of the mutual relations existing between Landlord and Tenant, as recognised by the common law of England from time immemorial; and directly opposed to the dictates of common sense,—so that it is difficult to suppose that those who concurred in passing it, from motives which will be hereafter alluded to, could have entertained the slightest hope that it would ever receive the royal assent.

Before entering into the details of the Bill, it is deemed necessary to shew under what relations the tenants contemplated in it stand, with respect to their landlords, as regards duration of tenure and terms of payment of rent, as these have a very evident bearing on the policy and justice of passing the Bill into an Act. The majority of the tenants hold by leases of a long endurance, as appears by the enumeration of the respective holdings in the Census of 1848—the general accuracy of which there is no reason to doubt, as it is published by the order of the House of Assembly in the Appendix to its Journal of the year 1849. In the year 1848 the whole number of tenants in the Island amounted to 6099, of whom more than one-half held under leases for 999 years, the residue by terms varying from 999 to 100, 50 and 30 years, there being of the whole number only 199 that occupy their lands under leases or agreements for a shorter period than thirty years, and those holding by these comparatively short periods of 100, 50, or 30 years, have generally a clause inserted in the lease or agreement, giving them the power of demanding releases in fee simple, upon the payment of twenty years purchase money.

As to the terms respecting the payment of rents under which the lands are held, they are, as given by the same authority, as follows:—Out of 6099 tenants, are 4970 who pay nine-pence, British sterling, the acre; 898 at rents varying from nine-pence to sixteen-pence, British sterling, the acre; 37 not exceeding two shillings, sterling, per acre; and 87, in the oldest, most populous and best cultivated districts, who hold at a greater sum than three shillings, British sterling, per acre. That there is no species of contract which the laws of all countries, by a common consent founded on the immutable principles of justice, look upon so religiously to be kept and enforced as that between landlord and tenant; and the payments of the rent reserved in such contracts have ever, by the law of England, been compelled to be made with rigour and strictness, tempered and modified by a care and watchfulness that the extraordinary power vested in the landlord should not be abused. And of this care and watchfulness the tenant of Prince Edward Island has an equal share with those of England, in addition to the benefit conferred by statutes, by which the power of the landlord is curtailed and regulated, passed by the local Legislature in favor of the tenant, who has also the same advantages given by the law of replevin, and may avail himself of any plea in bar or of set-off that the practice of the courts allow, as fully as the tenant in England can. But the tenant in Prince Edward Island is, in almost every possible case, placed on a far more favorable footing than the tenant in England. In the first place, the tenant's lease is of a long endurance; secondly, he is hampered with no burthensome conditions, is compellable to erect no particular species of buildings, to follow no prescribed course of cropping or tillage,—all he has to do is simply to provide for and pay his rent of nine-pence, British sterling, per acre, and the public taxes, which do not amount to one penny, British sterling, per acre; and having performed these duties, he is totally independent of his landlord—may sell and dispose of his leasehold interest at public auction, or by private contract—may mortgage, build, cultivate, or let it alone, just as he pleases. It is, therefore, submitted that it is contrary to the dictates of common sense, as well as opposed to the rules of common justice, that the landlord should be compelled to pay for buildings and improvements: on the necessity of erecting the one, and making the other, he has never been consulted, and which, if he had been consulted, he would, in all probability, have disapproved of. That the compelling the landlord to take back the land, because the tenant is either unable or unwilling to discharge the rent, and pay for the improvements at a valuation by arbitrators, is an act of injustice to him as a creditor, to which no other creditor of the tenant is by law subjected, inasmuch as any judgment creditor of the tenant may take out execution, levy upon the leasehold interest and sell it, with all the improvements, in a year from the date of the levy—turn the tenant out of possession, and, if the leasehold interest with the improvements are not sufficient to pay the debt, seize upon his person, and lodge it in prison, until the residue be paid. That the mortgagee of property is at liberty to foreclose, where the condition for re-payment of the mortgage money is broken, and that in such case the land with all its improvements is forfeited; and that this Bill would place the landlord—who, by abstaining from pressing his tenant for the rent, has, in equity, lent him so much money—in a worse situation than a mortgagee, or a judgment creditor,—thus making the claim of the landlord, which is in England and all other countries considered paramount, inferior to those of strangers.

