

The Colonial Herald,

AND

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND ADVERTISER.

Vol. VI.]

CHARLOTTETOWN, SATURDAY, APRIL 8, 1843.

[No. 297.]

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

MONDAY, March 20.

STATE OF THE COLONY.

Mr. RAE commenced this important debate, by observing he would not detain the House by a mere repetition of the state of the Colony; the grievances which the people are now suffering are so well known to this House—the tenantry more particularly—that they cry aloud to this Assembly for a remedial legislation; and we must not turn a deaf ear to their real and undoubted complaints; what we have now to consider, said the hon. member, is, which of the numerous resolutions now before us shall we adopt, whether we shall restrict ourselves to that of the hon. member, which only goes to address the proprietors, or whether we shall attempt a more general measure. He (Mr. Rae) would no longer beat about the bush, but at once declare that his opinion compelled him to go against the idea of addressing private individuals, (as he must term proprietors) to redress so weighty a matter as the one we are now about to enter upon; we have been told, time after time, that we cannot interfere between landlord and tenant; he would ask the question, why not? Why should not this power be possessed by us? has it not been done in other places, under similar circumstances, again and again? We have experienced opposition in other quarters, but will hon. members continue to allow such interference? Why are we not to be allowed similar privileges to those enjoyed by others: the amount of the matter is this; the tenants cannot discharge the burdens imposed upon them, for which reason he could not object to the resolutions of the hon. member for King's County, Mr. Cooper.

Mr. COOPER could not perceive any good effect would arise, even if the resolution of the Hon. the Speaker was agreed to by the Committee; Lord John Russell considered the question of tenures of this Colony as a public matter, and as such we ought to take it up and consider it.

[The hon. Member here offered a Resolution, which, together with the amendment, which was submitted by the Hon. Mr. Palmer and carried, has been already published in our columns.]

We hear a great deal about the previous agitation, but he had never known it so rife as it is at the present time; he thought if his resolution was adopted, Escheat might not be necessary, and agitation would be at an end. He also thought the resolution of the hon. the Speaker, if carried, had a tendency to cause a rupture between the Crown and the Proprietors. Hon. members seemed inclined to ridicule his proposition of a sixpenny rental, in certain cases; but he would ask whether the proprietors received so much as that, under the present system.

The Hon. the SPEAKER could not go into the matter in question till he was informed that those who were opposed to his resolution intended. The House could not forget the numerous measures brought forward by the hon. member for King's County, without effecting any, even the least, good for the Colony, excepting one great victory. But what had become of this £267,000 so achieved, as the hon. member had then represented. It had gone with the other accompaniments; it was a vision; and as the hon. member for Belfast (Mr. Douse) now and then expressed himself, it had terminated in smoke. The resolution of the hon. member appears to be one of those ridiculous things we have been so much accustomed to hear from the same quarter, namely, distress of the Colony—cruelty of Agents—and numerous other exaggerated statements, which are so continually dinned into our ears, that it reminded him of the fable of "the wolf in the wolf's skin." Distress he would say did not exist; but it was magnified five hundred fold. An hon. member has said, it was not proper in us to address the proprietors; he (Mr. Speaker) did not care about that, so that it had the desired effect. Very injurious reports have gone into the country; the deluded tenantry suppose we have the power to give them free lands. He would at once undeceive them; we have no such power; we cannot even interfere with their leases; the only benefit we can render them is, to use our best endeavors to obtain the consent of the proprietors to receive their rents in produce, and this he would consider as something gained.

