

Purchase Bill under which the present Government purchased this Estate; and there is fully one half of the adult signatures to that address who repudiate the whole sentiment of the printed one; and those who read it, say that the one published in the Islander and the written one are not the same. Even the Schoolmaster of this settlement, who went with Mr. McLean through it, says the same. The signatures to it average four to each house, for they put down the names in some cases of babies on the breast. I know one man, together with his two sons, who signed it; and the eldest of the sons is only 6 years old; therefore it is easy to make up 900 others at this rate. They say they were unable to attend the late issue of his Excellency through the badness of the roads, &c., but they should have added also that a great number of them had not clothes, and also that some of them would have to be carried, as they were not able to walk, being infants. If they had gone to Government House that day, really it would be a sight worth seeing, for such a motley group never would have been there before or after.

The day that they say the Meeting was held, 12th February, 1861, was the second Tuesday in the month, being Court day at the Cross Roads, when some of the Commissioners proposed Resolutions, seconded by the Constables of the Court—the Commissioners sitting in the place behind the counter. The people of this settlement do not like the idea of assisting the Government to collect the rents for the landlords, as that part of the address seems to imply, which says: "that we are ready on any emergency with our voice and our arms to sustain your Excellency and Government, and to resist or suppress any counteracting agencies employed by self-interested agitators." This is a language which was used in the "bloody despatch." I wonder why any of the tenantry "resist" in such an emergency. However it seems they intend to fight the poor tenantry, but I suppose they will keep their powder dry till out of harm's way, as usual.

Montage, Feb. 21, 1861.

FOR THE EXAMINER.

EXTRAORDINARY DECISION.

In the Police Court last week a person was charged before his Worship the Mayor with embezzlement. The complaint upon oath stated that the accused was his clerk, which was admitted, that fact having been previously also sworn to by the accused. The complainant then produced the ash book, wherein it appeared, in the handwriting of the accused, that false entries had been made by him, in the short space of three weeks, amounting to upwards of forty five pounds. The complainant then proposed to proceed with the investigation, and said he had abundant proof of other acts of embezzlement also, but was stopped by the Recorder, who thought proper to assert that the accused was not a clerk of the complainant, but a partner; and that the case must be dismissed, which it was accordingly. By what authority did the Recorder raise the objection to a charge which had not become a question? The clerkship was admitted, and had been sworn to by both parties; the accused did not set up a claim of partnership in his defence; that luminous idea and dogmatical conclusion was the offspring of the Recorder's own fertile brain, apparently for no other purpose than that of obscuring, or blinking, or getting rid of the charge, altogether reckless of any ulterior consequences; because, if the Recorder's assertion of partnership were established, and decisive, and without appeal, any person or tradesman upon application for a warrant of arrest at the Police Court, against a dishonest clerk, might be involved in utter and irrevocable ruin. If the Chief Magistrate of the City of Charlottesville cannot act without a legal opinion, it is surely a duty incumbent upon the citizens to appoint a Recorder, who is not absolutely superannuated, in order to prevent any Midas-like mockery, evasion and trick, in the administration of public justice.

FOR THE EXAMINER.

TO LINCOLN.

L'Inconnu! my funny friend,
On your narrow bones, come bend,
Pardon asking for the thrust
You aim to lay me in the dust;
One you wrong'd first in thy thought
Changing next with malice fraught,
Hid with a pen of steel,
Thus shatter, as you kneel,
L'Inconnu! up! live and learn
What has moved your anger stern
Nor to meet for public gaze,
Nor to set his checks a blaze,
Clearest settings by the way,
Not inceded as a lay,
But in memorandum style,
Put in pencil for a while.
Hastily my thoughts were penn'd,
But were copied by a friend,
Thus unfinish'd, L'Inconnu,
My poor lines have met your view,
As not dreaming but in jest;
For permission, I was press'd;
Laughingly, I gave the leave
That the public should receive.
Yet in truth I was surpris'd,
When I got it unrevic'd,
Coming from the printer's hand,
Soon as I had left the land.
But when you rebuke age a
I pray be mindful of your strain.
Let its measures e'en flow
Ere your hints at others throw.

March 4, 1861.

B*****

Provincial Parliament.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

TUESDAY, March 5th.

The following Special Committees were appointed:—
Committee on Education.—Hons. Messrs. Swaby, Johnson and Simpson.

