they will not sell as long as they can collect good rental, I am well assured. I understand the Government are about to purchase the Selkirk Estate. In Belfast there are a great many freeholders, and the best part of the property has been disposed of, and much that remains, are lands unfit for agricultural purposes. There are certain parts of all the Townships which are not fit for general settlement, and any efforts to make them available, would be a dead letter. T. KIRWAN, Reporter.

(To be continued.)

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

THURSDAY, February 26, 1857.

The Hons. Messrs. Forgan and Aldous took the oaths and their seats as members of the House.

The Hon. Mr. Haythorne's attendance was excused, on account of indisposition.

FRIDAY, February 27, 1857.

Mr. Howe was appointed Reporter.

Mr. John S. Bremner's tender for printing and binding Journal of the Council, was accepted, his being the lowest offer.

The Hon. Mr. Craswell, from the committee appointed to prepare an Address in answer to His Excellency's speech, reported a draft thereof, which he read in his place.

The House went into committee on the Address, the Hon. Mr. Craswell in the chair. On the clause referring to the contemplated loan being read—

The Hon. COLONEL SWABEY rose and stated, that before the question was put on that clause, it became him, not only as a member of the Government, but also as the official situation he held had an intimate relation to the subject, to offer a few observations on the matter. Their honors' all knew that the question of the landed tenures in this Island had long formed the subject of agitation, more or less violent and pernicious. The means of settling this vexed question were now available, and he had several reasons to justify his opinion, that the operation of the loan would be attended with success, and greatly beneficial results to the whole community. It must be remembered that the first operation under the Land Purchase Bill was very extensive. A large amount of property was purchased by the Government, the accounts handed over were badly arranged, had been carried from ledger to ledger, there were no reliable data from which to ascertain the quantity of land. He would, however, rather direct their honors' attention to the prospects of the results to flow from the contemplated loan. If the people on the Worrell Estate had been somewhat dilatory in availing themselves of the benefits of the Land Purchase Bill at first, that could be easily accounted for. It was well known that difficulties were suggested by parties whose political principles were opposed to those of the Government; these had the effect, to a certain extent, of damping the feelings of the people; but although there might be some little delay and difficulty in settling the Worrell Estate, no loss would result from its purchase. He was happy to call the attention of their honors' to the contrast presented by the settlers on Lot 11. The whole of the operations connected with the re-sale of that property, which had been but recently purchased, were now nearly complete. The tenantry considered the act of the Government in purchasing that Lot as a positive boon to them, and acted in accordance with that feeling. On the 16th February the last instalments were payable. As the Public Accounts were made up to the 31st of January, those last payments were, of course, not included; but he had no hesitation in stating, that if a balance were struck now, it would be found that but a trifling sum would be required to complete the purchase money of that estate, including the expenses of management, which were comparatively small, as intending purchasers come in readily and thus they insure the purchase of their lands at prices much lower than would otherwise be the case, if the operations extended over a number of years. There was another observation he would offer, as a member of the Government. When the proposal for the Imperial guarantee was first sent to England, Her Majesty's Government very properly requested information as to the financial condition of the Colony, in order that they might ascertain what means we had of repaying the loan. The local government sent home a statement of facts—a statement which could not be colored, inasmuch as the public records of the Island were its foundation—showing so healthy and prosperous a state, that the British Government at once saw that they could give the required guarantee without the slightest risk to themselves. He was not surprised at that, when he reflected on the large sums which the West Indian Islands, Canada, and other Colonies had received under Imperial guarantees. Our financial condition was better than theirs; but, perhaps, as the Island was a very small dependency, it might be more difficult to obtain, on that account, what we had requested. His Honor concluded by stating that these circumstances justified the committee in adopting the paragraph before it. On the clause relating to Education being read—