

Mr. COOPER was in favour of shortening the credit and establishing Warehouses. The larger importers must be supposed to have means in proportion to their business transactions.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY would move that the credits be for three, six and nine months, without, and three additional with interest, thus making twelve months in all.

The Hon. the SPEAKER thought that the interest on three months was so trifling that it was not worthy the consideration of the House. He was not opposed to the Warehousing system, but feared its benefits would be experienced only in Charlottetown.

Hon. Mr. MONTGOMERY thought it unfair to curtail the period at present allowed. There were many parts of the country in which Warehouses could not be established, and which were deprived of many advantages possessed by Charlottetown.

Mr. H. HAVILAND thought that the argument adduced by the hon. member, Mr. Yeo, was of great force in favour of extending the credit to the merchant. Our isolated position during the winter months compelled him to get all his goods in the autumn. Perhaps he imported too largely, and an extended credit was but reasonable under a state of circumstances which had no analogy to those of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Mr. CLARK thought the clause had better be altered, and he would suggest that but two terms of credit be given. The Hon. the SPEAKER moved that the present credit be continued.

Hon. Mr. PALMER wished the motion deferred until the question of Warehouses should be decided. The motion was carried and progress reported.

Mr. H. Haviland presented a Bill for extending the elective principle to the Legislative Council, which was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Mooney, from the Committee to whom was referred the petition of the School Trustees of Dunstaffnage district, to examine the same and report thereon, presented the report, which was agreed to as follows:—

Your Committee to whom was referred the petition of the Trustees of Dunstaffnage School, have to report—that having carefully examined the matter of the petition, as also several persons respecting the same, they have come to the conclusion, that the said Trustees were guided by their counsel in the matter, and that they acted solely for the interest of the school district, without any pecuniary advantage to themselves, and also suffered much inconvenience and loss of time, besides being made liable for a large amount of costs in law. Your Committee would therefore recommend their case to the favourable consideration of the House, when in Committee of Supply.

In answer to Mr. MCGILL, whether he intended to take any, and what action, on the subject of the Ferry Wharf, Hon. Mr. PALMER stated that there was a petition on the table in reference to the matter, and that he had not yet signed. His own opinion was unchanged. Perhaps the best way would be to test the sense of the House in Committee, and he would move that it be made the order of the day for to-morrow.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH introduced a Bill defining the limits of the City of Charlottetown, and the jurisdiction of the Mayor's and Police Courts, and transferring to the City fathers the exclusive jurisdiction of the Small Debt Court over matters arising within the limits of the City. Bill read a first time.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN gave notice of his intention to move the House into Committee on the following day, on the subject of amending the election law, and increasing the number of members.

House adjourned.

WEDNESDAY, March 26.

Hon. Mr. Wightman, from the Committee appointed to report generally on Light Houses, presented to the House the report of the said Committee, which was referred to the whole House in Committee, and agreed to therein, and is as follows:—

Your Committee appointed to report on the subject of Light Houses, and to whom were referred various papers and petitions, with reference to Lights and Light Houses, presented to the House in the present session—having given the subject and the various matters connected therewith their best attention—have to report—that they have had under consideration two despatches, dated 6th September, 1855, and 15th January, 1856, addressed by Her Majesty's principal Secretary of State for the Colonies to the Lieut. Governor of this Island, inviting the co-operation and assistance of the local authorities, in common with those of other Colonies, in order to bring about a more efficient and economical system of management, in the erection and maintenance of Colonial Lights than that which exists at present; and also a letter dated 15th August, 1855, from the office of Privy Council for Trade, addressed to the Colonial Office, on the same subject, together with the Imperial Statute, 18th and 19th Vic., cap. 91, passed to facilitate the erection and maintenance of Colonial Light Houses.