On Agriculture.—Hons. Messrs. Ramsay, Bagnall and Goff.
On Paupers.—Hons. Messrs. Hutchinson, MacLaren and Anderson.
On Miscellaneous Subjects.—Hons. Messrs. Swaby, Hutchinson and Anderson.

The following Petitions were presented to the House, and the same were received and read:—
By Hon. Mr. Anderson, a Petition of divers inhabitants of Prince County, praying for a grant to enable them to purchase a team, &c. for the use of the Indians.

By Hon. Dr. Johnson, a Petition of Widow Berrigan, in destitute circumstances, praying relief.
By Hon. Dr. Johnson, a Petition of Thomas Daly, in indigent circumstances, praying relief.

The foregoing Petitions were referred to the Special Committee appointed to report on all Petitions relating to Paupers.

By Hon. Col. Swaby, a petition of inhabitants of Grandville Settlement, Lat 21, praying for the establishment of a Post Office.

Ordered, that the said Petition be referred to the Special Committee appointed to report on all Petitions relating to miscellaneous subjects.

Hon. Mr. Ramsay obtained leave to absent himself for one week.

WEDNESDAY, March 6th.

Hons. Messrs. Swaby, Simpson and Johnson were appointed a Committee to join a Committee appointed by the House of Assembly to keep up a good correspondence between the two Branches of the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. Simpson, by command, laid on the Table the Colonial Treasurer's Accounts for the past year.

Hon. Col. Swaby presented a Petition of Hugh Logan, late Jailor of Georgetown, praying for remuneration for past services. Referred to the Special Committee on miscellaneous subjects.

Hon. the President informed the House that he had received a communication from His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, acquainting him that the Hon. Mr. Macintyre had resigned his seat as a member of this House; and that His Excellency had been pleased to accept the same.

THURSDAY, March 7th.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.—DESPATCHES.

The Hon. Mr. Palmer, a member of Her Majesty's Executive Council, by command of His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, laid before the House copies of the following Despatches, which were ordered to be laid on the Table.

1. Despatch of the 18th January, 1860, transmitting release of statistics.

No. 23, 16th June, 1860, on the subject of the Land Commission, and naming three Commissioners.

No. 25, June, 1860, sanctioning the Postal Act, No. 34, August 7th, 1860, regarding Volunteer Corps.

No. 38, October 4th, 1860, on the subject of site for Hospital.

Circular, 22nd October, 1860, on the subject of the removal of beacons.

No. 45, 2nd January, 1861, on the subject of Acts of a local nature, submitted for Her Majesty's approval.

Circular, 4th August, 1860, on the subject of the Census.

Circular, 1st Feb., 1861, on the subject of the great Exhibition of 1862.

January 11th, 1861, Letter from the Commissioners on the subject of delaying their Award.

Hon. Mr. Palmer also laid before the House the Public Accounts for the past year, as arranged and classified by the Auditors.

FRIDAY, March 8th.

The following Petitions were presented to the House and the same were received and read:—
By Hon. Mr. MacLaren, a Petition of Edward Wilson, in indigent circumstances, praying relief.

By Hon. Dr. Johnson, a Petition of John Vally, in destitute circumstances, praying relief.

By Hon. Mr. Walker, a Petition of James Dingwell, Bay Fortune, praying relief.

All referred to the Special Committee appointed to report on all Petitions relating to Paupers.

Message from the House of Assembly.—
A message from the House of Assembly by the Hon. Mr. Longworth, with a Bill relating to Grand and Petit Jurors, to which the House of Assembly desire the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

The said Bill was received and read.

SATURDAY, March 9th.

On motion, the House went into Committee of the whole upon a Bill intitled "An Act to consolidate and amend the Act relating to Grand and Petit Jurors." Second reading.

Hon. Dr. Johnson in the Chair.

On motion of Hon. Col. Swaby, the third clause was amended by adding "Commissioners of Public Lands" to the list of persons exempted from liability to serve as Jurors.

On the fifth clause being read—
Hon. Col. SWABY said—I am of opinion that great benefit would result from having the country divided into sections, and having a certain number of jurors chosen from each section.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—A measure of that nature might be of some benefit, but in selecting jurors very much depends on the discretion and impartiality of the sheriff.

After some further discussion the clause was agreed to.

