

The Hon. Mr. PALMER would willingly vote for the amendment if any good would arise from it; but being contrary to the military regulations, the expenses must, unfortunately fall on this Colony.

Mr. COOPER reminded hon. members of what Sir C. Fitzroy had said in a Despatch, that the government were not to interfere in the collection of the rents of this colony; yet in the face of this they had sent a military force, and this occurrence must be considered as a riot; and the Sheriff adhered to the constitutional Laws, he would * * *

Mr. RAE, in reply to the latter part of the hon. member's remarks, said, the matters upon which he was consulted may be compared to a sugar plum in an ocean of salt water, though he (Mr. RAE) was fain to acknowledge the hon. member does him the honour of now and then seeking his advice on trifling matters.

The SPEAKER moved, as an amendment, that the accounts be reported agreed to, &c.

The debate now assumed a different aspect, and was chiefly confined to a condemnation of the heavy charges on the government. Mr. THORNTON pronounced them to be excessive, and said that the Executive had done all in their power to reduce them.

Mr. COLES said, he did not see that the charge was so very extravagant for conveying the troops, when it was (as it should be) taken into consideration, the enormous rate the contractors were compelled to pay on the road, &c., for provender for the horses, &c.; neither did he (Mr. Coles) think it fair to attack only a part of the charges of particular individuals, while others that were equally liable remained unnoticed.

The Hon. the SPEAKER explained, that three of the Council were appointed to investigate the accounts, and the result was, that it was agreed to strike off forty-five pounds; yet this was overruled by the military authorities, and as one of the Council so appointed, I, said the hon. speaker, felt great disgust, and refused again to act. In respect to the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. D. Maclean), that the expenses should be borne by the Government, that question also has been fully investigated and found to be unenable and contrary to the military regulations.

The Hon. the Speaker's amendment was then put, and carried, twelve voting for it.

MARCH 8. FISHERY RESERVES.

House in Committee on that part of His Excellency's speech relative to the Fishery Reserves.

The Hon. Mr. PALMER said, one great obstacle to a settlement of this question is, the division of the Fishery Reserves. This must be determined by a Bill, even if we take each part of the Reserves separately. We must encourage and protect those who may be disposed to take up the occupation of fishing; at the same time, the interest of the settlers on the fishery reserves must not be lost sight of. I hold it to be utterly impossible to adhere strictly to the opinions, as laid down by the Attorney and Solicitor General of England. So much property, and so many interests are concerned, that the parties would not consent till further investigation, and probably not without going to the extreme limit of the Privy Council at home. In accordance with his (Mr. Palmer's) views of what he considered best to be done, he had prepared a Resolution, which he would now submit to the consideration of the Committee.

Resolved, That it is the opinion of this Committee, that any Legislative enactment to be made on the subject of the Fishery Reserves, shall require to be based upon the principles of, and having mainly in view, encouragement and protection to individuals immediately concerned in promoting the Fisheries—having a due regard to the interest of agriculturists.

Mr. COOPER said a great deal of speculative matter, on various occasions, had been offered by different members in this House upon this important question. An opportunity at length presents itself of enacting a law to benefit the agriculturists. Are we then to let the opportunity pass without embracing it? Yet he thought, from what he heard, the object was to protect those who took up fishing, and sacrifice those who have cleared the Reserves. And what is all this fishing to effect? It has been tried. He (Mr. Cooper) was not very sanguine even of the undertaking brought under our notice yesterday, as most hon. members appeared to be; many such schemes have been injurious to the pockets of the public.

Mr. YEO said the intention of the Government ever was, that this land should be applied to the purpose of fishing establishments, but that the soil was in the right of the proprietors, and so it will be determined, notwithstanding any Resolution to the contrary. He also considered that wherever establishments of this kind were erected, the proprietors should recompense the tenant for any damage he might sustain. He would like to hear a decision in a court of law.

