

A despatch from Lord Hobart to the Lieut. Governor, to pass an Act to re-vest the forfeited lands in the Crown; but the Act which was passed for that purpose was suppressed by the authorities, as it had no doubt answered the purpose they intended. The threatened future reduced the price of the grants, and the Colonial authorities and others acquired Townships for nominal or trifling sums. Thus the servants of the Crown and other leading men, who had assisted the inhabitants to petition the Sovereign to release them from oppression, became their task-masters, and gave strength to the oppressors to confirm their bondage.

"Put the Act to re-vest the forfeited lands in the Crown appears to have been received by Governor Smith, in the year 1818, to re-vest two Townships in the Crown, Nos. 55 and 56. Some 7 miles who had made considerable improvement at Launching, and had paid the Quit Rents for the whole Township of 55, could only obtain a grant of 600 acres, to divide amongst themselves, while the lands around them were granted principally to his sons and sons-in-law and other gentlemen, in tracts of from 500 to 1000 acres, persons who made no improvement or settlement; and as the settlers were confined to 600 acres, they had to purchase the lands around them to extend their improvements and settle their families.

"To understand the intentions of the Government, it is necessary to remark, that the same year in which the two Townships were escheated, Governor Smith made proclamation of an indulgence, said to be from His Royal Highness the Prince Regent to the proprietors, to reduce the Quit Rent upon certain conditions, and release proprietors from their obligations of settling their grants with foreign Protestants; but the proclamation does not assert that the indulgence is an Order in Council, nor is it authenticated by the seals of office, or the name of the Colonial Minister given who sent the despatch; therefore it is of no authority; yet it served the purpose to deceive the inhabitants, as the interested land holders led them to believe that they had the Royal authority to compel them to submit to become and remain tenants, nor expect to be released from bondage, even if the lands were re-vested in the Crown; and the acts of Governor Smith supported such assertions; for it was after his removal that the Crown lands of Townships 15 and 55 were granted in small tracts to settlers.

"To show that the proceedings of Governor Smith were founded on a plan, which had the support of the Colonial Ministers—a Despatch from Lord Goderich, of the 1st of August, 1833, in answer to an address, praying for the appointment of a Court of Escheat, he says, that in the event of an Escheat the tenants would have to pay the same rent to the Crown which had been imposed by the proprietors, and assuredly there would be no free grants; and in another Despatch from Lord Goderich, of the 27th January, 1833, containing a plan for the continuation of Quit Rents, he says, that his objections to a forfeiture for non-settlement, according to the conditions of the grants, would not apply to a forfeiture for non-payment of Quit Rents. In this case the rights of the Crown should be enforced with rigour, thus making the payment of arrears of Quit Rent far more important than to release the inhabitants of a Colony from oppression.

"Lord Goderich must have known that the allowing the grantees to hold over forfeited lands to impose rents on British subjects was illegal and most oppressive; and he must know that the Crown could not be put in the position of the wrong doers, to enforce the payment of rents, which had been imposed through the refusal of Ministers, to resume the forfeited lands for the protection of its subjects; but as the grantees had been allowed by successive Ministers to hold over forfeited lands, and to impose and recover rents for 60 years, they had a claim in equity to compensation, when deprived of the lands; therefore, to have enforced the forfeiture for arrears of Quit Rents, appears to have been intended to silence that claim for compensation; and for the Crown to resume the lands for a sum of money due for Quit Rent seemed to justify a demand upon the tenantry for rent, but we should expect more just and equitable measures from the Imperial Government of the present day.

"Lord Glenelg supports the same measure as his predecessors. In his Despatch of the 10th August, 1836, he says, that it is an erroneous impression for the tenantry to think that they should have a freehold interest. They should have known that in the event of an Escheat, the Crown would enforce the performance of the contracts, which the tenantry had made with the former proprietors. The former remarks to Lord Goderich's letters will apply to this; but Lord Glenelg, as if he thought the tenantry were entitled to better terms, admits that it was the impression of the inhabitants as far back as the year 1817, that they ought to be settled in freehold; and such impressions may have received some confirmation from the Escheat and settlement of Townships 15 and 55.