On the nineteenth clause, relating to freemen being exempt from serving as jurors, being read—
Hon. Mr. PALMER said—This clause exempts a very large, respectable and intelligent class of citizens from serving as jurors. I would, therefore, suggest that it should be left optional with them whether they would serve or not.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—Those men are liable to be called upon at all hours, by night and by day, to serve in the capacity of freemen; and, therefore, I am of opinion that they should not be chosen as jurors. Besides, I consider that it would be derogatory to the dignity of the Court to leave it to their own inclination whether they would serve or not.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—I cannot see that it would be in the least derogatory to the Court to leave it optional; and we know that many of our best and most intelligent men are chosen for fire companies.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—There is another thing which your Honors should consider. I have heard persons complaining that the majority of jurors are taken from Charlottesville, and if you enlarge your field from which to select jurors the objection will be increased.

Hon. Mr. PALMER—His Honor should bear in mind that it is not an increase of numbers, but an increase of intelligence that is required. There is no danger of one intelligent man being taken from Charlottesville, but there is a probability of increased intelligence.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON—In my opinion the Petit Jury is the most important; and it ought to consist of men of education and intelligence, and would not put any man on a Petit Jury who had not some knowledge of accounts.

Hon. the PRESIDENT—I thought that all the farmers had a knowledge of accounts.

Hon. Mr. SIMPSON—Not one in twenty of the common farmers have any knowledge of accounts.

Hon. Col. SWABY—Grand Jurors, in this country, are not chosen as they should be. In England Grand Jurors are selected from among the Magistrates. The benefit resulting from this course is, that they are a better informed class of men; and if we want to have an intelligent jury we should take the Magistrates.

Hon. Mr. BARNALL—I am of opinion that if it is left optional with freemen to claim exemption, the time of making such claim should be specified, otherwise 20 men might claim exemption in Charlottesville, and it would affect the whole country.

Hon. Mr. Palmer moved that the following amendment be adopted:—
"Every member of the several Charlottesville Fire Engine Companies shall also be exempt from serving as a Grand or Petit Juror, provided such member shall, on being duly summoned, or within twenty-four hours afterwards, signify to the officer by whom he shall be summoned his desire to claim such exemption."

The question of concurrence having been put thereon, the House divided:—
Contents.—Hon. Mr. Palmer, Hon. Mr. Simpson, Hon. Mr. MacLaren, Hon. Mr. Hutchinson—4.
Non-Contents.—Hon. the President, Hon. Col. Swaby, Hon. Mr. Barnall—3.

On motion, the House was then resumed, and the Chairman reported that the Committee had gone through the Bill and made certain amendments.

MONDAY, March 11th.

A message from the House of Assembly by the Hon. Mr. Haviland, with the following Bills, to which they desire the concurrence of the Legislative Council, viz:—
A Bill intitled "An Act for taking the Census."
A Bill intitled "An Act for the protection of the Alewives fisheries."

The said Bills were read a first time.

The following Petitions were presented to the House by Hon. Mr. Hutchinson—
A Petition of Ninian Patterson, praying relief on account of having been shipwrecked, and losing all his effects. Referred to the Special Committee appointed to report on miscellaneous subjects.

A Petition of James McCarron, of Charlottesville, a man aged 82, with a wife aged 74 years, unable to support themselves, and praying relief. Referred to the Special Committee appointed to report on all petitions relating to paupers.

Adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

TUESDAY, March 12th.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Simpson, the House went into Committee on the Bill intitled "An Act for the protection of the Alewives fisheries." His Honor Mr. Simpson in the Chair.

On the ninth clause, relating to the mode of recovering fines, being read—
Hon. the PRESIDENT said—I am of opinion that it would be better to make the several clauses in the Act harmonize. In this clause the fine imposed is to be recovered before one Justice of the Peace; and in another clause it is said that all fines imposed by this Act shall be recovered before two Justices of the Peace. Why should we have two tribunals to recover fines imposed by the same Act? I would, therefore, suggest the propriety of amending this clause by making all fines recoverable before two Justices of the Peace. Justices of the Peace in this country cannot, at all times, have access to gentlemen of the long robe for advice. I would, therefore, like to see our laws made so plain that the "wayfaring man, though a fool, would not err therein."

Hon. Mr. PALMER—There is evidently a confliction in the two last clauses which have been read. I would like to see them framed so as to appear harmonious.

On motion of His Honor the President the clause was amended by substituting the words "all fines and penalties shall be recoverable before two Justices of the Peace."

The succeeding clauses, on being read, were agreed to without any amendment.