The system contemplated by the despatch, letter and statute in question, appears to be, to raise funds payable into the Imperial Treasury, by means of tolls levied on ships which derive benefits from lights, whether they go to ports in the Colony in which the light is situated or not. These tolls are intended to be imposed by Her Majesty in Council, and made payable to the Collectors of Light Duties throughout the British Possessions, who are to pay over the amounts received by them to Her Majesty's Paymaster General, to be appropriated to the building and maintenance of the several light houses; provision is made for procuring advances for building as well as maintaining lights. Your Committee beg leave to refer to the above documents for a more detailed explanation of the proposed system.

Your Committee consider the matter as one of great importance, and one on which no hasty decision should be taken, and that it is desirable to ascertain what action the neighboring colonies are taking or propose taking in the matter, they therefore recommend that the Government open a correspondence with the Governments of Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, with a view of ascertaining the sentiments of those Governments with respect to the above proposed system. In the meantime they recommend that legislative action on the subject be suspended or deferred.

Your Committee have further to state that they have made a careful examination of the expenses arising from the maintenance of light houses, buoys and beacons for the past three years, the cost of which is shown to be £1550 3s. 9d.; the expense of sites, building of light houses and Keepers' houses amounts to £542 7s. 6d.; the further cost of lamps and lanterns for the same space of time is £691 7s. 6d.—making a total of £2792 13s. 9d.; and the receipts arising from light and anchorage dues for the same period of time appears to be £2,107 15s. 6d.—showing a balance against the Colony of £685 4s. 3d.

Your Committee have also had under consideration two petitions from the inhabitants of Tignish and North Cape, praying for the erection of a Lighthouse on the North Cape, and also on the East Point of this Island. That the erection of Lighthouses on these Capes would be essential to the general interests of the mercantile community, and would be of equal if not of greater benefit to the shipping of the neighbouring Colonies, Great Britain and the United States, than to that of this Island; and that, therefore, those countries should be called upon to contribute towards their erec-

tion and maintenance, more particularly as there does not appear to be any surplus fund at present in this Island available for the purpose. This contribution would, to some extent, be obtained, if the uniform system of co-operation, above alluded to, on the part of all the Colonies and the mother country were to be carried out.

The Committee have also considered the petition of the Keeper of Point Prim Lighthouse, as well as that of the Keeper of Panmure Island Lighthouse, praying severally for an increase of salary; but they cannot, at present, recommend the prayer of these petitions.

The Committee have likewise considered the report of the Superintendent of Public Works, showing the necessity for an alteration in the construction of the Lighthouse at Cascoque; and they recommend such improvement to be made as will afford that benefit to the public which was anticipated; they further submit that the efficiency of the light on Fish Island, Richmond Bay, be enquired into by the Government, with a view to its improvement.

Your Committee have also considered the petition of Thomas Robson, of New Brunswick, for a grant for his invention of a Fog Bell, as also the petition of certain inhabitants of Cumberland, N. S., praying the House to adopt measures in conjunction with the other British American Provinces, for the purpose of constructing Fog Bells on Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine, and a Lighthouse on the latter Cape. Although the construction of these works is set forth as being of importance to the welfare of the Island, yet your Committee cannot, at present, recommend the prayer of the said petitions.

Mr. Muirhead moved that the House do adopt the following resolution:—

Whereas the House, in the last Session, adopted the following report:—Your Committee who were appointed to report by Bill or otherwise on the petition of the inhabitants of Lot 19, praying for a Small Debt Court in their vicinity, have to report, that as the Session is now so far advanced, it is inexpedient to take up the matter this session, as they consider the Small Debt Act requires amendment, your Committee recommend that it be taken into consideration at an early day of the next session. Therefore resolved, that the said Small Debt Act be amended, so as to enable the Government to appoint additional Small Debt Courts where required.

On the question of concurrence being put on the foregoing resolution, the House divided:

For the resolution—Messrs. Muirhead, Lord, McIntosh and Whelan—4.

Against it—Messrs. McGill, Yeo, Perry, McDonald, Clark, Colonial Treasurer, Wightman, Montgomery, Laird, Munro, Dingwell, H. Haviland, Col. Secretary, Mooney, Longworth—15.