"But there is a former Despatch from Lord Glenelg, dated the 23rd July, 1835, kept back until 1838—the subject of which is a correspondence between a Sir Charles Saxton and the Colonial Office. Sir Charles puts the question, 'Will the payment of the commutation for Quit Rent as required by Lord Goderich's letter of the 27th January, 1833, release proprietors from the arrears of Quit Rent, and from the terms of settlement prescribed in their original grants? Would a grant be made on redemption of Quit Rents to parties for 2000 or 3000 acres?' (Answer). 'Proprietors commencing within the time limited could extinguish their Quit Rents altogether, a release from the condition requiring the settlement of one person to every 200 acres, was a boon held out by Lord Goderich for proprietors to commute within the time limited, which Lord Glenelg would adopt; but the Government cannot make a fresh grant.'

"The inference to be drawn from this correspondence is this; there has been no complaint of the infringement of the condition requiring a settlement of one person to every 200 acres, and consequently it was safe for the Minister to grant an indulgence, which had never been complained of; but as the grantees could not be altered it remained there still; but instead of the foreigners who were to have been settled, to substitute British subjects in lieu of them, to be settled as tenants, deprived them of their birth right; and the Government affording them no protection against the persons who deceived and enslaved them, is the cause of all the complaints; and if Governor Smith's proclamation had released the grantees from their conditions prescribed for settlement, Sir Charles Saxton would have no occasion to ask for such a release, nor would Lord Glenelg have had any cause to refuse a fresh grant, which is a further proof of a plan that Governor Smith's proclamation was intended to deceive the men they had enslaved.

"In the year 1839, the Earl of Durham, as Governor General, appointed a Commission to enquire into the complaints of the people, and from the evidence taken, came to the decision, 'that the lands had been granted upon terms which had never been performed, to which may be attributed all the evils under which this Colony labor; and, therefore, the necessity of providing a remedy; and as the people had suffered no time to elapse, without making their complaints known, it was not too late for the Crown to resume the grants it had made, as a measure not only legally justifiable, but the only course to free the Colony from the evils the grantees had inflicted.'

"But the Earl of Durham had not been aware that the evil inflicted upon this Colony was the act of the Colonial Ministers, who had not only given indulgence to defaulting grantees to hold over forfeited lands, but had assisted them with despatches to their Governor in the name of the Sovereign, to deceive and enslave the inhabitants, which had so far committed the Imperial Government that they could not deprive the proprietors of the land without compensation; for when Lord John Russell, in his despatch of the 25th of June, 1841, says, 'that the conditions of the grants were impracticable, and an Escheat at the present day for the non-performance of such conditions would be unjust; and the Government have no funds at their disposal to purchase the lands, to be afterwards sold or granted to the tenants.'

"The excuse which Ministers set up for granting indulgences to the grantees, is, that the conditions of the grants were impracticable; but Ministers must have known that the grantees cost nothing; and they were informed that the grantees made no attempt to perform their conditions for settlement, or to improve the land; and therefore they could lose nothing by the forfeiture, which they were fully apprised of. But the land having been reclaimed by the labor and means of British subjects, who had reason to believe, on the faith of an order in Council, that they would be protected by the Crown resuming the land, and for Ministers to grant indulgence under such circumstances to grantees who had no property in the land, or title in the grant, was to hand over the liberties and property of British subjects to defaulters, who had no title, which is criminal in a high degree,

because by fictions in law, in relation to land, the assumed proprietor is protected, and enabled to enforce the tenant's obligations, while this fraud which had been practised to obtain such obligations has never been investigated, as the only Court to afford redress in such cases, a Court of Escheats to investigate the titles, is not allowed to be put in operation. "It is necessary that the title of land should proceed from the Sovereign, to exercise authority over the titles to land, and it is a rule, that once a person suing for the rent of land, when the title is presumed to be in the Crown, and notice thereof given to the Judge, he will suspend judgment until that question is investigated in a Court of Escheat, which will be instituted by the Government, at the desire of the judge, to prevent persons recovering rent for Crown Lands. But when that notice is withheld from the Judge he is left to give an unjust decision. It is only in this small Colony, where such injustice could be continued, where a rent of from £20,000 to £30,000 a year is the reward to men to uphold this system of robbery, which can only continue while the tenantry pay for the shackles which hold them in bondage.