On motion, the President took the Chair, and the Chairman reported that the Committee had gone through the Bill, and made certain amendments.

On motion, the House went into Committee on a Bill, intitled "An Act for taking the Census of Prince Edward Island."—Hon. Dr. Johnson in the Chair.

On the fourth clause relating to the recovery of fines being read—
Hon. the PRESIDENT said—He could not understand why a fine of ten pounds should be recoverable in the Supreme Court, when Justices of the Peace have jurisdiction to the extent of twenty pounds.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Simpson, the clause was amended by striking out the words "Her Majesty's Supreme Court," and inserting the words "any two Justices of the Peace, or Commissioners of Small Debts."

The clause, as amended, was then agreed to.

Several unimportant amendments were made to the schedule referred to in this Act, which we do not consider it necessary to notice here; after which—
On motion, the President took the Chair, and the Chairman reported that the Committee had gone through the Bill and made certain amendments.

A message from the House of Assembly, by Hon. Mr. Haviland, with a Bill, intitled "An Act to exempt certain Bills of Exchange, Promissory Notes, Contracts and Agreements, from the operation of the Laws relating to usury," to which they desire the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

The following Petitions were presented to the House, and the same were received and read:—
By Hon. Mr. Simpson, a Petition of the Right Rev. Peter MacIntyre, Roman Catholic Bishop of Charlottesville, praying for an Act of Incorporation for the purpose of referring to a Special Committee to report thereon by Bill or otherwise.

Hons. Messrs. Simpson, Walker and Palmer.

By Hon. Mr. Palmer, a Petition of William C. Bourke, praying for remuneration for running a Steam Boat on the Hillsborough River.

Referred to the Special Committee appointed to report on all Petitions relating to miscellaneous subjects. His Honor, in presenting this Petition, remarked that it was an undertaking which the country ought to support; and he would heartily encourage any measure which the House of Assembly might desire to encourage the enterprise.

By Hon. Mr. Palmer, a Petition of Pnlay Campbell, Teacher, praying for remuneration for six months' services. Referred to the Special Committee appointed to report on all Petitions relating to Education.

By Hon. Dr. Johnson, a Petition of Duncan MacPhail, in destitute circumstances, praying relief; also—
A Petition of Margaret Morrison, Lat 30, praying relief. Ordered, that the two last preceding Petitions be referred to the Special Committee appointed to report on all Petitions relating to Paupers.

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

(Continued from our last)

Hon. Mr. COLES—The application then was made to one of the officers of the Government. Besides this case, one of the counsel for the tenantry stated publicly here that the officers were closed against them, while the Counsel for the proprietors had statistics and everything at their disposal. No one figure was placed in Mr. Thompson's hands by the Government. He came to me on the evening after Mr. Halliburton's address was delivered, and asked if I could do anything to assist him, saying that unless statistics were furnished him, he would be unable to meet all the arguments of his opponent. And not only were documents withheld, but during the progress of the meeting members of the Government and their officials made statements adverse to the interests of the people. Nearly the only instance of sympathy shown for the tenantry on the part of those connected with the present administration, was the remark of a certain member of the Government, to the effect that if the people were to be privileged to pay nothing for the land, they would prefer to pay it by instalments. I will now advert to the next paragraph of the Speech, which ought to be considered in connection with the sixth. It states that the Colonial Minister did not anticipate that the House of Assembly would proceed to pass an Act to give effect to the award of the Commissioners antecedent to the making of that award, that such legislation appears to him to be premature, and therefore he does not consider it advisable at present to submit this Act for Her Majesty's assent. Now, if His Excellency has taken a true extract from the despatch it appears very extraordinary that the Duke did not entertain this opinion when he penned the despatch of the 16th of June, commanding the information that the Commission was appointed; for that he was aware of the passing of the Act is evident from this passage in the despatch, which says:—

"In the second Despatch you inform me that a short Act has since passed through both Houses, giving effect to the foregoing resolution. I cannot do otherwise than express my sense of the promptitude and completeness with which the House of Assembly has thus given its support to the plan devised, in the hope of putting an end to the differences which have prevailed in Prince Edward Island."