That the Bill is retrospective, and will, if it takes effect, be the means of adding a parliamentary covenant to pay for improvements on the part of the landlord, which, had it been proposed at the time of executing the lease, he would have at once rejected.

That it is taking a fraudulent and unjust advantage of the lenity of the landlord, who, in most or in all cases, has forborne to press the tenant for the payment of his rent, from an unwillingness to interfere with, or prevent his making the necessary improvements, resting satisfied that by so doing he was promoting the interests of the tenant, and enabling him to pay his rent with greater ease in future years. That in fact, by this Bill, the landlord is to be punished for having assisted his tenant, at the outset of his career, with what was equivalent to a loan of money, without interest, for five, ten, or fifteen years. That the very fact of the improvements being greater in value than the rent in arrear, shows that the tenant has had a beneficial use of the soil, and that there is no injustice in compelling him to dispose of those improvements at public sale, or by private contract, and first discharging the debt which honor and honesty alike require him to pay, appropriate the residue at his own will and pleasure.

That no distinction is made by the Bill between landlords who have only a life-interest in the soil, and those who have the fee-simple: as, for instance, tenants for life, tenants in tail, tenants by the courtesy, and tenants in dower—all of who have no other interest in the land than what they derive from the annual profits, and who might be ruined or starved by the detention of the rents, and who have, certainly, no interest in the improvements, other than their affording a greater security for the payment of those rents.

That the Bill has not been called for by any harsh and oppressive practices on the part of the landlords, or their agents—there having been only six tenants, out of all that hold lands in the Island, ejected for the non-payment of rent, during the space of the last four years, as was shown by a return furnished by the Prothonotary of the Supreme Court.

That the allowing the improvements to be estimated by arbitrators, is an useless, expensive and uncertain method of finding their true value, which more easily and with greater certainty can be ascertained by exposing them to sale, with proper notice, and under proper precautions—a mode of procedure to which the proprietor who is in want of his rent, must have recourse, if the Bill should become an Act, and who, if the improvements realize less than their estimated value, must submit to a loss which ought in justice and equity to be paid by the tenant.

That under the terms of the Bill, as to what shall be considered the just value of the improvements to be paid for by the landlord, and those to be borne by the tenant, it would be utterly impossible for any arbitrators to come to a just decision, inasmuch as few, if any, of the tenants in the Island keep any account of their expenditure, or of their income.

That the Bill directs the arbitrators "to take into consideration any expenditure of manure, lime, or any other matter calculated to improve the temporary fertility of the soil, and to award a recompense therefor," a convincing proof that the true intention of the Bill is to prevent the landlord from ever recovering his rent, when it has once been suffered to fall into arrear, as an award made upon such principles would, in most cases, amount to more than the original value of the land.

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 monied men from the Island, as no one will be inclined, or can be expected to invest capital in the purchase of land, which he 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.

That the true object of the Bill has been declared by the Hon. G. Coles, the leader of the Government, in his speech on the Escheat question, on the 29th day of March last, to be for the purpose of compelling the proprietors "to come in and offer their lands to the Government under the Land Purchase Bill."

That, if the royal assent be given to this Bill, it will be sanctioning a species of class, partial and unjust legislation, which cannot fai. to have a ruinous effect on the future prosperity of Prince Edward Island, and may be drawn into a precedent for any species of wrong and injury it may be the pleasure of an ignorant and interested majority in the Legislature to inflict upon either individuals or bodies of men.

The undersigned, therefore, most humbly pray that Your Majesty will be graciously pleased to take the premises into your royal consideration, and withhold your royal allowance from the said Bill. And Your Majesty's petitioners, as in duty bound, shall ever pray.

Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, 19th June, 1855.

(Signed) ROBERT BRUCE STEWART,
Proprietor of Lots 30, 7, 10, 12, ½ of Lot 47, parts of Lots 46 & 47, and Lennox Island.

ROBERT RENNIE,
Agent for D. S. RENNIE, Proprietor of part of Lot 23.

D. HODGSON,
Proprietor of part of Lot 23.

LADY WOOD,
By her Attorney, SAML. NELSON, Lots 67 & 50.

M. M. FANNING,
By her Attorney, SAML. NELSON, owner part Lot 24.

CHAS. PALMER,
For self & others, owners of ½ Lot 1.

JOHN R. BOURKE,
Owner of part Township No. 36.