"When individuals give up their natural right of taking redress of wrongs in their own hands, it is upon condition that the Sovereign who has engaged to administer justice will appoint Courts, to take cognizance of complaints, and a Lord Justice in any case; and the subject who has suffered wrong may, in the name of the Sovereign, plead for redress of his own wrongs. But when any Court is kept shut, purposely to prevent justice being administered, then the social compact is broken, and the right reverts to the people to take the redress of wrongs in their own hands; therefore it becomes the duty of this House to require a Court of Escheats to be established to afford justice.

"When Lord John Russell says 'that the Government have no funds at their disposal to purchase the lands, to be afterwards sold or granted to the tenants,' is an admission that the lands would be purchased from the Proprietors, and sold or granted to the tenants, if the Government had the funds at their disposal to do so. The Imperial Parliament have always granted money to pay a just debt; but as the claims of the Proprietors to compensation originated from the delay of Ministers to resume the forfeited lands, and the Government cannot ask Parliament for money to purchase, without exposing the delinquency of Colonial Ministers, and therefore justice is likely to be delayed, as long as this House suffers the tenantry to be imposed on. When the Proprietors are deprived of the land, they can apply to Parliament, and if Parliament refuse compensation, it will be a proof they had no right to receive it.

"The Despatch from Earl Grey of the 12th Feb., 1851, calls the Governor's attention to the Land Question, and says that the rights of parties cannot be altered but by an equitable adjustment; and while the laws continue as at present, they should be enforced with rigour if necessary. This threat implies that the rents might be re-covered at the point of the bayonet.

"Now the first law of the Island is, that the Crown shall resume the forfeited lands, to be enabled to protect the inhabitants who reclaim and cultivate the land. The obligations of the tenants to pay rent was imposed through the unjust delay to enforce that law; but that law is in force in the first place, according to its true intent and meaning, to re-vest the forfeited lands in the Crown; and the fraudulent leases fall to the ground. We have no right to seek a settlement of the Land Question by equity, when the written law provides for that settlement.

"The plan forced upon the late Government, to purchase the land, with opposition from the Proprietors; and when objections were started, Ministers could not obtain the money they had promised to keep it in operation. On the settlement of all the tenantry in freehold, the Estates purchased, makes the rest of the tenantry feel their bondage more and more. But to ask for a Commission, to submit the question to arbitration, where the Judges are restricted to respect the claims of the landholders and impose conditions upon the tenants—is most unjust, and unworthy of consideration.

"From the tenor of the despatches referred to, it is admitted that the landholders have no title to the land; but in consequence of indulgence they have a claim to compensation when deprived of the land, which places the tenantry in the worst position, for the landholders have no inducement to deal leniently with their tenants, but the reverse; the greater the burden they impose on their tenantry, the more it enhances their claims for compensation; which will no doubt be regulated by the amount of rent they received.

"When Lord Stanley stated in the House of Commons that the wrong of which this Colony had to complain was the act of the Imperial Government, and it was their duty to provide a remedy, the Proprietors were well aware that whenever they were deprived of the land, the Imperial Government must make them compensation, and it is not likely that they would agree to any compromise which would reduce their claim. Whatever price the tenants may have to pay for their land will be required for the improvement of the Colony, to make up for the loss it has sustained; and forfeited lands in the Crown for the settlement of the inhabitants, cannot benefit the landholders, while it would greatly retard the improvement of the Island.

"Therefore Resolved, that it is necessary to establish a Court of Escheats, to investigate the titles of the Townships and re-vest forfeited lands in the Crown, with a view of settling the inhabitants."

The Examiner.

Charlottetown, P. E. I., April 17, 1860.

THE LAND COMMISSION AGAIN.