He here acknowledges the promptitude and completeness with which the House of Assembly acted, and now we are told that such legislation is premature. In a former despatch he stated that as far as possible it was necessary that the Legislature should concur in any measures which might be required to give validity to the decision of the Commissioners; and I presume that on account of this statement, the Act was passed which he does not consider advisable to submit for the Royal assent. One would have thought that the lawyers on the other side of the House would have been competent to put a proper construction upon a despatch, but here the Duke trips them up a bit, and tells them that their legislation was premature. It appears, however, that His Grace was pleased with the passing of the Act, when we see the despatch of the 16th of June, and how are we to account for the change in his views? The only inference which can be drawn in the case, is that he has been influenced in withholding the assent by the petition forwarded by certain proprietors to the Colonial Office. Had the Act been sent home at the proper time, I believe it would have received the Royal assent. It was possible to have had it prepared and forwarded in the month of May, but I understand it was not sent to England until the month of August, and consequently could not be received by the Duke of Newcastle until after his return from his visit with the Princes of Wales to the Colonies. Had the Government been anxious that the Bill should have obtained the Royal assent, they would doubtless have forwarded it in good time; but everything has been done to favor the proprietors. They gained time to petition after the sitting of the Commission, and now the assent is withheld. If the decision of the Commissioners is unfavorable to the proprietors the assent will never be required; and the Act not being sent home earlier may prove the ruin of the tenantry. When a Bill is laid past in this manner in the Colonial Office, it is generally considered to be completely set aside. It is my firm belief that Sir Samuel Cunard knew when this proprietary party was in power, that this was the time to have a settlement of this question; and that, no doubt, was the reason he advised that the award should be binding, for otherwise the tenantry would not submit to it—there might as well be an arbitration without a bond. He knew that there was nothing to fear if the measure or award pleased the Government; and that this view is correct appears from the circumstances that they did not forward the Act to the Colonial Office earlier in the summer, but gave the proprietors time after the sitting of the Commission to petition against it. If the Commissioners are the gentlemen I take them to be, they will at once throw up their commissions, for why should they continue their investigation when there is no law to render their decision binding? One clause in the Act reads thus:—Be it therefore enacted by the Lieutenant Governor, Council and Assembly, that the report or award, or one part thereof to be made by the Commissioners, &c. This shows, I think, that if the Commissioners could not give in a whole award they should make a partial report. This they ought to have done. It would have given the people some idea of the result of the Commission, and tended to allay the excitement in the country. The tenantry have made great exertions to pay their year's rent according to the recommendation of the Commissioners, but the proprietors in most cases have not attended to their part of the recommendation. I know several instances of persons who, with considerable effort, had made out to pay their rents as recommended, and a few days after they were

issued from the Attorney General's office, who, as he is an officer of the Government, ought not to have acted contrary to the recommendation of the Royal Commissioners.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—He issued no writs against tenants on any estate the proprietor of which had agreed to the Commission.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—The hon. member is mistaken. The proprietor himself for whom the writs were issued admitted that he had agreed to the Commission. If this is all the Commission is to do—by the means of causing writs to be issued and distrains made, what will be the ultimate result? I would ask the hon. member for Georgetown, how many writs have been issued from the office in which he is a partner since the closing of the Commissioners' Court? And I have heard also that another legal gentleman, a member of the Government, has been engaged in a prosecution against a tenant. I have in my possession a letter which states that a tenant was put in for £3 or £4 expense in a case about land, and had never received any notice that he was required to pay. A poor widow who was prosecuted for rent, and came to make her case known to the Commissioners, at a time when she was able to receive only a very short hearing, has since been further opposed. In another case the bill of costs entered the house of a person who was dying—and did die before he left the place—and seized the little property which the poor man possessed, and so disgusted were the people in the neighbourhood that they would not purchase at the sale.