JOHN, ROBERT & GORDON THOMSON,
Of Belfast, Ireland, owners of part Township No. 26,
By their Attorney, J. R. BOURKE.

REVD. JOHN McDONALD,
Chichester, England, owner of part Township No. 37,
By his Attorney, J. R. BOURKE.

JOHN ARCHIBALD MACDONALD,
For self and others, owners of part of Lots 35 & 36.

CHAS. WRIGHT,
Owner of land on Townships Nos. 65 & 50.

PETER MACGOWAN,
On behalf of Sir JOHN HUNTER LITTLER, G. C. B.,
Owner of Lands on Towhships Nos. 37 & 38.

ELLEN STEWART,
For self and sisters, owners of ½ Lot 18.

HATTON H. STANFIELD,
Township No. 54, per his Attorney, G. W. DEBLOIS.

P. D. STEWART,
Owner of Lands in Lot 48.

MARY L. B. IRVING,
Owner of Land on Lot 18.

WM. DOUSE,
Agent for the Trustees of the late EARL OF SELKIRK, for parts of Township Lands.

WM. BOWLEY,
By WM. DOUSE, his Attor'y, for part of Township 40.

JAMES MONTGOMERY,
For part of Townships 34, 51 & 59, by his Attorney, WM. DOUSE.

A. T. TODD,
Proprietor of part of Lot 19, by his Attorney, WM. FORGAN.

T. H. HAVILAND,
Proprietor of Lot 56 and ⅓ part of Lot 43, by T. HEATH HAVILAND, his Attorney.

WM. H. POPE,
As Agent for CAPT. & MRS. CUMBERLAND, owners of ½ Township No. 65, and lands in Charlottetown and Royalty.

JAMES H. CONROY,
For Lands on Townships 38, 45 & 26.

FRANCIS HENRY BYRNE,
ANNA MATILDA BYRNE,
CHAUCY HARE TOWNSHEND,
ELIZA FRANCES TOWNSHEND,
CHAS. LAPIN DE ST. ROMAIN,
HENRIETTA JANE DE ST. ROMAIN,
By ROBT. STEWART, their Attorney for part of Townships Nos. 46 & 48.

MATILDA G. CUNNINGHAM,
By ROBT. STEWART, her Attorney for part of Townships Nos. 46 & 48.

Heirs of JAMES DOUGLAS,
By their Attorney, ROBT. STEWART, for part of Township No. 19.

WM. CUNDALL,
Proprietor of part of Lot 20.

(COPY.)

The Petition of certain Owners of Township Lands, against the Rent Roll and Tenants' Compensation Acts.

To the Right Honorable Sir William Molesworth, M. P., Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonial Department, &c.

THE HUMBLE PETITION OF THE UNDERSIGNED OWNERS OF TOWNSHIP LANDS IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND—

We, the undersigned resident owners of land in Prince Edward Island, beg leave to approach the Principal Secretary of State for Her Majesty's Colonies, with feelings of the most profound veneration and respect for Her Majesty's Person and Government, but with just grounds of apprehension as to the consequences that may result to your petitioners from certain recent local enactments, calculated seriously to affect Township Lands and the security of property generally throughout this Island, which enactments having suspending clauses annexed to them, cannot go into operation until Her Majesty's assent be first given thereto.

Various reasons urged by your petitioners and other landowners against the royal allowance being extended to the measures in question, were respectfully submitted in three several petitions from this Colony, two of which dated June 4th and June 19th, 1855, were handed to the Lieut. Governor for transmission to the Secretary of State, and one dated June the 4th, was forwarded direct to the Colonial Office, a copy of which letter has since been sent out to the Lieut. Governor, in order that he may report to the Colonial Minister thereon; and in consequence of the change which has since taken place in the head of the Colonial Department, your petitioners humbly presume at this stage of the proceedings to pray, that their representations may receive such further considerations as may be thought due to the circumstances of the case, and the peculiar hardships they complain of.