We stated in our last paper that despatches had been received from the Colonial Office, by the last English Mail, authorising the appointment of the now celebrated Land Commission. Not being in the confidence of the Government, we did not, of course, know the precise nature of those despatches; but we have no longer reason to plead ignorance on that score. The Executive Councilors in the House of Assembly were mighty jubilant during the early part of last week—looked very knowing, and unconsciously bland towards themselves and their supporters; and by vague hints, and

"Nois, and becks, and wretched smiles," gave their opponents to understand that the Escheator's, like Othello's, "occupation was gone," for that they were invested with such authority as would set the vexatious Land Question at rest for all time to come. Unable to contain the awful secret any longer, the Leader of the Government No. 2, laid before the House of Assembly, on Wednesday last, in his usually dignified and grandiloquent style, the documents which, we suppose, had been near setting fire to his pocket during the previous day or two. They consist of two letters,—one from the Duke of Newcastle to the Lieut. Governor; and the other from Sir S. Cunard and five other land proprietors to the Secretary for the Colonies. Both these remarkable documents are given below. The Duke of Newcastle approvingly refers to the letter of Sir Samuel Cunard—endorses every statement it contains; and puts his veto—as he did before—on the resolutions passed by the House of Assembly last Session. But his Grace goes a little further to complicate and embarrass the question than even the proprietors do. He states that "it will be necessary, before going further into the matter, to be assured that the tenants will accept, as binding, the decision of the Commissioners, or the majority of them; and as far as possible that the Legislature of the Colony would concur in any measures which might be required to give validity to that decision." It is quite plain, from this language, that the Duke of Newcastle expects that the tenantry will be permitted to give the assurance required in the only way in which they can give it—'at the hustings'; and when he alludes to the necessity of "the Legislature" ratifying their decision, he evidently considers that the only way to give effect to what we must consider the arbitrary proposals of the Land Proprietors, would be the sanction of a Bill on the subject by the several branches of the Legislature. The House of Assembly, however, undertakes to answer for the tenantry, and for the Legislative Council as well—thereby adopting a proceeding at variance with that suggested by the Duke of Newcastle.

We have not room, at present, to offer any lengthy comments on the letter of the six Proprietors. When we know that there are nearly forty persons who claim to be owners of land in this Island—the majority of whom are on the other side of the Atlantic—it must strike the reader as very extraordinary to see only six names appended to the letter in question,—and, indeed, it may be said there are only five, for Sir S. Cunard undertook to sign the paper for one of his own family. It is very evident that the Proprietors, as a body, feel no interest in the formation of the Commission, or otherwise they are strongly opposed to it. Even the proprietors in the Island here have given the House of Assembly no proof of their acquiescence in the course recommended by Sir S. Cunard and his four English friends. What reason have we to infer, then, that they will be bound by the suggestions contained in the letter under consideration?

But let us see what these suggestions are. The five proprietors say they will "readily acquiesce in any arrangement that may be practicable for the purpose of settling the various questions alluded to in the memorial from the House of Assembly," but they have no confidence in the mode recommended by the House. Sir S. Cunard and his friends are to be the sole judges of what is "practicable;" and who can doubt that they will most positively declare that it is not practicable to entertain the question of Escheat, on the ground of non-fulfilment of the original conditions? Who can doubt that they will set their faces as positively against any considerable remission of the arrears of rent? In fact, we believe nothing will be "practicable," in their estimation, but the adoption of a report from three Commissioners—two of whom to be their own nominees—desired to confirm them in their possessions, with the view of putting a stop to all future agitation; and they most likely ask the tenantry to bind themselves to accept as final the report of that Commission.

We say that two of the three Commissioners—should they ever commence their labors, which we doubt extremely—will be the nominees of Sir Samuel Cunard and his friends. Can there be any doubt of it? It is true, they suggest that one Commissioner should be appointed by the House of Assembly—one by the British Government, and one by themselves; but as the British Government will not stir hand or foot in the matter without consulting Sir Samuel Cunard, we have every reason to conclude that this gentleman himself will have the exclusive honour of nominating the two Commissioners. What chance the House of Assembly's Commissioner would have in resisting the undue demands and pretensions of the proprietors—even supposing him to be a liberal minded man, and had a leaning towards the tenantry—it is not difficult to conjecture. The majority would be against him—it is in their power to make a final report—he must either sign it, or abandon the whole business in disgust, and enter, perhaps, a useless protest.