Now, Sir, though it may be considered a stretch of legislation, I would like to see an Act should be passed to prevent any such proceedings pending the award of the Commission. I received a letter from one of the Commissioners, stating that it will be late in the summer before their decision can be given, and as an act will probably be required to be passed next Session to give it effect, before that can receive the Royal assent and the award become binding upon the parties, nearly two years will elapse. Something then should be done by the Legislature in the mean time to prevent distrains for arrears of rents. This would only be giving effect to what the Commissioners recommended when they closed their Court in Charlottesville. It has been said that he who fails to do his duty is equally guilty with the person who violates law. If the present "Col. fearing Government" have failed to send home the Act referred to in time, they are much to blame. The House rose on the 5th of May; there was not sufficient time to have it copied and forwarded by the 14th of the same month; but they neglected to do so, and are therefore chargeable with the consequences to the tenantry which may ensue. I might have referred to some other points, but as the House is restricted to time, and my friend on my right (Mr. Whelan) has, I believe, a resolution to propose, I will conclude for the present.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to take part in this discussion to-day for private reasons, but I cannot suffer this tirade to pass without a remark or two. The hon. leader of the Opposition has accused persons of the legal profession connected with the Government of engaging in prosecutions for rent since the rising of the Commission, who recommended that no distrains be made for arrears pending the giving in of their award. Does he think that a professional man, whatever position he may occupy, can act contrary to the instructions of his client? He would be most extraordinary if he was to raise his voice to his client and say, I will not follow your directions, though in the best of my ability. It shows weakness on the part of the hon. member to lay a charge against a member of the Government for issuing a writ of assize against the directions of his client. I received instructions to proceed in a certain case against a person in arrears of rent, before the sitting of the Commissioners' Court, afterwards having received a letter from the individual saying that the proprietor had not a good title, and stating other objections to paying the amount, I was bound by my instructions to issue a writ. I do not purpose at present to reply to the assertions of the hon. member, but there is another point to which I may advert. He made a statement to the effect that not a single member of the Government came forward to advocate the cause of the tenantry. Now if an individual was desirous to have his case ably advocated, would he be likely to retain the person best acquainted with his peculiar nature? As Mr. Hensley is a gentleman well acquainted with the case of the tenantry, and because he is as able as any lawyer in the Colony, not contented with the Government, but was appointed as one of the counsel on their behalf. Mr. Thompson, though a young man, was known to be perhaps as able an advocate as is to be found in the Lower Provinces; he was therefore retained to be Mr. Hensley's coadjutor. The Government having thus prepared able counsel, thought it better to leave the case in their hands. The hon. member referred to some of those belonging to the Government, giving evidence before the Commission, against the tenantry, or in favour of the proprietors. If they did so in a case where their private interests were concerned, how can their conduct be censurable? But one distinguished member of the Government offered occasional remarks at different times before the Court, and watched the proceedings from the first nearly to the last. I myself, though an obscure member of the Government, also came before the Commission.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—You did more harm than any person who appeared before them.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—This is the first time I have heard so; the truth, however, respecting my statements will be known when they appear in print. I did not go the length of some individuals on the questions of Ecclesiastical and Quit Rents, but I based my arguments on the resolutions and statements of the Government as they appeared before the Commission, and made statements at length in favour of the tenantry. The hon. leader of the Opposition also stated that delegates applied to the Government for information, and never received an answer. Mr. Benjamin Davies came to me, desiring to be furnished with a statement of the number of papers in the Colony, and the amount of oatmeal distributed one or two years by the Government. I went immediately to the Clerk of the Council and directed him to supply the information; and I have good authority for stating that it was done. Reference was made to statistics being withheld from Mr. Thompson, while Mr. Halliburton had everything put to his hand. Mr. Halliburton used his statistics chiefly from the census returns of the Island, which were also in the hands of Mr. Thompson; but as he had to meet Mr. Halliburton's statements in reply, and had not then time to prepare them, to complain that he had not the means was the only way he could easily get over the matter. The hon. member, because he found in a clause of the Act referring to the giving of the award of the Commission the words, "one part thereof," argued that if they could not have given in the whole award they should have given a partial report. These words are merely a technical expression, and are not intended to convey any such meaning as he put upon them. I thought he was jesting until he began to back up his position by arguments. I did not intend to say so much at this time; I only rose to show that a person bound by a solemn oath could not neglect the instructions of his client, though connected with the Government.

Hon. Mr. YEO.—I wonder if the hon. member, Mr. Coles, thinks he is doing any good to the country by the course which he is pursuing. He makes a cry about this Act not passing at Home. I knew that it would never pass. This agitation which is kept up is ruining the country. Ireland some years ago was nearly ruined the same way, but a great change has come over that country lately, and the people now I believe are beginning to do well. If it were not for a few persons who keep up agitation, the people here would live very contentedly. It is a true saying that one scabby sheep spoils a flock. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. COLES.—I do not wonder that the hon. member from Port Hill comes forward to support the cause he does. But what information is this he has given us? He states that he knew the Act would never pass at home. Here then is a member of the Government which passed this Bill saying that it could never receive the Royal assent. Whether he is the scabby sheep in the flock or not, I cannot tell, but there is certainly strange conduct somewhere. The hon. member for West Kive has attempted to make a defence. He says he came before the Commissioners, and no doubt he did, yet it was difficult to tell whether he was in favour of the tenants or proprietors. He mentioned the circumstances of some individuals who are freasholders, but said little respecting the condition of the tenantry. When the question was put to him by one of the Commissioners as a member of the Government, and a member of the Legislature, what he thought the tenants should pay for their land, he said 20 years' purchase.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—I made no such statement. Some little alteration ensuing, the standing order was moved, and the House shortly afterwards adjourned.

