

pounds, which is just six shillings per acre; and yet, the sapient Elector assesses his readers, their one fourth will only amount to "the trifling sum of one and sixpence." as if, indeed, the landlord had a right to pay more for one hundred acres in the tenant. Learned Arithmetician! school-boy would calculate better! I fear the idea of the Tea, Rum, and Tobacco, turbed your reasoning faculties, for "your intellect seems to far surpass your knowledge" in your laudable efforts "to rescue from the grasp of the iron handed proprietors."

In his second edition, we have another specimen of the Elector's perspicuous mode of reasoning in the contrast he draws between the different modes of paying the Civil List, with regard to the effect it could have on commerce. "It is a matter of indifference whether the home Government pay our Civil List, or that the proprietors be compelled to do so, as in either case, Bills of Exchange would be equally available; or should not the proprietors consent to give bills at the former par, they would send us specie to fill our coffers." In the former case, I admit it would be indifferent, but the latter I deny, for this reason, that our civil officers would be paid by the Treasurer, and I doubt whether they would prefer sterling gold and silver, to our printed rags; and is it not natural to suppose they would send elsewhere for their necessities; especially, as they could pay with a general circulating medium, over more certain than bills of exchange! And the superfluous parts of their salaries, if such there be, they would save, without ever benefitting the country therewith. Such is not now the case, they are, many of them, in all probability dealing on credit till their salaries become due: when they endorse their Bills to their creditors, which enables the latter to make ready remittances, whereby a part, at least, of the circulating specie remains in the Island.

In the next place, he says, 'the amount, if paid by the proprietors here, would be paid out of their rental, into the Treasury, by which it would remain in the Island,' than which, a worse plan could not be devised to distress the people. Let us suppose that the proprietors paid their 3000l in Treasury Notes, and that our Civil Officers were paid in these Notes, though I am of opinion they would receive them with reluctance: they would be obliged to pay their merchants with Treasury Notes, by which a drawback would be laid on commerce for want of negotiable Bills. Nor is this the chief evil, every proprietor of 20,000 has 5000 of them occupied, the annual rental of which amounts to two hundred and fifty pounds, forty-five of which will pay the proposed land tax; now, is it not clear, that the poor farmer would

be the ultimate sufferer should his landlord use coercive measures to enforce the payment of rent, especially if the tenantry were some years in arrear, many of whom I know to be so. What mercy, I ask, could they expect from an irritated landlord, who sees his tenants combining to divest him of his property? None! Are they then not the enemies of the people, who advise such combinations! time, alone, can develop!!

The Elector says 4000 will pay the Civil List as well as the expense of collecting. Let us consider. In July 1823, several Lots &c. in Prince-County were sold for Quit Rent, I should rather say, to pay the fees of those who sold them. In 1825 a Committee of the House of Assembly reported thereon; an abstract of which I give, to shew the people how much they have to expect at the hands of the tax gatherers!

"That it further appears to your Committee by the said Acting Receiver General, that the whole Quit Rents received by him, amounted to the sum of 3980l, about 400l of which was collected by his deputies, in doing which, there were but few instances of actual distraint, as the parties generally settled by paying their Quit Rents together with the deputies charges for travelling, and other fees; and that the expenses incurred in recovering the remainder of the said Quit Rent, and paid out of the Quit Rent Revenue, absorbed the whole of the said 3980l except 670l, which was handed over to the present Receiver General out of which, there is still payable upwards of 400l due, on the before-mentioned proceedings!!"—*Journals of the House of Assembly, March 21, 1825, Fol. 51.*

What do you think of that Mr. Elector, it was quite as profitable to be a Receiver of Quit Rents then, as it may be hereafter, to be a collector of Land Tax!

Mr. Editor, I have too long trespassed on your kindness, but the subject is of too much importance to the people; it would be, therefore, criminal to suffer them to be led to ruin by the mistaken advice of political theorists.

A TRUE FRIEND TO THE COLONY.  
Charlotte-Town, March 11, 1833.

I perceive Mr. Editor by your Report of last Saturday, that you were enabled to get a glimpse of the proceedings of the House of Assembly; even though you are neither King's Printer, or Printer of the House, (*in uno*) nor one of the other great Officers of that Honorable Body. However, after all, you did but raise a corner of the curtain, and at the same time our curiosity; and mine, was chiefly to know, what were the effusions of great B. and little B., and to whom it was their great minds

were excited to speak, "in that commanding and determined manner," whether to the House or to His Excellency in perspective? I suppose the latter. Mr. Hazard has given us the whole affair in his last Paper, but those effusions of course he has left out, they having been uttered *obscure*. Now, Mr. Editor, the exciting cause appears to have been, that three of the members conceived that the Governor had accused the House of inconsistency; and they (not being in the slightest degree open to that accusation!) were naturally much offended. Their non-liability to the charge will be apparent or not from the answers to the following queries:—

Did not the House of Assembly in their Session before last, address the Home Government (and also the Governor, praying him to use his best influence to forward the same) for a supply of Arms and Accoutrements for the Militia? And did they not last Session bind themselves to take care of them on their arrival? and have they not this Session adopted and received the Report of the Committee on Major Rankin's Petition, in which Report the House is recommended *not to sanction* "any measure whereby the industrious "classes will be taken from their farms "to attend Militia Musters" Perhaps, Mr. Editor, when those Arms were applied for, it was in the hope they might be distributed about the country that the inhabitants might destroy with them the ducks and geese, or perhaps to defend themselves from the Bears, which were then it appears more numerous than usual, since the Legislature were under the necessity of re-enacting a Law for their destruction, after having dropped it for a year.

Again, have we not one of the Members in the Report of his Examination before the House, (printed by their Printer,) declaring, that he did not know that the Governor had communicated his sentiments last Session, on the subject of his inability to accept the Grant of 300l; and even telling the House, that he had answered His Excellency that it was the "first time he had ever heard of such a thing"? And yet, did not the Governor send down a written message? and if an Hon. member may be referred to his own Journals, he will see it entered in page 103. Such being the case, why was the 300l left in the appropriation Bill? There it is, Mr. Editor, to this day, I