In order to give a finishing touch to the delusion with which the Government have amused and gulled the country for nearly twelve months regarding this notable Commission, they passed a resolution on Saturday last, nominating the Hon. Joseph Howe, of Nova Scotia, to be the Commissioner on behalf of the tenantry here. Mr. Howe is supposed to be still popular with the tenantry of this Island, notwithstanding the differences which have sprung up between him and the Catholics of his native Province; and the Government, no doubt, suppose, that the nomination of such a man will be hailed with approbation by the tenantry, and help to establish some confidence in the folly and delusion which they are practising on the country. But they know very well that Mr. Howe's position, as Provincial Secretary of Nova Scotia, Clerk of the Executive Council there, and a leading member of the Government, precludes the possibility of his spending his time here, to embroil himself in the almost interminable disputes between landlord and tenant; and they are very well aware, likewise, that he has too much sagacity to damage his reputation as a public man—as he most assuredly would—by engaging in a contest with the proprietors in which he must be worsted; or by agreeing to the demands of that class, in which case he must become odious to the tenantry. Mr. Howe is more at his ease, and less liable to censure in the Secretary's Office in Halifax; and will, no doubt, put in a civil plan, touching his official duties, for declining the honour, &c., &c.

That, in view of the course adopted by the House of Assembly, the tenantry will never consider themselves bound to abide the award of the Commission—should it ever go into operation—is morally certain; and we are convinced that the bar on, if not mischievous, results of the same scheme, will give rise to an agitation in the Is and no e violent and wide spread. Sana has ever yet attended the discussion of the Land Question.

We have many other observations to offer on this subject, but must reserve them until we have more space at our disposal. For the present, we submit to the perusal of our readers the correspondence which gave rise to the debate on Friday and Saturday last.

For the resolutions which were moved by the Hon. Col. Gray and the Hon. Mr. Coles, together with the divisions thereon, we refer the reader to the Parliamentary summary published on our second page.

Downing Street, 21st March, 1860.

Sir—With reference to my despatch, No. 11, of the 6th of September last, in which I informed you that I had communicated to Sir Samuel Cunard the correspondence which had taken place upon the subject of the appointment of a Commission to propose measures of arrangement between Landlords and Tenants in Prince Edward Island, I transmit to you the copy of a letter which has been addressed to me by Sir S. Cunard, and several other proprietors of land in the Island.

The proprietors, it will be seen, do not think that the appointment of a Commission, in the manner proposed by the House of Assembly in their Address of the 9th May last, would be the most desirable mode of proceeding, as the labours of such a Commission could only terminate in a Report, the conclusions of which would not be binding on any of the parties interested. They suggest, therefore, instead, that three Commissioners or Referees should be appointed—one by Her Majesty, one by the House of Assembly, and the third by the Proprietors—and that they should be invested with power to hear and determine all the questions in dispute. It is further suggested that the expense of the Commission should be divided equally between the Crown, the Tenants and the Proprietors.

If the consent of all the parties can be obtained to this proposal, I believe that it may offer the means of bringing these long-pending disputes to a termination. But it will be necessary, before going further into the matter, to be assured that the Tenants will accept, as binding, the decision of the Commissioners, or the majority of them; and, as far as possible, that the Legislature of the Colony would concur in any measures which might be required to give validity to that decision. It would be very desirable also that any Commissioner who might be named by the House of Assembly on behalf of the Tenants should go into the enquiry unfettered by any conditions such as were proposed in the Assembly last year. I have, therefore, to request that you will ascertain and report to me whether the Tenants of Prince Edward Island, or the House of Assembly, on their behalf, are prepared to agree to the proposed reference.

I have the honor to be, &c. &c. &c. NEWCASTLE. (Signed) HENRY BULWER, Private Secretary.

Bush Hill House, Edmonton, 13th February, 1860.

MY LORD DUKE; We have been furnished with a copy of a Memorial, addressed to Her Majesty by the House of Assembly of Prince Edward Island, on the subject of the questions which have arisen in connection with the original Grants of Land in that Island, and the rights of Proprietors in respect thereof. We observe that the House of Assembly have suggested that Her Majesty should appoint one or more Commissioners

to enquire into the relations of Landlord and Tenant in the Island, and to negotiate with the Proprietors of the Township of Land for fixing a certain rate of price at which every Tenant might have the option of purchasing his land; and also to negotiate with the Proprietors for a remission of the arrears of rent, in such cases as the Commissioners might deem reasonable, and proposing that the Commissioners should report the result to Her Majesty.