In respect to an "Act for imposing a rate or duty on the Rent Rolls of the Proprietors of Township Lands," it will be seen by two of the petitions mentioned, that this measure, though ostensibly in the light of an income tax, is in reality an additional burthen on real estate, of a peculiarly harsh and oppressive kind; and is meant to bear exclusively on one particular class of Her Majesty's subjects, whose property in this Colony is already taxed in an unequal ratio to its value, as compared with other landed property of a more profitable description. All persons entitled to rent for over five hundred acres of Township Land, are to be liable to the proposed tax, whether such rent can be collected or not, and it will be further apparent by the terms on which land is usually let in this Colony, (namely, about one shilling and a penny farthing, currency, per acre, and from that in some few cases up to two shillings per acre), *that eighteen pounds ten shillings and fivepence sterling* is the rent usually accruing due, per annum, from the above quantity of Land; which rents on the average are far from being regularly paid. All persons therefore, entitled to that amount and upwards of yearly rental, are subject to the provisions and penalties of the Act; and this brings the minimum of liability greatly below that to the present income tax in England; which, your petitioners submit, seems neither fair nor reasonable in a comparatively young country, where owners of land have yet numerous difficulties to contend with, and are now sought to be burthened with an onerous impost, from which all other colonists are exempt, both in this and the neighboring Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

It will also be observed that the possession of the property in the Town, or Royalties of Charlottetown Georgetrwn and Princetown, does not render the owners thereof in any way liable to the said tax; though on what principle of equity or justice such property should be exempt therefrom, if the tax be just and necessary, it would be difficult for the framers and supporters of the Act in question to explain, as in Charlottetown and Royalty in particular, there is much valuable property, from which considerable rents and profits are derived; and the following *data* will convey some idea of the value of such property, as compared with that of Township lands. The valuations are taken from the report of sworn assessors appointed under a Colonial statute.

Charlottetown alone comprises 492 lots of about one-third of an acre each, and the Royalty and Common contains over 600 lots of 12 acres each; five town lots in the fifth hundred (Nos. 23, 24, 25, 68 & 69), but with one dwelling thereon erected, are rated at £120 yearly value, gardens and out-houses included; and the tenant, or if unlet, the owner thereof is liable only to three-pence in the pound assessment, under the Education Act. Each lot in the Town, Common and Royalty, is also liable to the small land tax of two shillings currency per annum; whereas wilderness and unprofitable Township lands are assessed at nine shillings and two-pence per hundred acres, yearly, whether the same is capable of being brought into cultivation or not, being nearly one and a-quarter per cent, or the maximum price offered for the best Township land by the Government, under the Land Purchase Bill.

Three lots adjoining Queen Street, fronting on the water, and containing less than an acre of ground, are assessed (buildings included), at £250 per annum, and one other lot adjoining Pownal Street at £140, while various lots and parcels of lots, occupied in each case by individuals as business stands or otherwise, are assessed, one at £150, two at £120 each, four at £100 each, and from that gradually lower; yet all incomes derivable from property, whether in the Towns or Royalties, are to be exempt from the proposed tax: Two Breweries and Distilleries are rated one at £100, and the other at £120; and thus it will appear that the estimated value of three small lots in Charlottetown, (improvements thereon included), is equal to what is offered by the Government for 13,300 acres of the most productive Township land in the Island.

Why property of the above description, which in case of invasion, would be the very first to suffer from the fire and depredations of an enemy, should be wholly exempted from a tax, the implied object of which is to provide for the defence of the Colony, may possibly be in a measure accounted for, by its being owned, in three of the cases referred to, by gentlemen who were members of the Executive Government, and leading men in the Legislature, at the time the Bill was passed, as will appear by the names mentioned in the margin; the last named gentleman having only resigned his seat at the Executive Board about six weeks ago, when on the eve of his departure for England; but he still holds his valuable property in Charlottetown.

Honbles.
Chas. Young,
George Coles,
W. W. Lord.

The very title of the Act, in the opinion of your petitioners, implies a departure from Her Majesty's Instructions, as no two objections can be more essentially dissimilar, than *providing an armed force for the defence of the Colony*, and *the further encouragement of Education;* yet in that part of the Royal Instruciions which relates to the passing of laws, it is distinctly and expressly enjoined "that each different matter be provided for, by a different law, without including in one and the same Act such things as have no proper relation to each other." And this circumstance, your petitioners submit, affords tangible proof that the object of the Legislature in passing the Bill, was not what appears on the face of it, but in reality was to harass and oppress a particular class of Colonists, with whose interests those of a majority in the Assembly, having little or no stake in Township lands, do not happen to be identified.