Mr. RAE, in reply to the hon. the Speaker, did still think it was derogatory in us, as a legislative body, to apply to the proprietors. We are continually taunted by hon. members in respect to the opinions entertained by us on the Escheat question; but did it originate with us, or rather was it not a matter of debate long before we had a seat in this House? Another reason he objected to addressing the proprietors, was, the influence they have with the Colonial Secretary, who, from such cause, might be induced to turn a deaf ear to our applications. [Here the hon. member informed the House that produce was taken in rent in Scotland. The hon. the Speaker wished the hon. member to point out when any law existed to compel such a course.] Mr. RAE continued, it was done by agreement, and till an alteration in the Teind law at home, the Teind used all to be taken in grain. There had been for the last 100 years, a law regulating the procedure in matters both between Tenants, Landlords and clergymen. Let us now turn to Ireland, and compare the similarity of the proceedings now agitating in that country to our own. The great and learned O'Connell's opinion is, that the Tenantry there are entitled to compensation for the whole of their improvements, and to fixity of tenure. What is going on in that country he (Mr. Rae) expected we should hear more of hereafter. Thus does it appear we are not the only agitators. The resolutions now before us all agree that the Tenants cannot pay in Cash. He wished his motion to examine evidence had been carried; we could then have proved our former representations to be true, which have been contradicted in another quarter. How can we then call upon the same authority to join us now in an address, that is contradictory to his former statements? He (Mr. Rae) would wish to see him relieved from so unpleasant a dilemma.

Mr. COOPER would not give up the position he had so long maintained; he still remained of the same opinion, that if we applied for Escheat on certain grounds, it would yet be granted; the settlement of the land could in no other way be offered than by the interference of the Crown; a line should be drawn between the proprietor and the tenant. [The hon. member here read a report of Lord Durham, in which it is said, a large tract of land had been given away in one day;] the greatest struggle the people experience is with those representatives who have never done anything to settle the Colony. Yes, he would repeat it, the greatest struggle they experienced was with the House of Assembly. [The hon. member again referred to the despatches of Lord John Russell; after reading which he asked,] Was it right or honorable to petition those who would not come into a conventional settlement with the tenantry? To him (Mr. Cooper) it appeared the height of folly to expect relief to the people by any other means than a settlement of the land; we are now at a great expense to the home government, and so shall we continue till this is accomplished. The hon. member concluded an animated address, of which this is merely a condensed outline.

Mr. DOUSE could not express his surprise at the proceedings of certain hon. members, who will not improve by past experience; there is the old thing over and over again, till it is become quite nauseous; their remedies are not good for any complaint, save and except the ever to be condemned agitation of the Colony; they talk about short leases being an evil; did they not cause this same system? Was it not themselves who had caused us to adopt it in our own defence? What have been the results as considered by some proprietors who have given long leases; but the placing of power in hands to assist agitators to endeavour to deprive them of their own property; these facts have been too well known in many instances where the rights of property have in consequence been disregarded. This caused the adoption, where he himself was concerned, of disposing of property, by giving 21 years for payment at one pound per acre—it was considered as affording the occupant, an opportunity of becoming a freeholder and consequently compelling him to respect its rights.

Agitators have been the greatest enemies to the tenantry, without deriving any good whatever for them. Had they not impressed even the minds of their children, that it was necessary to agitate; he, as an agent, had spent many hundred pounds, which has benefited the tenantry, and for which he had never received either cash or produce in return, yet he would state, that in course of time he hoped to do so; if the resolution of the hon. member for King's County was correct, it would be a pre-

mium for the idle and dissipated tenantry, and tend to discourage the praise-worthy and industrious; but he did not fear this—He regarded it only as a means to keep up agitation; there was certainly some matter in the composition of the amendment worthy of observation, which was the difference the hon. member (Mr. Cooper) had made between the sterling now received and the Currency proposed to be paid. He will have it, the tenantry may pay 1s Currency, whereas they only pay at present about 1s 1/4, making a difference of one-ninth. Then, again, while he approved of receiving produce for rents in these dull times, he (Mr. Douse) disapproved of a fixed price. He did not see any tangible reason why we should not petition the proprietors; they are men like ourselves, and he thought it would be attended with greater good than the forcing pump which has been so often, though ineffectually, tried upon them. He would say, let Landlord and Tenant pull together, but let us not waste our time in so useless an occupation as debating on a measure that, if it passed this House, would be thrown out in the other. The hon. member for King's County, of all others, from his delegation to London knows that agitation is insignificant and useless. Eight years ago he preached from the same text; and instead of benefit, his audience had misery entailed upon them. He would ask the hon. member whether, even in the present bad times, he could shew that one distress had been recently carried into effect, or how long since a single farmer had been immured within the walls of a prison for rent? While he felt most anxious that proprietors should listen to real grievances, he would never go with any measure to keep up agitation.