As large Proprietors of land in this Island, we beg to state that we shall readily acquiesce in any arrangement that may be practicable, for the purpose of settling the various questions alluded to in the Memorial from the House of Assembly; but we do not think that the appointment of Commissioners, in the manner proposed by them, would be the most desirable mode of procedure, as the labour of such Commission would only terminate in a Report, which would not be binding on any of the parties interested.

We beg, therefore, to suggest, that instead of the mode proposed by the House of Assembly, three Commissioners or Referees should be appointed—one to be named by Her Majesty, one by the House of Assembly, and one by the Proprietors of land; and that these Commissioners should have power to enter into all the enquiries that may be necessary, and to decide upon the different questions which may be brought before them, giving of course to the parties interested the opportunity of being heard.

We should propose that the expense of the Commission should be borne by the three parties to the reference, that is to say, in equal thirds, and we feel assured that there would be no difficulty in securing the adhesion of all the land-proprietors to a settlement on this footing.

The precise mode of carrying it into execution if adopted, would require consideration, and upon that subject we trust that your Grace would lead your valuable assistance.

We have, &c. (Signed) S. CUNARD, E. CUNARD, per S. Cunard, GRAHAM MONTGOMERY, SELKIE, JAMES MONTGOMERY, LAWRENCE SULLIVAN.

To His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, &c. &c. &c. A true copy, HENRY BULWER, Private Secretary.

DEFEAT OF THE GOVERNMENT IN THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

THERE was much consternation amongst the members and supporters of the Government on Wednesday last when it became known that the only measure of great importance—the one which had more of a partisan character than any other—the Act to amend the Election Laws, which was carried by a strict party vote in the House of Assembly, was rejected by the Legislative Council—only three members of that body having been found to support the measure. The Bill, we understand, gave rise to a debate of unusual length and warmth—the Leader of the Government in that end of the building, Mr. Palmer, having distinguished himself by threatening vengeance on the Council, and declaring that steps would be taken to make the Council pass the measure in less than three weeks. What proceedings he intended, or intends, to adopt, the honorable member did not condescend to make known. But even if he had the power to alter the constitution of the Legislative Council—authorised by one of those secret despatches which they pretend to have in their possession relating to that body—he could not make the change in three weeks; and he could not bring the Bill forward twice in the one Session; besides, he knows very well that the House of Assembly would have to re-enact it before it could be again presented to the Council—a thing it would be impossible to accomplish, even supposing he could resort to the arbitrary step of proroguing the Legislature, and calling it immediately after. Mr. Palmer's threat was, therefore, very unwisely, if not to say foolish, and was evidently the result of bad temper. It only had any effect on the majority of the Council, it was only to strengthen them in their determination to reject the Bill.

We were not present at the debate in the Council, but we believe the reasons which influenced the majority of that House to take the course they did had their origin in those two Sections of the Election Bill: the first giving power to Road Overseers to grant certificates to statute labour voters; and the second, that which enacted the disfranchisement of Prince-town, Novelt and Lot 18, and conferred on Summerside the honour of being the Shire town of the County. The Council contended, we understand, that the first section put a very dangerous power—and a power that might be used for the worst purposes—in the hands of a class of petty officials who were generally selected on account of their predilections towards the Government of the day, and who were not, in the aggregate, the best informed class in the community,—in fact, Road Overseers were, by the new Bill, to have a very extensive control over the exercise of the elective franchise; and the Council, very properly thought, as we did in the Assembly, that no such extraordinary power ought to be given to a class of officials, so scattered, so irresponsible, and so unfitted by their social relations, their political bias, and their educational acquirements, as Road Overseers generally are; and that the certificates of such men—many of whom can barely write their names—ought not to be the only passports to the hustings. The Council objected, we understand, to the other clause, as being unequal for and unnecessary. Prince-town has been recognised as the Shire town for many years, and with Lot 18 added to it in the Election Law, its constituency is as respectable, in a numerical point of view, as that of Georgetown and Royalty, and should not be disfranchised at the mere dictation of a member of the Government, and without some expression of opinion on the subject. It was, therefore, deemed advisable to postpone the further consideration of the Bill until next Session.