The Hon. Col. Treasurer read in his place a petition of Thomas Robson, Sackville, N. B., praying that if it shall be deemed advisable to place Fog Bells at Cape Traverse and Cape Tormentine, such may be erected on the plan invented by him. On a motion being made to receive the petition it was resolved, that as the report of the Committee on Light-houses has been adopted by the House, it is unnecessary to entertain the prayer of the said petition.

Mr. Laird presented a petition from persons styling themselves electors of P. E. Island, praying that an Act may be passed this session to make the Legislative Council elective. Petition laid on the table.

The Legislative Council sent down a Bill passed by them intitled "an Act for transferring to one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State the powers and estates vested in the principal officers of the Ordnance," which was read a first time.

A conference was then held with the Council on the Act relating to licenses for the sale of spirituous liquors.

The Act relating to the Indians of this Island was then read a second time and committed to a Committee of the whole House, when Theophilus Stewart, Esquire, one of the Indian Commissioners, was heard at the Bar of the House, in support of the claims of the Indians. A speech on the same subject delivered at the Bar of the Council Chamber, by the same gentleman, has been already given to the public—that before the House was nearly to the same effect; and it is therefore unnecessary to publish the latter.

Hon. Mr. Palmer presented a petition from certain inhabitants of Charlottetown, praying the House, for reasons therein set forth, to adhere to their previous resolution to construct a ferry wharf at the end of Prince Street; and also a petition from certain other inhabitants of the City, and others, praying for the like object. Both petitions laid on the table. Then the House adjourned.

THURSDAY, March 27.

Mr. Perry presented a petition from certain electors of P. E. Island, praying for an Act to render the Legislative Council elective. Laid on the table.

The engrossed Bill from the Council relating to the transfer of estates vested in the principal officers of Ordnance, was read a second time—committed to a committee of the whole House, and agreed to therein without amendment. The Bill was read a third time and passed.

The Bill relating to the boundaries of the city of Charlottetown and the jurisdiction of the Mayor's and Police Courts, was read a second time—committed, and agreed to with some amendments. The House then adjourned.

FERRY WHARF.

In the afternoon sitting a long discussion again arose out of a motion made by the Hon. Mr. Wightman to rescind the resolution adopted by the House on a previous day, relative to the erection of a public wharf at the end of Prince street, and recommending the House to go into Committee again on the consideration of certain petitions against the contemplated Ferry wharf. But as the principal arguments used both for and against the wharf at the place indicated, have been already fully given to the public, it is unnecessary to occupy space with a repetition of them here.

When the discussion was brought to a close the House divided. For Hon. Mr. Wightman's motion:—Hons. Messrs. Wightman, Mooney, Montgomery, Lord, Messrs McDonald, Yeo, Laird, Doune, McGill—9.

Against it—Hons. Col. Secretary, Col. Treasurer, Messrs. Whelan, Longworth, Palmer, Dingwell, Munro, Perry, Muirhead, McIntosh, Cooper, Clark, H. Haviland—13.

The motion was therefore lost, and the House shortly after adjourned.

FRIDAY, March 28.

The House resumed the further consideration of the Revenue Bill. After a short time the Committee rose and progress was reported.

The Legislative Council sent down a message informing the House that they had agreed to the Bill regulating the sale by license of spirituous liquors, and also the Bill relating to summary convictions and orders before Justices of the Peace, with some amendments, which were agreed to by the House. The Council also passed the Bill to incorporate the Trustees of St. David's Church in Georgetown, without any amendment.

Hon. Mr. Wightman, from the committee appointed to present an address to His Excellency, respecting the report of the House on the Post Office Department, reported the delivery of the address, and stated that His Excellency would comply with the desire of the House.

Mr. H. Haviland, from the Committee to whom was referred the petition of the Medical Association praying the House to pass an Act to regulate the practice of Physic and Surgery in this Island—reported that it is inexpedient to legislate on the subject matter of this petition. The committee was composed of nine members—five signed the report, which was to the foregoing effect, and four declined to sign it.