Mr. MACINTOSH had been attentively listening to this debate, but he could hear nothing but agitate! agitate!!! yet no remedy proposed to do away with it; it will never cease till some effectual measure is brought in to settle the land question; then, and not till then, will the people be satisfied or the Colony tranquil. Greater commotion exists in the country than he (Mr. Macintosh) had ever known; and a spark would set it in a flame, were it not for the snow [a laugh]; the legal authorities are now opposed; not long since a sheriff started for Queen's County to levy an execution; but he had to turn back without effecting his object. The hon. member said he may differ in opinion with some hon. members, but not one of them could entertain a more sincere desire to see the Colony prosperous than he (Mr. Macintosh) did.

Mr. YEO said no good could possibly come out of the resolution of the hon. member for King's County; but this was not the intention of that party; it was only to keep up the trade of agitation, and to see their long speeches in the newspapers, through the means of—(here the hon. member cast a look at the Reporter.) This is the whole sum and substance of the matter. Much had been said about the Lieut. Governor's statements to the Home Government; but it should be borne in mind, that he had not then been long in the country. The hon. the Solicitor General too had come in for his share of scandal; nothing ever could have been so cruel as what hon. gentlemen's conduct to the poor man and his family of ten children, in the opinion of some hon. members; but why would they not inquire into the cause before such statements were propagated? He (Mr. Yeo) had inquired into the circumstance, and most unhesitatingly declared the man's bad conduct brought it on himself; other charges had unsparingly been heaped upon this individual, quite as unmerited. The whole of the expenses on a certain Estate did not amount to more than £25!!! We cannot prevent parties from sending statements home about the Colony Lady Westmorland had, he (Mr. Yeo) expected, sent home some very curious ones, as she was in the habit of putting very curious questions. He would support the combined resolution of the Hons. the Speaker and Mr. Palmer.

Mr. D. MACLEAN said a great deal had been said to persuade the House that it has no right to interfere in "the sacred right of property" between landlord and tenant, as if no one but the land speculators had that right; but he would say that a legislature that refused to interfere, when just and necessary, was worse than useless. He was aware that facts and historical precedents are peculiarly unpalatable to a few individuals in this House, and he would therefore remind them how the Church of Rome was despoiled of its property in England, during the reign of Henry the Eighth. Had one-tenth of the privileges which France now enjoys been conceded one hundred years ago, which France now enjoys, the revolution, with all its horrors would never have occurred. Prussia most likely saved herself from revolution by abrogating the feudal system, in confirming the tenant in two-thirds of his farm in fee simple, the remaining third being placed at the uncontented disposal of the landlord. In Carolina, the British Government resumed the grants after a lapse of sixty years, although the title of the proprietors was not disputed, but because their grants occasioned tumults and riots in that country. In Maryland the legislature of that Colony abolished the rent of one dollar per hundred acres, as an iniquitous imposition, before their independence was recognized, without paying one farthing of compensation to the proprietor. In Pennsylvania, since the revolution, the descendants of William Penn were deprived of their "sacred rights" by legislative enactments, at the rate of six pence per acre compensation. In Canada, he would read a resolution of the united parliament in 1811, interfering between landlord and tenant, in order to convert the leasehold into freehold tenure—with compensation it is true; but he contended the right equally exists, whether there is compensation given or not. [Here he read the resolution referred to.] He might, he said, add more precedents, but he considered that he had said quite enough to satisfy the House that we really possess the right of interference; and he considered that they would betray the interest of their constituents, did they in any measure divest themselves of that right. He would be very willing to go with a Petition to the Queen on the subject; but he never would give a vote to a petition so degrading to the House as would be one supplicating the Proprietors.