Debate on the Address resumed.

Hon. Col. GRAY.—I believe the hon. leader of the Opposition had possession of the floor when the Committee rose on Saturday evening. Does he purpose to continue his speech this morning? If not, I shall claim the attention of the Committee for a short time.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—The hon. member may proceed.

Hon. Col. GRAY.—Mr. Chairman, the assent displayed on the part of the hon. leader of the Opposition is so apparent, the expressions cast upon the Government so utterly unfounded, that I cannot help feeling for his position. The Commission is indeed a sharp thorn in the hon. member's side. I repeat in the Commission is indeed a sharp thorn in the hon. member's side, Sir, I will have to trespass on the patience of the Committee while I follow certain arguments in his speech on the paragraph under consideration. So extraordinary is the position which the hon. member has assumed, that I am astonished at his hardihood. Does he for one moment imagine that any case in the Island will believe that the Government will any case soon as their wishes are acceded to by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, turn round and tear out their own vital. I speak not of my colleagues individually; they are well able to speak for themselves. They are well capable of discerning between their real and apparent interests. However, to give a true history of the case, I will venture to say that the Government will not be so easily hoodwinked by the hon. member as he would have us believe. They are well capable of discerning between their real and apparent interests. However, to give a true history of the case, I will venture to say that the Government will not be so easily hoodwinked by the hon. member as he would have us believe. They are well capable of discerning between their real and apparent interests. However, to give a true history of the case, I will venture to say that the Government will not be so easily hoodwinked by the hon. member as he would have us believe. They are well capable of discerning between their real and apparent interests.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—I never said any such words.

Hon. Col. GRAY.—These are the words, then, as nearly as I can remember. Now, Mr. Chairman and hon. members, I am sure, you can believe that? Is it credible? The hon. member next stated that the Government produced no documents by which the Commissioners could be guided. So far from this being the case, immediately on their arrival, the Colonial Secretary, by order of His Excellency, furnished the Commissioners with every document connected with the Land Commission and the public records, and he also heard the evidence on the short notice given of the sitting of the Commissioners, and dwelt much upon the non-appearance of the Royal Gazette. He is not happy in this allusion, as the Commissioners themselves were the parties in fault, and I publicly commented upon it to them at the time. Respecting the Gazette, the issue of the Gazette was delayed by my request, but Mr. Chairman, I was desirous to insert a notice of their true sitting in the three Counties. The hon. member asked what did the Government do? and observed that they merely put into the hands of the Commissioners the Act of the Legislature and the resolutions of the House. Yes, Mr. Chairman, and much more. I myself gave Mr. Thompson written orders to do as he pleased, and he was told to do as an unbridled bridle. The hon. leader of the Opposition then alluded to a declaration of Mr. Hensley, stating that the Government had no objection to the tenantry bringing forward what evidence they pleased; and then the hon. member asked "What had the Government to do with it?" Was not this right? When immediately after, he turned round and accused the Government of not doing anything, he next referred to Mr. Cooper's address, and an observation made by the Colonial Secretary. I was present at the time, and considered the Colonial Secretary was justified in pointing out where Mr. Cooper was in error. But the hon. member dwelt upon the fact of the Colonial Secretary having a volume of the Journals of the House of Assembly in his possession. I was present at the time, and the Colonial Secretary, in allusion to Mr. Cooper's error, stated it could be proven by the Journals of the House. One of the Commissioners asked, "are these Journals here?" The Colonial Secretary replied, "that particular Vol. to which I allude is now at my house; I will send for it, but there will be a little delay in its doing so." Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know, hon. member who might not in like manner have had the book at his house. The Colonial Secretary is one of a Committee of three for revising and reprinting the Laws, and requires constant reference to the Library, and is at liberty to take any volume he pleases to his own house at all times. Of all the hon. members who are present, why does not the hon. member who would be ashamed to attack any man with respect to such trifles. The hon. member said that he was told some despatch had applied to the Government for information, and was retained.