Hon. Mr. Longworth introduced a Bill in further amendment

of the Act to incorporate the Minister and Trustees of St. James's Church, Charlottetown. Read a first time. House adjourned.

In the afternoon sitting, the Bill relating to the City of Charlottetown, and the jurisdiction of the Mayor's and Police Courts, was read a third time and passed.

Mr. McDonald, from the Special Committee, presented the report of said Committee on Public Accounts, which was read, and ordered to be taken up to-morrow.

The House then resumed the further consideration in Committee of the Bill to alter and Amend the Act incorporating the Minister and Elders of St. James's Church, Belfast. The Bill was agreed to in Committee, with some amendments.

PETITIONS AND REMONSTRANCES OF THE PROPRIETORS.

The order of the day for the House to go into Committee on the consideration of the Message of His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, of the 20th February last, transmitting extracts of Despatches and copies of Letters, Memorials and Remonstrances of certain Proprietors and Agents of Land relative to the Rent Roll and Tenants' Compensation Bills, being read, the House went into Committee, Mr. McDonald in the Chair.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, the House being aware of the nature of the contents of the Petitions, it will not be necessary to impose on you the duty of reading them at length, unless it is wished that the opinions of the petitioners on this House and others should be heard again. It may be as well, perhaps, to read a few extracts; and firstly, I will take up the extract from Sir George Grey's despatch, wherein he says:—

"I regret to be obliged to inform you that Her Majesty's Government find themselves unable to advise Her Majesty to give Her assent to either the one or the other of these Acts."

Sir George Grey concludes his despatch by remarking:—

"It is needless to enumerate all the objections which apply to this measure, and the more so, as they are ably stated in the memorial presented against it by some of the owners of land, and transmitted with your Despatch of the 2nd July last. But I cannot refrain from remarking that those lands in Prince Edward Island, on which any great improvements have been made by tenants, were let in a state of wilderness, at the almost nominal rent of ninepence or a shilling an acre, on the express understanding that they were to be brought into cultivation by the tenant; that to secure to the tenant the enjoyment and profit of his improvements, leases of extraordinary length were given; and that a tenant who, by misfortune or other cause, is unable to pay that insignificant rent, is always at liberty to sell his lease to the best bidder, and thus to realize in the market the value of the improvements he may have made."

I suppose Sir George Grey was so alarmed at the bundle of petitions, that without reading them through, he took it for granted that such bulk must, under any circumstances, contain at least some good reasons against the Bills. As to the Tenants' Compensation Bill, I cannot agree with him. A measure of that nature has been sought for years, not only by the inhabitants of this Colony, but by the tenant population of Ireland. It has been received with considerable favour in the Imperial House of Commons; therefore, it cannot be so unconstitutional for us to pass a measure involving the same principle. The proprietors state that there is no necessity for the Bill, as there have been but six cases of ejectment in the Supreme Court in four years; therefore, Sir, if that is the case, why not pass a measure which would so little interfere with the proprietors. The first document emanates from a most important personage, namely, Sir, it would be hardly worth noticing anything that gentleman may write, if it did not come before us in the present shape. He begins, Sir, by stating that he is the proprietor of 80,000 acres of land, but yet, poor man, he is unable to get his living. This may be true, but I have heard queer stories of that gentleman, of his going about the country to collect his rents, provided with a few cold potatoes, and going to a tenant's house, warning and eating some, and replacing the remainder in his wallet to sustain him during his further progress. I have been told of another instance of his penuriousness, which is certainly amusing. On one of his collection tours, he was invited to dinner by one of the most respectable freeholders in the Island. During the repast, his host apologized for the absence of anything but water to drink. The guest said it was of no consequence, and very coolly produced a flask from his coat pocket, from which he helped himself, then quietly replaced the cork, restored the flask to its pocket, and went on with his dinner, without asking the man whose hospitality he was enjoying to participate. The memorial of this gentleman with reference to the Rent Roll Bill states that—

"The late Col. Lane, when acting as administrator of the Government, after the death of Sir Donald Campbell, assured me that he had instructions forbidding any such employment of the military force;" (that is, aiding the civil power in the collection of rents.)