The Hon. SPEAKER in reply to the hon. member who had just resumed his seat, said, he could not perceive any similarity in the occurrences quoted by the hon. member; they did not in any way apply to this Colony. Could any precedents be produced as having taken place in Britain, wherein rent was not to be paid? He challenged hon. members, and they could not answer. The hon. member (Mr. Rae) had talked about Scotland, but it was very wide of the question now in debate. What weight can we attach to these precedents, as hon. members are pleased to designate them? Let them produce a single instance, from any place that is similarly situated to this Colony; then our attention would be demanded. No answer had been given by the hon. member for King's County to my question, as to what had become of the produce of his great victory, the £267,000. Did the hon. member get it himself? Let us see, said the hon. Speaker, what have been the savings and doings of the hon. members. (Here he read from the Colonial Herald a long letter, as published by the hon. member when this victory was said to have been achieved.) The reading of this letter set the risible faculties of the House in motion. The hon. Speaker then enumerated several of the hon. member's former measures, and compared them to his present proceedings. The fishery reserves are now a dead letter; that question is now pending before the law officers of the Crown.—The hon. Speaker next alluded to the occurrences in Sir Charles Fitz Roy's time, and declared it as his decided opinion that the most likely way to benefit the Colony is to address the Government to use their influence with the Proprietors in behalf of the tenantry. Before he sat down he must say a few words on the nature of the petitions presented to this House, and the system adopted in getting them up. He believed some of the hon. members near him could, if they pleased, give effective evidence on the latter head, for he knew application had been made to a certain person in Prince County to get up a petition, but who refused. The Rustico petition had broken down, but another had been got up by a disappointed candidate, who had the audacity to recommend that this Colony should be annexed to that of Nova Scotia. He also very much doubted the genuineness of some of the signatures thereto attached; and not one of them complained of any real grievance, but simply that they could not pay their rents. He would not deny that at one time he was an advocate for escheat; and had not been for the hon. member for King's County, (Mr. Cooper) fourteen townships could then have been escheated. At that

period a consultation took place between the hon. member and myself; but finding him so dissatisfied, and so unreasonable in his opinions, from that time to this we have been in variance in our political arguments. In many places, where precedents are introduced to our notice, as having occurred, if they possessed the blessing of having such good leases as we have, he thought they would not want a change. Was it to be wondered at, that many tenants in this Colony could not pay their rents? They were not satisfied with less than one hundred Acres, for the whole of which they had to pay rent—a few acres of which only had they cleared. Thus it was their own imprudence that had brought them into this dilemma. He would conclude by expressing a hope that the proprietors will agree to our solicitations and thus do away with the long, but useless, agitation of the Colony.

Mr. D. MACLEAN said he had not intended to say any thing further on the subject; but being called on by the hon. the Speaker, he deemed a reply necessary, though he did not intend to follow him through his lax, tautological harangue, that resembled the two ends of an epic poem, a beginning and end, but no middle. He (Mr. Maclean) seemed to be a sort of "raw-head and bloody-boots stumbling-block" in the path of the honourable Speaker, and the hon. member of Charlottetown, and when the latter gentleman next alludes to him, (Mr. Maclean) he would thank him to state facts, and not draw upon his lively imagination. The hon. the Speaker has been criticising the New London Petition; and he has discovered a mare's nest. He has out of 300 or 400 names discovered 4 or 5 that he considered as objectionable; one of whom he informs us is an ungrateful pauper; another was not more than 16 years of age; and so far was Donald Sutherland's name from being affixed without his consent, that he had authorised a friend to sign his name, as he could not be present at the meeting. We have been told that the law would be enforced, and had heard a few unmeaning words about "rebellion, blood and cannon." He would warn them to take care how they brought the military into collision with the people, in an effort to maintain un equitable laws. The authorities of this Colony can order blood to be drawn; but in the present state of North America, the staunching of that blood may be beyond their control; for the echoes of the first volley would hardly die away in P. E. Island till they would roll along the parallel of forty-five degrees to the valley of the Mississippi, and bear with them the exaggerated tidings that the revolution had commenced which would exterminate British rule in America; and probably be followed by the outbreak on the Canadian frontier, the hunters' lodges. Gentlemen might laugh; but for his part he could not perceive any cause for mirth in the fact that an unprincipled horde of 50,000 armed men is sworn by deep and deadly oaths to carry fire and sword into a sister province. Is it a laughable matter that the Senate of the United States has passed a bill in Congress to take possession of the British territory of Oregon, and that if it passes the other branch of the Legislature, there must be war? He would not hazard an opinion respecting the resolutions before the House, having only once heard them read over, but he thought that, with a few amendments important to the tenant, but unimportant to the land claimant, the House might pass them unanimously.