Mr. DOUSE said, the question had been tried and decided long since. He had himself instituted a lawsuit with a Mr. John McNeil, a tenant on Lot 62, who refused to pay rent on account of the front part of his farm being a fishery reserve, though he had always held under lease an undisturbed possession of the property. The case was ably conducted by counsel on both sides; it was contended, on the part of the plaintiff, that the question of these reserved lands was one which laid between the Crown and the Proprietor, and not the tenant and the Crown. The trial was understood to be a mutual one between parties, to determine the question, and the defendant's expenses of suit were paid by his own; that Mr. Cooper's friends, who had made a subscription for that purpose. So much for the present position of landlord and tenant, on that score. The grants of the Townships clearly defined the length and breadth, for twenty thousand acres of land, and its frontage on the sea coasts, which length and breadth, agreeable to description, have been surveyed for the Grantees by different Surveyor-Generals, who were Crown Officers. The taxes were paid for all lands by the proprietor of the Township, (the Glebe and School lands always excepted), until disposed of. If it was only intended by the Grantor to convey sixteen instead of twenty thousand acres, as the case may now prove to be, after deducting the fishery reserve lands, why had not the number of acres intended to be conveyed been laid off, and the proper quantity of land specified? Why was the proprietor thus put in possession of 20,000 acres, and then from two to four thousand acres confiscated? It certainly appeared a case of extreme hardship to dispossess even small freeholders, after holding the quiet and peaceable possession for probably thirty or forty years—and which might have been purchased from parties who neither reside or hold any property in the Colony at the present time. Then, again, are the tenants to be deceived with impressions that their leases are to be broken, their back rents refunded, and themselves remunerated by the lessor for the improvements made on the frontage of their farms? He thought the Crown would never authorize such a disturbance of property, after giving possession by its officers, unless it could be clearly shown that they were actually required for the purposes intended, viz: fishing establishments, which would benefit all parties interested. From the very few applications which had been hitherto made, by persons desirous of carrying on any extensive fishing establishments in the Colony, he saw none of those benefits likely to result by enhancing the value of property in its vicinity. The Resolution now before the Committee states "that no more rent should be paid by the tenant to the proprietor of the Township on which such reserves are;" which strengthens an opinion, that hon. members really were about to make a harvest for gentlemen of the long robe, at the expense of the tenantry; and he would add, at a time when they could least afford it. He cautioned the House against leading the public into error, and would record his name against the Resolution, satisfied as he was, that if it passed here it would never receive the sanction of the other branches of the Legislature.

The Hon. the SPEAKER thought the fisherman's interest would have been paramount to every other consideration with hon. members; but since an opinion has been obtained as to the extent of the Fishery Reserves, a fresh light has broken in upon those hon. members, and the fisherman's rights, it would now appear, are to be a minor consideration. We cannot take away the fisherman's right, and transfer it to the occupying tenant; yet the fisherman should be restricted in some degree, and the present occupiers of the Reserved Land should be compensated for any loss or damage sustained in the carrying on of the fishery, according to the award of sworn Commissioners. Let the fisherman choose his own spot, and the most advantageous situation; let him at the same time be restricted from committing any improper nuisance or waste. "I am (said the hon. Speaker) for confirming any individual, settled on the Reserves in his possession, according to the nature of the titles by which they hold; but as the Proprietors had no right to lease or sell the Crown Reserves, I would compel them to pay into the public Treasury the full amount of rent that may in future arise from any and all the Reserves, which they have leased, and, if practicable, I would also have no objection to their refunding any purchase money which they may have received for Reserves sold by them; thus a fund would be created for the purpose of meeting any compensation that might be awarded to any occupier who may sustain damage by a fisherman using a part of his cleared land. The tenants would, in this case, continue to attend to the Landlords, as heretofore, which would be much better than to make them tenants of the Crown, and would save them from the great expense to which persons are now liable, in cases of non-payment of land tax." He (the Speaker) could not legislate on the opinion given by the Crown Officers as to the extent of the Reserves, because they tell us, in the first place, that they cannot give any legal definition of the word "coast" or "sea coast." If these gentlemen, however eminent in their profession, cannot give us any legal opinion on the subject, he feared but little value would be placed on their nautical opinions, when they tell us that the "coast" extends as far up the Rivers, Inlets, Creeks and Rivulets as the tide ebbs and flows. Had the question been asked of the Lords of the Admiralty, the Trinity Board, the master of a Collier, or the skipper of a Sand Barge, he would venture to say, that they would not have told us that the coast of England was understood to extend up the Thames, as far as Richmond. The case was one of such importance, that it would, doubtless, be decided only by an appeal to the Privy Council.

Mr. COOPER said hon. members would do well to look at the original grants, then would it be seen what every one was to occupy. The Fishery Reserves ought to have been given up to emigrants. But in consequence of the abuses which have so long existed, people coming here to settle had no alternative but that of applying to Land Agents, and therefore have been compelled to pay a two-fold value for what in reality was right their own, but which had been usurped by others who had no right to it whatever.