The new Election Bill—being an attempt to cripple the elective franchise, and to give encouragement to corruption and partiality, by placing all the statute labour voters in the Colony at the mercy of partisan Road Overseers—would be an outrageous invasion of popular rights if carried into law. It is fearful to contemplate the despotism and tyranny which might be practised under this Act, and the agitation and discontent to which it would inevitably give rise. The party in power, aided by their clerical emissaries, have already created disunion enough in the Colony by the agitation of a so-called religious question; and they have now attempted to sow the seeds of political turmoil—to create squabbles, about the time of every election, between voters and road overseers, and to deprive many of the former of their constitutional rights. The country will be gratified to learn that the Legislative Council has again exercised their legitimate and constitutional authority to serve their fellow colonists from the visitation of these frightful evils. It is not the first time the Council have saved the liberties of the people when their destruction was threatened by arbitrary power; and the recollection of these events must remind us all of Cobbett's earnest exclamation—'Thank God, we have a House of Lords!' The people of Prince Edward Island will congratulate themselves, in a similar spirit, on having a Legislative Council to erect, whenever the occasion requires, an effective barrier between despotism and popular rights.

Since the foregoing remarks were written, the Government have, we understand, nominated three gentlemen to seats in the Legislative Council—namely, Messrs. J. R. Gardiner and Alexander Anderson, of Beedon, and Mr. Donald Ramsay, of Beech Point, near Malpeque—all from Prince County—thus making the number in the Council fifteen. They have been brought to Town by special messengers, despatched in hot haste, to serve the purposes of the Government. Whether they will allow themselves to be made the plant tools of the Executive, remains to be seen. What a telling commentary this furnishes on the crisis at hand! We observe that the House of Assembly have suggested that Her Majesty should appoint one or more Commissioners

a course—that the Council were a set of hangers or old women—that one member was quite enough to do all the business required there—that it was infamous for any Government to fill seats in that Branch with persons holding their own political views; and that the only remedy to abate the evils was to adopt the elective system! There is not a word about the elective system now—not a word about the expense of increasing instead of diminishing the number of Councilors! Political consistency is a virtue not much in favour with our rulers. When the new Councilors shall have taken their seats, and given us a touch of their quality, we shall have more to say about this unequalled for, and high-handed exercise of the prerogative.

MORE TAXATION.

THE Revenue Bill for the ensuing year was under the consideration of the Committee of the House of Assembly last evening. The Government propose to add one fifth to the duties levied last year on goods subject to an *ad valorem* duty, and on spirits, by which they will probably increase the revenue to the extent of seven or eight thousand pounds. This is a new mode of robbing Peter to pay Paul. Twelve months ago the party now in power used to declaim against the Government of that day for allowing the public debt to increase, and for not reducing taxation. They promised to lessen the taxes—to liquidate the debt, and to keep the expenditure within the income of the Colony. They have done neither; but they now propose new taxes in the hope of meeting their extravagant expenditure this session.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"Verand" lines on the death of Master David McGill, will be inserted in our next No. "X. Y." in reference to the lecture on Galileo, at the C. Y. M. L. Institute, on Wednesday evening last, has been received, and will receive an early attention. "Conservative," on "Exploded Delusions," will also receive attention as soon as space will permit. "J.," "A. C.," "Equity," "A Teacher," received during the past week, and other communications which came to hand at an earlier date—are not authenticated by the names of the writers, and according to our rules, cannot be entertained. "Pro Bono Publico" is in type, and will appear in our next.

CHARLOTTETOWN DEBATING CLUB.—The subject of discussion at the last meeting was, 'The advantages &c. &c. of a Federal Union of the British North American Colonies.' The debate was more than usually animated. Upon a division members decided in favour of a Federal Union, by a majority of two votes. Subject of debate for next meeting: 'Does the Free Education Act merit an equal liberal support to the people?' April 10, 1860. M. McLEOD, Sec'y.

Obit.

On Friday morning last, at St. Eleanors, after a few weeks illness, EMMA, the beloved wife of JOHN HAZARD, Esq., in the 35th year of her age, deeply and suddenly departed. She was the mother of some months, which she endured with much patience and fortitude. Mr. Philip Smith, second son of Mr. Andrew Smith, senior, Newtown, aged 68 years.