Mr. RAE could not but marvel at the hon. the Speaker's assertion, that 22 Townships might have been escheated, had it not been for the opposition of the hon. member for King's County (Mr. Cooper). Why not have thrown him overboard? From this it appeared that at that time this Escheat question, now so obnoxious, had been a popular measure. The hon. member, Mr. Cooper, might have been rash, but he wanted it to go to the right parties. But he (Mr. Rae) supposed it was to be left to the Executive to see it as they pleased; he could but feel gratified, and from so undoubted an authority, that "the extreme" — "the wild" — "the snaky measure" — had not always been thought so ridiculous as many hon. members were now pleased to designate Escheat. Mr. Hume asked if anything less than Escheat would satisfy the people; and now, with a great increase of distress, nothing preferable to simply asking the proprietors to take their rent in produce can be thought of! Verily, verily, we shall be degraded in the eyes of others. And few of our hon. selves are pointed at because we advocate the cause of the people; but should it happen that none such are left, then will the people speak in a different way; a lory power over 100,000 acres does not give a possessor a right to rule over us altogether; it will not do to make lords of some and slaves of others. He (Mr. Rae) knew full many changes detrimental to the interests of this Colony had taken place at home; and it may not be wise to push extreme measures. We must be satisfied with accepting a compromise if we can obtain it, for the people are inclined to do any thing to obtain redress of their undisputed grievances. For his (Mr. Rae's) part, he did not expect to derive much benefit from the application, if adopted; the proprietors may consent to take produce for two or three years; and that would be the extent of the benefit of our present legislation.

Mr. DOUSE said, we are continually listening to many imputations made by some hon. members in this House about the ill-treatment of Proprietors to their tenantry, but he believed them to be as unjust as they were unfounded. Proprietors of property in this Island may be desirous of serving their tenantry, but in consequence of the tenant's listening to the ill advice of others, they are actually prevented from showing their sincerity towards them. He would avail himself of the present opportunity of putting such imputations to the test, and called upon the hon. members, Mr. Cooper and Mr. Rae, in their places, and who had been the principals in calling the attention of the House to the State of the Colony, and he would say the most active in pronouncing their indignation, to come forward manfully on the floor of that House, and point out who the proprietors of land in this Island were that had been guilty of the enormities stated by them. He would wish to hear something like a discrimination, if such there be. (Here Mr. Douse called over a list of names—Messrs. Canard, Stewart, Worrell, Earls of Selkirk, Melville, Westmorland, Sir George Seymour and Sir Gabriel Wood, Panning, Sulivan, Todd, Conroy, Mann, Cundall, Montgomery, Rennie, Winslow, Lord James Townshend, and others, and then placed the list on the table.) He (Mr. Douse) would challenge, he would defy hon. members to fix a stigma of tyranny against any one of these in the recovery of their rents; and if he received no reply, he would say, away then with such calumny and calumniators. The hon. member, Mr. Cooper, had stated that he would even have a fixed price for produce. How was this to be done otherwise than by allowing a fair market price at the time of payment? Every thing appears to be so ambiguously expressed, that it cannot be understood; in fact, it was tiresome to any one who valued his time, and who had the good of the Colony at heart, to be obliged to sit and listen to such statements. He would, in short, be sorry, even were it possible, to be a tenant under either of the agitators, and he more than doubted whether they would grant terms more favourable, and accept of payments less liberal, than the present land owners.— However, he would like to hear a reply from the hon. members he had called upon, as they might throw out some new light upon the subject, which may have a more favourable tendency; but it appeared to him that their whole aim, as the hon. member Mr. Yeo, expressed it "was to kick up a row in the country, and to see their long, but injurious speeches in the newspapers." He would support the resolution to address the proprietors, as being most likely to conduce to the benefit of the Colony.