Why, Sir, the Government has been frequently taunted with intending to provide a Military force, to facilitate the collection of the proprietors' rents; yet we are told in another place that in Sir Donald Campbell's time the troops were not allowed to be applied to such purposes, as appears from the extract I have just read. So, Sir, under these conflicting statements, we are not to be blamed if the rents of the proprietors are not very regularly collected. Mr. Stewart goes on to state in opposition to the Tenants' Compensation Bill:—

"But the evil of such an Act as this would be less extreme in Great Britain than in this Colony, wherein ninety-nine persons out of every hundred have a direct feeling and personal interest on behalf of the tenant, and quite the reverse towards a landlord. I do not hesitate to say that justice is quite out of the question, and could not be hoped for, under such arbitration. The Act would have, and is intended to have, in connexion with other Acts, the effect of depriving the landlord of every remedy, other than the expensive one of an action at law in the Supreme Court of Judicature,—the rent being no more than one shilling per acre per annum, the defendant being generally destitute alike of property and of principle, the jury being unavoidably composed of tenants, or persons interested for tenants, or hoping themselves to become freeholders, without purchasing their land, and the sanctity of an oath being but little regarded when a proprietor is to be injured by its infraction. Under all these adverse influences or circumstances, the landlord has but little chance of succeeding, and still less chance of benefiting by his success, if he should gain his suit."

Direct intimidation and threats to treat with the landlord for taking the vacant farm—intimidation and threats of injury both to property and person.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I consider that it behoves this House to deny the foul libel I have read; it is a gross slander on the tenant population of the Island, and should not be allowed to go abroad uncontradicted. We should not, as representatives of the people, pass over in silence the gross and willful aspersion on their character. As to the charge of want of principle on the part of the tenantry, I feel sure that they will bear comparison in that respect with their maligner; and as to the hardship to result from the Bill, I can see no injustice to the proprietor from his having to pay for improvements which would become his property. I find another curious charge against the Legislature preferred by Mr. Stewart:—

"In an Act relative to Highways there is the following clause: When land held by a tenant or lessee, under lease, or agreement, or a part thereof, shall be laid off or taken for a line of highway or road, the tenant or lessee shall be discharged from any further or future payment to the lessor or landlord, in respect of the said land, or of a part or proportion thereof, according to the extent or area of the land taken for the highway or line of road."

I believe this enactment to be an unprecedented novelty in legislation, and quite unjust in principle. The Land Assessment is levied upon the entire area of each Township, road and all. The Act of which the above extract forms a part, or some other Act, was passed by the House of Assembly with a provision, that in case a road-way should ever be stopped up, as not being required, the fee simple of the area which had been occupied by the said road-way should go to the tenant and not to the landlord. This enactment was not passed by the Legislative Council."

Now, Sir, I do not consider this a case of very grievous hardship. By the original grants the proprietors are bound to give up land required for highways. Why, Sir, should the tenant pay rent for land so taken? As to the Act being unjust in principle, I can only say that it received the sanction of the Imperial Government, and it contained no provision of the nature alluded to. The next extract contains the writer's opinion respecting the Bill passed last year in this House to compel proprietors to put their titles on record:—

"I may also state that an Act was passed by the House of Assembly during the recent Session, requiring proprietors to put their titles on record before recovering rents from their tenants under lease, agreement, or otherwise. I need scarcely point out to your Lordship how directly such an enactment would strike at the root of a great principle hitherto recognised in the letting of real property, that the tenant cannot question his landlord's title. The Legislative Council have not passed this Act, but it was brought forward as a Government measure. As such it was passed by the House of Assembly, and it has been published as having been passed by the Legislative Council, so as to lead the country constituency to believe it to be the law of the land, and thus to be strengthened in their obstinate resistance to the landlord. These facts are proofs of the animus entertained towards the proprietors."