Mr. RAE did not understand the hon. member's views. Did he mean to say that what was public property should be made private, because the purchasers might not have happened to know it was reserved for the fisheries? Well then (said the hon. member), that must be settled by the Crown, and that alone.

Mr. COLES thought the time of the House should not be consumed in debating on matter that had been settled by the law officers of the Crown; but the preferable mode of legislating was upon what can now be effected conformably with that decision. If the hon. the Speaker could carry out his views to create a fund to compensate the occupiers for any loss or damage they may hereafter suffer by the occupiers of the Fishery Reserves, for the purpose of fishing, it would be as advantageous as a rent roll tax upon the Proprietors, which he (Mr. Coles) had unsuccessfully attempted to carry into effect. But how is this to be carried out? In what way are the Proprietors to be compelled to pay for property that they have nothing to do with? Although he (Mr. Coles) was favourable to the Fishery Reserves being made a source of revenue, he thought they had now nothing to do with the Proprietors, as they have nothing to do with the Fishery Reserves. A preferable and more practicable plan presented itself, which was, to raise a fund for this contemplated purpose by calling upon those who are settled on the land in question to pay, say three pence per acre, which he thought the parties concerned should not complain of, inasmuch as it would tend to their own interest, and indemnification for any loss or damage caused by fishermen in or upon their occupations; and this small sum would be sufficient to confirm them in their titles. The hon. member (Mr. Cooper) is very apt to talk about giving power to one and the other, to which he invariably evinces the most determined dislike; but the hon. member appeared to forget himself, than whom he (Mr. Coles) did not know any one more anxious than was that hon. member to obtain the possession of that which he cries down in others. Let us impose this small sum of three pence, and pass an enactment to create a power to compel the performance, or to eject them from the Reserves; and being liable to the latter, he (Mr. Coles) would not go for a higher sum, but approved of the settlers remaining undisturbed till the fishermen may apply for the purpose of carrying on the business.

Mr. COOPER said, the hon. member had neglected to say whether the Proprietors, who had wrongfully exacted large sums for the Fishery Reserves, should refund to the injured parties, or whether they, in his opinion, should go Scot free.

Mr. YEO thought it was not in the power of the House to determine the question of the hon. member, but had no doubt it would be tried in the Law Courts, and carried from one to the other; in consideration of which, he (Mr. Yeo) would be very sorry to be a party concerned.

The hon. the SPEAKER said, it would appear, from what had fallen from hon. members, each of which had his own unconnected plan, that we should not legislate at all; that there are many who are settled on the Fishery Reserves who would be well pleased if we did not, he (the Speaker) did not doubt in the least. But let us look at the extent of the Reserves, embracing not much less than 1000 miles of coast, as defined, and equal to 60,000 acres; take likewise the quality and value of the land, in comparison with other parts of the Island, and then it must be obvious to all, how indispensable it is for us to see that so valuable a part of the Island is not frittered away. Are we then to throw this open to the present occupiers, free of rent, at the expense of the fishermen? He (the Speaker) would wish to have it made clear, in what way (the tenants) will be injured, if they remain the same as heretofore. It would be nothing short of the greatest folly were we to say they should now be declared freeholders of so much of the Crown Reserves. This should not for a moment occupy our deliberation. Let those who have covenanted for quiet possession fight their own battles in the law courts with the Proprietors, and let the latter abide the consequence, if they have not leased the land subject to the reservations. But he (the Speaker) had yet to learn what the former have to complain of, so long as they remain undisturbed; but if any hon. member fancied an exclusive right exists in them, let a resolution to that effect be put at once, and the sense of the House taken upon it; it is useless to contend against a majority of the House. The hon. member from King's County (Mr. Cooper) has certainly advanced a novel opinion, as to the objects of the government in first making the Reserves, viz: that as the intention was to have settled the Island with German Protestants, the government thought it advisable to secure their allegiance by surrounding them with a cordon of British subjects. This certainly was very rich!

Mr. COOPER said, the satirical jokes of the hon. Speaker may pass for what they are worth; he would refrain from making any further comments upon them. It would seem from other remarks that had transpired, that the hon. Speaker was in favour of a judgment for the proprietors; but when the evidence of those who had been deceived was adduced, he (Mr. Cooper) thought if it was decided according to that, it would be in opposition to the opinion of the hon. Speaker, and any other result would not be founded on justice, which long ago would have been inquired into and determined, had there been an established Court of Escheat. But justice has been administered by the Courts, misnamed Courts of Justice; the law is made subservient to the proprietors; and now that it is determined by the law

officers of the Crown that the proprietors have nothing whatever to do with the Fishery Reserves, we are met with statements, tending to make an impression that we have nothing to do with those settlers whom they have imposed upon, but must leave it to be arranged by the former and the Crown, leaving out the interest of the latter. But he (Mr. Cooper) would maintain that the Crown is the people, and the people's rights are in that, and we have a right to protect them by our legislation.