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, it 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 god understanding usually supposed to exist between the Govenor 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. The suspending clause, therefore, seems the only safeguard against the enactment of oppressive statutes in the Colonies, the addition of which, to all Acts of an unusual and extraordinaay tendency, has been strenuously enforced by the Crown, since Governments were first established in the North American Dependencies. And your petitioners venture to express a hope, that the benefit of that clause will not be denied to their several and respectful petitions against the measures referred to, viz:—No. 1. "An Act to impose a rate or duty on the Rent Rolls of the Proprietors of certain rented Township lands in Prince Edward Island, in order to defray the expenses of any armed force which may be required on account of the withdrawal of the troops, and for the further encouragement of Education." And—No. 2. "An Act to secure Compensation to Tenants in Prince Edward Island, and thereby to promote the improvement of the soil." Why your petitioners are thus harassed, has been explained in former representations addressed to the Colonial Office on the subject, the leader of the local Government having declared in the Assembly, that his object is to compel the owners of Township lands to sell them to the Government, under the provisions of an Act enabling the local authorites to re-sell and dispose of the same to their numerous friends and adherents. This species of legislation, if sanctioned, will render nugatory various gracious Acts of favour and indulgence, conferred upon the original grantees and their heirs by Her Majesty's royal predecessors, which may not be specifically enumerated here. And your petitioners beg leave respectfully to impress on your consideration, that the lands in Prince Edward Island have in many cases descended to their present owners through three successive generations, having become subject in some cases to securities for debt, settlements for dower, testamentary and other provisions, and the titles to them were in various instances acquired upwards of eighty years ago, amidst the hardships and privations incident to an infant Colony. The deprivation of lands so held, under a harsh and compulsory system of legislation, adopted to suit party purposes, and persevered in from interested motives, cannot fail greatly to unsettle the security of every description of property in this Island, to drive persons of capital away from it, an effect which is already being felt, and must also tend to lessen the confidence hitherto reposed in the protection of the Crown, and in the integrity of British institutions.

We, therefore, humbly pray that the foregoing and three other petitions on the subject of the said Bills—two of which, dated the 4th and 19th of June, 1855, were addressed to Her most gracious Majesty, and one dated the 4th of June, to the Right Honorable Lord John Russell—may be taken into consideration along with the said Bills; and we further pray, that on the grounds stated, you will be pleased to recommend Her Majesty to disallow the said Bills. And your petitioners shall ever pray, &c. &c. &c.

(Signed)

R. BRUCE STEWART,	ELLEN STEWART,
SAMUEL NELSON,	MARY STEWART,
JOHN A. McDONALD, For self and brother,	MARY D. B. IRVING,
	CHARLES WRIGHT,
HENRY PALMER,	J. R. BOURKE,
JAMES H. CONROY,	J. W. E. WERE,
J. A. M. McDONALD,	WM. CUNDALL.

Charlottetown, P. E. Island, 27th August, 1855.

Extract from the Minutes of the Executive Council.

COUNCIL CHAMBER, 27th August, 1855.

At a Meeting of a Committee of the Executive Council.

His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor having submitted for the consideration of a Committee of the Executive Council, a Paper purporting to be a Petition of certain owners of Township Lands in Prince Edward Island, the object of which is to induce Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies to advise that the Royal Assent, shall not be given to two Bills transmitted to the Colonial Office, passed by the Legislature of this Island, at its last sitting—the one for imposing a Rate or Duty on the rent Rolls of the Proprietors of Township Lands,—and the other to secure Compensation to Tenants, and thereby to promote the improvement of the soil; and the Committee having taken the said Petition into their serious consideration, beg to report as followeth:—

May it please Your Excellency:

Before entering on the arguments urged by the Petitioners, we cannot refrain from remarking on the peculiar, unjust and malignant spirit exhibited by the manner in which they bring their case under notice. We allude to two allegations, totally groundless, made by these parties—the one against three Members of Your Excellency's Government,—the second, against the whole Body. In regard to the first, they certainly well know that the taxes existing on Lands already are applied to purposes of Education; and that of the Councillors of whose injustice they complain, neither the Honorable George Coles, (the iutroducer of the Education Bill), the Honorable Charles Young, nor the Honorable William W. Lord, derive the slightest benefit from that measure.