Sir, it is false that the Bill alluded to was brought in as a Government measure, or that the people have been led to believe that it is the law of the land. If such was the case, I

can only say that it is the first time I have heard of it. We are next treated to what purports to be extracts of a speech delivered by me when the subject of escheat was under discussion. Well, Sir, the writer might have remembered that I was then opposing escheat, and if all the Township lands held by the large proprietors were sold under the Land Purchase Bill at the price specified in that Bill, I believe the holders would get more than they were ever entitled to receive in justice or equity; and, Sir, I find the name of one gentleman attached to the petitions who has purchased a large portion of an estate for less than the Government were authorised to give by the Land Purchase Bill; yet he is not afraid to invest his money in a country from which he deliberately says that our Legislature is driving away moneyed men. I next come to the concluding paragraph of Mr. Stewart's memorial, and which I must say is at least deserving of commendation for the impartiality of its allusion to the two parties in this House, if it had no other merit:—

"I am no party man. The two opposing parties who divide our little state, abusing each other under the names of Tory and Liberal, or a Colonial phrase, "Snarler and Snatcher," differ solely upon the division of the spoil, and are, as it were, constantly dividing against each other for popularity, by promising their constituents, and so far as they are able, performing their promise, to keep up an incessant and sweeping attack upon all the rights of property and laws of justice. It is to Her Majesty's Home Government alone that I can look for either protection or redress against whatever party may, by such promises and performances as I have mentioned, happen to be in possession, for the time being, of the reins of local rule in this Colony. If an impartial view were taken of almost every Act sent home from this Colony, during many past Sessions of our Legislature, they would appear like guns in a long line of battery, converging upon one devoted point of attack, the Proprietary interest. I beg to assure your Lordship that I can confidently and safely challenge the most searching enquiry into the lenity of my own conduct towards my tenantry; and further, that during the many years that I have been in this Colony there has not been a single instance on the part of any Proprietor, of that oppression and tyranny with which we are charged by the demagogues who gain their bread by sowing falsehood."

As to Mr. Stewart's lenity, on which he vaunts himself, he manifests but little of a lenient spirit when he endeavours to save a few shillings of compensation to a tenant, by stating falsehoods, and when he makes such statements they should be contradicted. I next come, Mr. Chairman, to a document bearing the joint signatures of Mr. Bruce Stewart and Mr. Charles Wright, two very fine gentlemen and well adapted to unite in such an effusion. My opinion of the great Mr. Stewart has just been expressed; and as to Mr. Wright, there is no doubt that he is a very important gentleman, a very rich man, lives in great style; I presume he is above allowing one of the poor Snatchers to enter the doors of his house. His hostility to the Liberal party has been of some service to them. I fear, however, that it will be long before he or his friend, Mr. Stewart, represents a constituency in this Island—hence their opposition, particularly to the Legislative Council, to which, if sent there, Mr. Wright no doubt thinks he would be an ornament, and if he could get a seat there he probably would be content to adopt a different course. As to the remarks in this and other of the documents, on the composition of the Legislative Council, I think it not out of place to notice them here, although the body reflected on are well able to defend themselves. Sir, the practice formerly was to appoint to that body none but those who were interested on behalf of the proprietors' claims. None other had seats in the Council, for many years, than they who were bound to oppose any measure affecting the proprietors. I am happy to say that the faction is now nearly extinct. At the Council Board there is but one advocate for the proprietors, and he, on questions of another nature, is generally found to record his vote in favour of Liberal measures. This fact may be made use of as an argument by the opponents of the Government, as proving the partial character of the Council; but it is to be supposed that any Government would appoint its opponents! In supplying the vacancies which have occurred by the resignation of members, the Government have adopted the principle of selecting members from different sections of the country; and notwithstanding the assertions of the petitioners, I contend that gentlemen of property, who have families growing up in the Colony, have a greater stake in the prosperity of the country than any man whose sole claim to a seat is the possession of a few thousand acres of land; and I say that Her Majesty's Commissions to the recently appointed members are in themselves sufficient answer to the objections urged by the petitioners, and are instructions to the Lieutenant Governor. On looking over the names subscribed to those documents, I find some that require a passing notice. I see among the list the name of Mr. Peter McGowan. Now there is no doubt, I presume, that Mr. McGowan is a very wealthy gentleman—owns extensive tracts of land, and would, as a natural consequence, be well qualified for a seat in the Legislative Council. The hon. member, Mr. Doune, whose name figures in three or four places, was, I believe, behind the door when the Tenants' Compensation Bill passed. That Bill passed without division, and the Journals show that there were but two members opposed to the passing of the Rent Roll Bill, namely, Mr. Haviland and Mr. Palmer. There is, Mr. Chairman, another name attached to the petitions which I cannot pass over without remark, that of Mr. W. H. Pope. He certainly is a most influential personage, and would no doubt, in his own estimation, make an excellent Legislative Councillor. He has taken a very good way of realizing his wishes for land agencies, by abusing the other branch of the Legislature, and I would advise the hon. member for Belfast to look well after his Lordship's shoes. In the petition to the Queen signed by Mr. Pope, I see the following paragraph:—