Mr. D. MACLEAN had repeatedly heard statements, tending to show that the present Chief Justice invariably charged the jury in favour of the proprietors. Any one has a right to dispose of his own property, but the proprietors had sold that of others as their own. Such conduct in others would be called swindling; and no milder term ought to be applied to this. As there seemed to be great difference of opinion in the House, he would beg leave to introduce a resolution:

"Resolved, That certain lands in this Colony, originally reserved for the use of the fisheries in this Island, having been declared by the Attorney and Solicitor-General of England to be the property of the Crown, having been claimed, and in many cases leased and sold, by the proprietors of the Townships on which such are situated, it is right and proper that the settlers on said lands should be protected by Legislative enactment in the quiet possession thereof (without any further rent being exacted by the Proprietors of the Townships on which such reserves are; but at the same time not interfering with any right the Crown may enjoy to exact rent for such reserves) until the land be required for the use of the Fisheries.

Mr. D. MACDONALD would cheerfully second the motion, for, in his opinion, it being a reservation of the Crown, the tenant should also be reserved from paying rent.

Mr. COLES remarked, the hon. Speaker says, let the Tenant remain till he becomes interrupted by the fisherman, and then seek redress from the Proprietor by instituting law proceedings. He (Mr. Coles) could not go with that idea, as he thought it was imperative on this House to consider the ruinous effect of such a course, and thought it behooved them to pass an enactment to prevent the necessity of rendering it necessary for the Tenantry to be left to the tender mercies of the gentlemen of the Bar. In respect to the observation that fell from the hon. member (Mr. Palmer) as to what should be the division of the Fishery Reserves for the purpose of fishing, he (Mr. Coles) thought there could be no better stop short than where the tide stops, and was further of opinion that the fisherman should find no obstruction whatever, but that he should have free ingress and egress to and from the spot whereon he may choose to locate.

Mr. THORNTON said, the Resolution of the hon. member, (Mr. D. Maclean) was not very objectionable, and with some additions and slight alterations, he might then give it his support. The hon. member (Mr. D. Maclean) ultimately agreed to the proposition of the hon. member (Mr. Thornton), embracing the hon. member's views.

Mr. DALZIEL would not mask his opinions, but at once declare, that the proprietors are in duty bound to refund the back rents to the tenants. At one time, they may have been ignorant of the land having been reserved, but of later date he (Mr. Dalziel) had seen leases with a clause inserted, "any thing in the letters patent of this Island to the contrary notwithstanding." He would support any Resolution recommending the enactment of a law to regulate the Fishery Reserves.

Mr. COOPER said, the conditions of the grants had not been complied with by the Proprietors; the lands must be escheated, and it is useless to think or talk of justice being done to the people till that be accomplished. Lord Stanley advised that justice should be done between both parties, and in his (Mr. Cooper's) opinion, it was the greatest injustice to compel a tenant to pay rent, so long as the conditions remain unfulfilled by the Proprietors.

The Hon. the SPEAKER, in allusion to what had been trumpeted forth by the hon. member (Mr. Cooper), relative to the administration of the law between Landlord and Tenant in this Colony, reminded the hon. member, that in England the tenant cannot, by any law, challenge the title of his Landlord, so long as he remains undisturbed; nor can the Tenant here reasonably complain, so long as he remains in the possession and peaceful enjoyment of his farm.