NEW ADVERTISEMENTS.

E. & N. A. RAILWAY.

Shediac and Moncton Railway. COMMENCING on TUESDAY, the 10th inst. Trains will run on this division of the Railway, each lawful day, until further notice. Leaving SHEDIAC at 8 a. m., and 3 p. m. "MONCTON" at 10 a. m., and 5 p. m. Connecting when practicable with the Steamers arriving at Shediac from Quebec and the Northern Ports and Pictou and Prince Edward Island, and at Moncton with those from Saint John. By order, R. C. SCOVILL, Commissioner.

AUCTION.

TO be sold by Public Auction, on Thursday, the 4th May, at 12 o'clock noon, at the Head St. Peter's Bay, a NEW HOUSE, 22 x 18 feet, newly finished, with 1 acre of land attached, subject to a rent of £2 per annum. Also a lot of Household furniture. Terms liberal and made known at sale. ANDREW McISAAC, Shoemaker. Head St Peter's Bay, April 17, 1860.

DISSOLUTION OF PARTNERSHIP.

WE the undersigned have this day, by mutual consent, agreed to dissolve PARTNERSHIP. The business for the future will be carried on by Patrick Hickey, who is empowered to collect in all debts and pay all demands against the said firm. PATRICK HICKEY, GARRETT GILLESPIE. Charlottetown, April 17, 1860. Id. Sw.

Farm for Sale.

THE Subscriber offers for sale his valuable FARM, situated in one of the finest settlements on the Island, and only 5 miles from Georgetown and 1 1/2 miles from Brudenell Wharf. Situated on the Georgetown Road, running to Brudenell River, consisting of 80 acres of free land, 50 acres of which are clear and in a high state of cultivation. There is a Dwelling House and Barn 40 by 25 feet on the premises; there is also a stream running through the property—and any quantity of Muscadine may be had. It is a desirable place for a Tannery or a mercantile business. Possession given immediately if required. It will be sold at a bargain. THOMAS REVILLE. Georgetown Road, Lot 52, April 17, 1860.

Improved Stock for Sale.

THE Subscriber will if not previously disposed of, offer at Public Auction, at his Barrack, on Wednesday the 18th day of April next, at 2 o'clock, the following Surplus Stock:—3 yearling HEIFERS, 3 do. BULLS, 3 COWS. One two year old HEIFER in Calf, all of the Durham Stock imported from England. Also several superior young Sow PIGS from the Stock imported by Sir Alexander Bannerman. Also, several head of Fat Cattle. GEORGE COLES. Charlottetown, March 27, 1860. Id.

Clearing Out Sale!

THE Subscriber intending to close his business at Traveller's Rest, Lot 19, will sell by PUBLIC AUCTION, commencing on TUESDAY, the 1st May next, at 10 o'clock, a. m., the whole of his Stock of DRY GOODS, HARDWARE, GROCERIES, CROCKERYWARE, DRUGS, BOOTS AND SHOES, HOUSEHOLD FURNITURE, Horses, Waggon, Harness, &c. TERMS AT SALE. JAMES MURHEAD. Traveller's Rest, April 5, 1860.

Biscuit Baking Machine.

THE Subscriber having procured a MACHINE for the purpose of BAKING BISCUIT, notices the public that he is now prepared to supply them with all kinds of Plain and Fancy Biscuit, Ship Bread, &c., at short notice, and warranted to give satisfaction. OS HAND—40 B trels of good SHIP BREAD, 20 do. PILOT BREAD, 10 Boxes WINE CRACKERS, 15 do. BUTTER do. JOHN QUIRK, near Temperance Hall. April 10, 1860. Sw.

To Charter.

THE new Schooner "GOLD FINDER," now in St. Peter's Harbor, from 80 to 100 tons, N. M. Apply to W. W. Lord, Charlottetown, or to the Subscriber, WM. H. McKEN, St. Peter's Harbor. April 10, 1860.

DARRY'S TRICOPHEROUS is the best and cheapest article for dressing, beautifying, curling, preserving and restoring the hair. Ladies, try it. Sold by all Druggists & Perfumers.