"That it is a specimen of class legislation of the most odious kind, and can serve no other end than to reduce the value of real estate, already at a very low rate, as may be seen by the price paid by the Government for the estate of Charles Worrell, Esquire."

That the Bill is impolitic, having a tendency to drive all moneyed men from the Island, as no one will be inclined, or can be expected to invest capital in the purchase of land, which is deprived of the power of turning to a beneficial use, and may be prevented from reaping the just profits of, under the sanction of law."

Now, Sir, that is rather queer doctrine to be promulgated by Mr. Pope, who has fleeced the country by getting from the public double the amount he and his associates paid for the Worrell Estate. As to driving moneyed men out of the Island, there would be no great loss to the country if it were rid of some of the petitioners. The parties who signed the next document, as it recommends the prayer of the others, are responsible for all the charges preferred against the Government and Legislature, and I am surprised that they should have seen fit to name individuals in the manner they have done, charging them with legislating with a view to save their own properties. Now, Sir, property in Charlottetown is already heavily taxed under the Education Act and the Act of Incorporation. There is a great outcry made against the measure, but I ask is it right that parties not resident in the Island should annually draw from it large sums of money without contributing anything to the revenue? Their poor tenants pay far more into the Treasury. The next extract I shall read to the Committee is as follows:—

"Your petitioners are of course unacquainted with what arguments the Lieut. Governor may make use of in support of a measure to which he has already assented in his place in the Legislature, or how far such may influence a Colonial Minister in the final disposal of the same. But your petitioners humbly apprehend, that the Lieut. Governor's recommendation of any measure introduced by that Government of which he is the head, and carried through both Houses of the Legislature, must be assumed with his full knowledge and concurrence, is afterwards assented to and recommended by him, in the ordinary course of proceeding in such cases. And any other course would appear inconsistent with the good understanding usually supposed to exist between the Governor of a Colony and his sworn confidential advisers, and might also operate prejudicially towards His Excellency, by a vote of "want of confidence" being passed on him, by a resolute and unscrupulous majority in the Assembly."

Well, Sir, the Governor, as a matter of course, assents to measures introduced by the Government. If he differs from his Executive Council, as regards any measures of Government they may wish to introduce, it is their duty to resign their seats and offices. That is the only constitutional course, and it is not very likely they would pass a vote of censure on His Excellency. I am surprised at three of the names attached to the petitions. The parties I refer to hold public offices, and I consider that they should have resigned their situations before they expressed themselves as they have done. They are in the receipt of large sums from the people whom