The Hon. Mr. PALMER said, he did not for a moment think otherwise of the hon. member (Mr. Cooper), than that he would, if he could, bring any Court of Justice into contempt. Whatever he thinks right, let it be ever so foolish, must be so; but then it cannot be expected that we shall take it for granted, simply on that account. The hon. member seems now to have got it into his head that the Tenants on the Fishery Reserves are not occupying what is invested in the Crown; that the whole is forfeited; and thus would consider the prerogative of the Crown as mere nothingness. But this is the course pursued by all levels; and out of the whole of the silly and simple cases the hon. member had ever taken up, there was none in which he had betrayed greater ignorance. All titles are good till a jury of twelve men decide to the contrary; and this old question of Proprietorship of lands in this Colony has undergone trial, and been decided by those the hon. member ought to believe would not act otherwise than according to law. But that would not answer the purpose of the hon. member, whose object was that of bringing the Courts of this Island into contempt. But he (Mr. Palmer) did not hesitate to declare, that justice was as impartially administered in our Courts as in any other that could be pointed out, notwithstanding what the hon. member would have believed outside this House, to the contrary. But to come more immediately to the subject now before the House, he would ask the hon. member what all the noise and clamour about the Fishery Reserves, of past years, is now to end in? Another interest, it appears, is to become paramount. Let then this wheel-about conduct go forth to the public; let it attract the notice of the Home Government, and let them form their own opinions of such turnabout and despotic tergiversation. It would now seem that the Resolution is to be avoided; but we shall see presently which interest is to be taken up; that is the point he (Mr. Palmer) wanted to see come to. He was not for confirming the Proprietors in their titles, but decidedly to encourage and protect the Fisheries.

Mr. RAE considered, in a question of this importance, that it was not so very marvellous that differences of opinion should exist. For his part, he could not view the subject in the same light as the hon. member for Charlottetown (Mr. Palmer). In his (Mr. RAE's) opinion, the first step to be taken was that of decidedly negating any motion or resolution imposing on the tenant the least fraction of rent whatever. The House ought to divest itself of all consideration for the proprietors. It is nonsense to listen to those hon. members who say the proprietors will not now possess so much as they ought, or that it is not a great boon. As it is, have they not committed unwarrantable usurpation? And have they not subjected the tenants to payments and labours amounting to ten times the value of the fee simple of the land? We must leave out their interest altogether, and take up that of others, combining those who have bought, and those who have paid twenty or thirty years' rent; and not exclusively confine ourselves to the interest of the fishermen. Yet it must not be said, that we are going to be so unreasonably liberal as to make presents of the property of the Crown. We must not adopt the system of the public officers of past times; but a strong case must be made out, to lay before the Crown, to prevent, if possible, a repetition of former errors. This is the only feasible plan we can adopt, it being utterly out of our power to dictate, as we cannot say what they shall or shall not do. The hon. member then submitted a Resolution, which subsequently he withdrew, the same views being embodied in that of the hon. member (Mr. D. Maclean.)

The Hon. Mr. PALMER said the Resolution submitted by the hon. member (Mr. Maclean) was unnecessary, if his were carried. He would wish it to be perfectly understood, that no further rent should be paid for the Fishery Reserves. At the same time, let it not be thought that we have the power to say the tenants shall henceforth enjoy it as freeholds, but that any further consideration for such occupation must go to the Crown. His (Mr. Palmer's) Resolution merely goes to say, that the fisherman's interest is not tantamount, but exceeds that of any other, and must be the first consideration; then the others will follow, as a matter of course. We must commence upon abstract principles.

Mr. WIGHTMAN did not object to the Resolution of the hon. member (Mr. Maclean). The Proprietors have no right to demand rent. "All are agreed upon that point," said the hon. the Speaker. Mr. Wightman was very sanguine that the Crown would never demand rent. Those who have been at great expense in clearing the reserves, and others who have expended large sums in the erection of buildings, &c., demand (and not unreasonably) the protection of enactments, to secure them from loss, as in many instances total ruin may follow without such provision.

(Remainder of the debate in our next.)

P. E. ISLAND AUXILIARY TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.—It will, no doubt, be highly gratifying to the friends and advocates of Temperance to learn that the efforts of the above Society for the furtherance of the good cause, have of late been much more successful, and have excited a greater degree of interest, than they did for many months previous. The meetings—at all of which the greatest order and harmony have prevailed—have been regularly held and numerous and respectfully attended, and on no occasion has there been less than ten or a dozen signatures obtained to the Pledge. On Monday evening last, a public meeting was held in the Vestry of the Wesleyan Chapel, at which, notwithstanding the bad state of the roads, there was an unusually large attendance. The meeting having been opened, as usual, with singing and prayer, the President stated, that, in accordance with a Resolution passed at the last Anniversary meeting, the following Address had been prepared and forwarded to the Rev. JAMES WADDELL, late President of the Society:—

To the Rev. JAMES WADDELL, late one of the Masters of the Central Academy, President of the Auxiliary Temperance Society, &c. &c.