Mr. COOPER observed, so many questions had been put, and so many allusions made about him, that he did not know which to take up first, but though he must give the preference to escheat. He nevertheless denied the assertion of the hon. Speaker, that there were not more than fourteen townships that could have been escheated; and he (Mr. Cooper) at that period, took his stand upon the principle that the whole Island was equally liable to be escheated. (Here the hon. member went into an explanation of his conduct at the time alluded to by the hon. Speaker.) Hon. members should act consistently, and not attempt to cry down a measure without right or reason on their side. The original grants seemed to be lost sight of altogether; he need not say what they were; it was well known to the House and to the country that the proprietors had not fulfilled the conditions of their grants, and thus was the land as justly entitled to be escheated now as ever it was. The fact of the tenantry's be-

ing in arrears of rent is laid to my charge. He too must put a question: were the tenants not so circumstanced before he (Mr. Cooper) took an active part in the politics of the country. The laughter creating letter must not be forgotten; the circumstance that caused him to pen that letter was the information brought to him by several persons, that the then Governor had used expressions contained in it. But why rake up old matters? Is it consistent with that which hon. members so continually condemn? The despatches we have received are of so contradictory a nature, that he would most emphatically again declare that we are as equally entitled to escheat as ever we were.

The hon. the SPEAKER said the hon. member for Prince County (Mr. Rae) had asked why the escheat of the twenty-two townships had not taken place at the time he (the Speaker) had alluded to previously; it was simply this—a bill was passed, in which an informality existed; the then Governor wrote home for instructions; in the meantime agitation was going on, and in consequence, the home government thought it would not be safe to trust the people. The then House of Assembly made out a very strong case, but the hon. member for King's County (Mr. Cooper) would not be satisfied with an iota less than the abrogation of the whole of the leases, &c. The hon. member would in addition have us believe it would have been a greater boon had the proprietors brought out settlers at that time. Why, land could be got for a song then! Some had fallen into the hands of the proprietors at three farthings per acre; and thus there could not have been much difficulty in obtaining free land, by those who wished to possess it. The only reason he, the Speaker, had for alluding to escheat, was to prove that the then House of Assembly performed their duty.

Mr. RAE said, he considered himself to be one of those called upon by the hon. member for Belfast, (Mr. Douse), and he would ask, was selling land with a bad title, or letting it at 1s. 6d., and 2s. per acre, a proof of the well disposed feelings of the proprietors? The hon. member, and other hon. members, could say, prove the cruelty; yet if the proprietors were so kind and so well disposed, why had the hon. member so zealously opposed his (Mr. Rae's) motion to examine evidence? This looked as if the House were afraid that a something may come out that would not bear the light; but, was it not that it would be committing a breach of confidence, he would take up the gauntlet thrown by the hon. member for Belfast. He (Mr. Rae) could some tales unfold—if he was at liberty so to do—that would exhibit striking facts of the treatment of this worthy set of individuals. A land agent's book was a document he, of all things, would like to peep into; he thought the perusal might throw a light upon certain suspicions entertained by hon. members. He wondered if they adopted the system of book-keeping by single or double entry? Lord Selkirk was not so bad as some that might be mentioned; he had attempted something for the benefit of his tenantry. Mr. Rae thought the hon. member's, Mr. Cooper's, resolutions should be amended, by confining it only to the rights given us in the various despatches received from the home government.

Mr. COLES reminded hon. members they were travelling a long way from the question; he thought a kind of promise had been held out that the old, and now become unpopular grievances were to be suspended in this matter; but it appeared to be as if as ever; why said the hon. member, is this stale and useless question of escheat to be so continually raked up, when the injury it has done to the Colony is so well known? If we obtained the consent of the proprietors to take produce in lieu of cash for their rents, it would be of greater benefit than any measure of Escheat. What did hon. members, the advocates of a reinvestment of the land in the Crown, expect, if they accomplished so great a desideratum? In their opinion, would not the Crown dispose of it as they did of the other property, at as much as could be obtained for it? He (Mr. Coles) did not approve of fixing the price to be paid; when prices rated high—as he hoped to see them, the tenantry would be dissatisfied; nor could he approve of any attempt to lower the rent, in as much as he thought it would strangle the good effect altogether; a fair measure in his (Mr. Coles) view would be the market price of Charlottetown.