The other most objectionable statement is where the Petitioners speak of an Act "enabling the authorities to sell and dispose of lands purchased under the Land Purchase Bill to their numerous *friends and adherents.*" These Petitioners well know that the Land Purchase Bill gives the Tenants or Occupiers of improved Lands the right to purchase their occupations—be they friends or foes of any Administration—and that no part of it can bear the construction they have put on it.

We further beg to remark, that Charles Wright, Esquire, one of the subscribers to this Petition, has already endeavored to communicate with the Colonial Minister, without submitting his letter to Your Excellency, and although his endeavour was not permitted to take effect, the attempt exhibited the spirit in which these parties would act.

We now come to a part of this subject which is, if possible, even of more importance, namely, a renewal of the system by which every Act of the different Branches of the Legislature, in which Your Excellency especially is included, is, it appears, undergoing, not the revision of Her Majesty's Ministers, but of a Body unknown to the Constitution, and consisting of parties, for the most part, who, though unable to command attention in the local Legislature, nevertheless seek to counteract its decisions at the Colonial Office.

The people of this Island had reason to expect, that when Her Majesty graciously accorded to them what is commonly termed Responsible Government, this secret and baneful influence would be discarded, and the discussion of Island affairs no longer take place through the oratory of malcontents assembled in Downing Street, but in the Colonial Legislature. Far be it, nevertheless, from us to desire the doors of the Colonial Office to be shut against those who think they have reason to complain of the Government or local Legislature of this Island; but we cannot refrain from observing, that the frequent exercise of this principle, as we gather from the public Journals—exhibiting, as it does, a systematic opposition to every act of legislation, has a very injurious effect on the minds of the people of this Colony, and engenders very great distrust.

We are sorry to be obliged to add, that it is by this course of procedure alone, and by no salutary attempt to participate in or originate any act for the promotion of the general welfare, that the Proprietors of Land in this Colony are known, and it is the fundamental cause of their enjoying so little of the sympathy of its people.

Your Excellency has had so recently under your notice the Bills to secure Compensation to Tenants, &c., that we have not thought it necessary to trouble you on that subject.

A true Extract, which I certify,
CHARLES DESBRISAY, Clerk Ex. Council.

Copy of a Despatch from the Right Honorable H. Labouchere, Secretary of State for the Colonies, to His Excellency Lieut. Governor Daly, in reference to what is usually termed "The Land Question."

No. 3. DOWNING STREET, 21st December, 1855.

SIR;

Upon entering on the duties which Her Majesty has been pleased to confide to me, I could not avoid giving my most serious attention to the correspondence which has recently taken place with regard to two Acts of the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, to which Her Majesty's Government were unable to advise Her Majesty to give her assent.

2. I have at the same time found it a series of transactions, extending over a long period of years, which are marked by the continued efforts of a large portion of the resident inhabitants of the Island, either to abolish altogether, or materially to curtail the rights of the owners of landed property.

3. I will not now repeat arguments which have been urged on various occasions by my predecessors; it will be sufficient for me to express my decided opinion, that whatever character may properly attach to the circumstances connected with the original grants, which have been often employed against the maintenance of the rights of the proprietors, they could not, with justice, be used to defeat the rights of the present owners who have acquired their property by inheritance, by family settlements or for valuable consideration.

4. Seeing, therefore, that the rights of the proprietors could not be sacrificed without manifest injustice, I feel that it will be my duty steadily to resist by all means in my power measures similar in their character to those which were recently under the consideration of Her Majesty's Government.

5. I desire, however, at the same time to assure you, that it was with much regret that Her Majesty's advisers felt themselves constrained to oppose the wishes of the people of Prince Edward Island, expressed through their representatives, and that it is my earnest wish to be spared the necessity of authoritative interference in regard to matters affecting the internal administration of their affairs.

6. With regard to the main object which has been frequently proposed by a large portion of the inhabitants, namely, that some means may be provided, by which a tenant holding under a lease may arrive at the position of fee simple proprietor, I am anxious to facilitate such a change, provided that it be effected without injustice to the proprietors.

7. There are but two ways in which such a change could be effected. The first is the usual and natural one of purchase and sale between the tenant and the owner; and no reason appears as yet to have been stated why, if the tenants offer to the landowners the full value of the right and interest of the landowner, sales and purchases cannot be effected. It would