REV. AND DEAR SIR; In compliance with a Resolution, unanimously adopted at the Anniversary Meeting of the P. E. Island Auxiliary Temperance Society, held in the Vestry of the Wesleyan Chapel, in this Town, on the evening of Monday, the 23d inst., the undersigned beg leave to tender you, in the name, and on behalf of the Society with which they stand connected, an expression of their unqualified approbation of the manner in which you formerly discharged the duties of President and Corresponding Secretary of their Society, and the deep sense they entertain of the loss the cause of Temperance in this Island has sustained by your removal from amongst us.

Having ourselves repeatedly witnessed your untiring zeal and assiduity for the promotion and extension of the Temperance Reformation, and other benevolent and philanthropic objects, we have great pleasure in thus complying with the wishes of our constituents. Regretting that any circumstance should have arisen to render your removal from this Island unavoidable, and trusting that Divine Providence will ever continue to smile upon you and your amiable family, and that, wherever your lot may be cast, He will not only bless you, but make you a blessing,

We beg leave to subscribe ourselves, With great respect and esteem,

- Rev. and Dear Sir, Your most obt. Servts., J. B. COOPER, President. J. B. STRONG, Vice President. G. BEER, jr., do. W. CUNDALL, Corresponding Secy. G. MOORE, Recording do. W. TROWAN, Treasurer. JOHN WILLIAMS, JOHN BOYER, JOHN RIDER, JOHN PIDWELL, JOHN BEER, WILLIAM TANTON, Committee.

Charlottetown, 31st Jan. 1844.

To which the following reply had just been received:— To the President, Office-bearers and Committee of the Prince Edward Island Auxiliary Temperance Society.

GENTLEMEN; I have duly received your kind Address, conveying to me a valued testimonial of your own approbation of my exertions for "the promotion of the Temperance Reformation, and other benevolent and philanthropic objects," which I considered among you; and affording me a very gratifying evidence of the favourable remembrance of the Prince Edward Island Auxiliary Temperance Society—with the operations of which I was so long associated.

You will believe me when I say, that "the praise of men" was not my incentive to the exertions which you so highly eulogise; still, I am far from undervaluing the good opinion of generous and virtuous minds. It consoles under injuries; it cheers amid discouragements; and I thank you sincerely for the expression of it with which you have furnished me. In the chair and on the floor of your (may I not say our?) Society, I have spent many interesting hours—hours which it is pleasing to know you have not forgotten, and hours, the influence of which, we have reason to hope, will be felt in days yet to come.

My removal will not, I hope, be felt to be such a loss to the cause as you would have me suppose. There are among you persons whose zealous exertions cannot fail to produce the happiest effects, and I sincerely pray, that you may see the fruit of your labours and be satisfied.

Most gratefully acknowledging your kind interest in the welfare of myself and my family, and cordially reciprocating prayers for your individual and social happiness,

I am, Gentlemen, Most respectfully, Yours, JAMES WADDELL.

Truro, N. S., March 8, 1844.

The Address, and Reply thereto, were then ordered to be inserted in the Minutes of the Society, and published in the Colonial Herald.

Several animated addresses were subsequently delivered, and twelve new members added to the Society, making an increase of upwards of Sixty since the commencement of the present year. The following Resolutions were submitted to the meeting and unanimously agreed to:—

- 1. RESOLVED, That the melancholy instances, of almost daily occurrence, afforded of the pernicious effects of intoxicating liquors, call loudly on every individual to assist, both by precept and example, in discountenancing the causes and practice of intemperance. 2. RESOLVED, That the success with which Divine Providence has been pleased to crown the efforts of the advocates of Temperance generally—and this Society in particular—while it demands our gratitude, should act as a powerful stimulus to continued and increased exertion in disseminating those principles, the adoption of which has, in so many instances, been attended with such happy results.

Several of the Branch Societies are in a flourishing state, particularly those at Little York and Vernon River, both of which have received considerable accessions to their numbers during the present year.

A deputation proceeded to New Wiltshire (Bedeque Road), yesterday, for the purpose of organising a Branch Society in that Settlement. Several animated addresses were delivered, and at the close of the meeting Nine-and-twenty persons came forward and subscribed the Pledge of the Auxiliary Society. The office-bearers will be chosen at the next meeting.

MECHANICS' INSTITUTE.—On Wednesday evening last, the Rev. Mr. Kier, of Princeton, delivered a very interesting and instructive lecture on The power of God, as displayed in the works of Creation. An animated discussion ensued, tending to throw still further light on the subjects so ably treated by the Rev. lecturer, and at a late hour the audience separated, apparently highly gratified with their evening's entertainment.

The President (the Hon. C. Young) will read a lecture on Sculpture, on Wednesday evening next.