Hon. Mr. PALMER. The hon. member for Prince County [Mr. Rae] had said, he did not wish to go into those old unfortunate matters; he (Mr. P.) was sorry to see the hon. member depart from the question, which caused others to follow in his steps. There was nothing new in his arguments; the hon. member had alluded to his Excellency, as being placed in a difficult position; there was nothing in that quarter; we need not fear any comment would be made on our proceedings by his Excellency. He, Mr. Palmer, was pleased to see symptoms of shame—as he thought—in some hon. members, in having so unsparingly and unjustly censured that exalted representative of Majesty. [The hon. member then went into the old threadbare question of Escheat, and read some printed extracts to the House.] If through the good offices of his Excellency we obtain the weight also of the Home Government, to support our address to the proprietors, we shall be in a by-far more likely situation of effecting a permanent good for the Colony, than any of those visionary schemes would ever have procured. The hon. member for Queen's County, [Mr. D. Maclean] he, Mr. Palmer, would not attempt to follow, in his history of revolutions; he would satisfy himself by simply stating to the House that he [the hon. member] wished to see the same effect by the same cause take place in this colony; his speeches conveyed that meaning, and fully justified him, Mr. Palmer, in making the assertion; but he thought it would be far better to go on in a constitutional way; he would do the people justice, by declaring them to be blameless; it is wholly the fault of the agitators; the complaints and dissatisfaction evinced in the Colony lie at the door of those who continue the ferment of the country. It was not long since that the hon. member for Queen's County [Mr. D. Maclean] would not be satisfied with anything less than the application of the axe to the root of all grievances; but, since then, the hon. member seemed inclined to confine his views within a more narrow compass. He [Mr. Palmer] without going further, would now submit his Resolutions, which were the combined ideas of the hon. the Speaker, of himself and several other hon. members, and were compiled with caution, so as to produce—if possible—unanimity in this House, and throughout the Colony. It must be an admitted fact, that former attempts have not been attended with any good result to the benefit of the people; the adoption of the resolution will have a very desirable effect, that of enlisting the home Government in our favour, through his Excellency, who will most willingly second our wishes; it will not materially interfere with the rental of the proprietors; if they will not conform, the government has power to turn round upon them in another way; former proceedings have done much harm in many respects; the home Government have felt annoyed, the Proprietors too, and in consequence extra burdens have been imposed upon the people. It is now high time that we should endeavour to retrieve our character, and the way to accomplish so desirable an object is to keep within the bounds of moderation. He (Mr. Palmer) would wish to undeceive the Tenantry; he would wish them to understand that we possess not the slightest power to abolish the agreements they themselves have voluntarily entered into. He would advise them to give up these false hopes others had caused them to entertain, and devote their attention to their Farms. He [Mr. Palmer] concluded, he would just say a word on the Petitions received by the House. No new grievance—no new matter, is therein set forth; in short, nothing is prayed for of any consequence that we have not been attempting by our legislation, to ameliorate or remove, so far as we have power or can lawfully interfere, and it is worse than unless to talk about what we cannot.

[For Resolution, see the Colonial Herald of the 25th ult.] The Hon. SPEAKER most willingly would second the resolution from which he expected much benefit would accrue. If it should happen that he, the speaker, was wrong in his anticipations, and the Proprietors would not acquiesce, then he would most willingly agree to tax their landed property; but from what is passing, there is very little doubt of a non compliance; already are the Agents meeting the Tenantry; they are advertising to accept produce in payment of rent the tenants on the property which he (the Speaker) represented were allowed to pay half in produce, but he was proud to say it was seldom that they wished to embrace the privilege, but paid the whole rent in cash? In all countries there are rich and poor; if an equality were this day to take place, to-morrow would not find it the same; the same laws are made for the whole, and we cannot, nor ought we to alter them to the benefit of one more than another. Notwithstanding that hon. members are so fond of attempting to disparage this Colony, his conviction was, that another could not be found in America, taking it all things with equal advantages, for settlement as this holds out; such was his candid opinion, and as such, was he very sanguine of seeing it turn out