

# THE EXAMINER:

A WEEKLY JOURNAL OF POLITICS, LITERATURE AND NEWS.

EDWARD WHELAN]

This is true Liberty, when Free-born Men, having to advise the Public, may speak free.—EURIPIDES.

[EDITOR AND PUBLISHER

Vol. IV.

CHARLOTTETOWN, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND, MONDAY, APRIL 9, 1855.

No. 39.

## Colonial Legislature.

THURSDAY, March 29.

### COURT OF ESCHEAT.

After the order of the day had been gone into, Mr. Cooper moved, that the Speaker leave the Chair, and Mr. McDonald be Chairman of Committee of the whole House. Mr. Coles moved in amendment, that Mr. Haviland take the Chair.

Mr. HAVILAND objected as unfair to place him, one of the minority in the Chair, on a question of this importance.

Mr. COLES thought Mr. Haviland from his long experience and parliamentary knowledge, best suited to take the Chair on the occasion, Mr. McDonald was a young member.

Mr. HAVILAND was much obliged for the compliment, but stated his unwillingness to take the Chair, as he wished to speak to the question.

Mr. COLES urged the question, which being put was carried in the affirmative.

One of the petitions being read, praying for a Court of Escheat.

Mr. COOPER rose and said, anything from him would be of little use, unless he showed authorities, he would therefore first shew the condition of Forfeiture.

“And the said Grantees further bind and oblige themselves, their heirs and assigns, to settle the said Lot or Township hereby granted, within Ten Years from the date hereof, with Protestant settlers, in the proportion of one person to every Two Hundred acres—said Protestant settlers to be introduced from such parts of Europe as are not within His Majesty’s dominions, or to be such persons as have resided within His Majesty’s dominions of America, two years antecedent to the date hereof. And if the said Grantees shall not settle one third of the said Lot, or Township in proportion aforesaid, within four years from the date hereof, then the whole of the said Lot or Township shall become forfeited to His Majesty, his heirs and successors, and this grant shall be void and of none effect.”

Sir Alexander quoted a despatch of Lord Glenelg’s to show that as far back as the year 1787, the Inhabitants have sought the enforcement of the forfeiture, the settlement of the Tenantry in fee simple.

“This impression would seem to have originated as far back as the year 1787, and it may have derived some confirmation from the course pursued with regard to the forfeited Lots Nos. 15 & 55.”

About the year 1809 and up to 1802 the Ministers conceded that point, which we have in Governor Fanning’s Speech.

“I have the satisfaction to inform you, from the highest authority, that the public affairs of this Island have already attracted the attention, and been brought under the consideration of His Majesty’s Ministers, in a manner highly favourable to the late humble and dutiful representations, made on behalf of the inhabitants, respecting the many large, unsettled, and uncultivated tracts of land, in this valuable Island.”

A Bill was passed for the purpose of revesting the forfeited Lands in the Crown, 2d April, 1803. About this time the Governor and others bought many Townships for small sums, and then they destroyed the Act which had the Royal assent.

[From proceedings of the House of Assembly 1805.]

“Resolved, That the proceedings of the Legislature of this Island, in passing the two Acts, namely, for enforcing the due and regular payment of Quit Rents—and for re-investing His Majesty with the unsettled Lands of this Island—were in direct conformity with His Majesty’s Royal Pleasure, signified by His Secretary of State, to the late Lieutenant Governor, General Fanning.”

“Resolved, That it appears to this Committee, and that they have the strongest reason to believe, that the Royal Assent to the said Act for re-investing His Majesty with such Lands as are or may be liable to forfeiture within this Island, has been graciously afforded by His Majesty.”

This agitation continued until the year 1805.

On Tuesday, 21 December, 1806.—“Ordered, on motion of Mr. Holland, that a Committee be appointed to draw up the heads of a new Bill, for the effectually re-investing in His Majesty such Lands in this Island as are liable to Escheat.”

The proceedings appear to have been quashed as the Committee made no report. In the year 1816 it appears, that the Governor made proclamation for the regular payment of Quit rent, and to alter the conditions of the grants.

“Whereas by my Proclamation, issued on the First day of October, 1816, it was notified that it was intended on the part of the Crown, to fix a Scale for future payment of Quit Rent, would commence on the 25th June in that year, and that the first half-yearly payment would be demanded on the 25th day of December following.”

“The further pleasure of His Royal Highness is, that the Proprietors of Township Lands shall be released from the obligation imposed by their original Grants of settling them with Foreign Protestants, provided that within Ten years from December 1816, the Lands shall have been settled with other persons in the proportions specified in their original Grants.”

About the same time Townships (15) and (55) were re-vested in the Crown by Escheats.

In the year 1825, Dr. McAulay moved for leave to bring in a petition from upwards of eight hundred inhabitants of this Island, praying that this House would address His Majesty, humbly to request, that His Majesty would be graciously pleased not to grant any further indulgence to the Proprietors of Townships to settle the same, than as already intimated by proclamation in the year 1816. Leave being granted, the said petition was read and ordered to lie on the Table.

Dr. McAulay, Chairman of the committee reported, that this committee considers the interference of the House with the measures of His Majesty respecting the enforcing or remitting the conditions of the Township grants in this Island, as at present premature.

The report of the Committee shows that the House considered any proceedings on the Land question premature. The Land question was again revived in the year 1832, and in the year 1833, the census was taken showing the No. of settlers in fee, and the No. of Tenants and Squatters upon each Township. Township 17 had 99, No. 28 had 91, settlers in fee simple.

The Attorney and Solicitor general were examined, touching the power of the Lieutenant Governor, to appoint a Court of Escheats and forfeitures.

Q. Is it your opinion that the Representative of His Majesty is competent to appoint a Court of Escheats in this Colony?

A. I am of opinion that it is competent for the Representative of His Majesty in this Colony, to appoint a Commissioner or Commissioners of Escheats within the same.

Q. Were such Courts appointed, would it be necessary to regulate their proceedings by a law of the island?

A. If such Courts were established, I am of opinion that it would be proper and necessary to regulate their practice and proceedings by law, and particularly to define the period of notice to be given, and how given, before proceeding to take an Inquest of Office for the purpose of re-vesting in His Majesty any Lands within this Island; and such law should also limit and fix a period for parties to come in and traverse any Inquest so taken.

Q. Is it your opinion that the Representative of His Majesty is competent to appoint Courts of Escheat in this Island?

A. Unquestionably.

Q. Were such Courts appointed, would it be necessary to regulate their proceedings by a Law of the Island?

A. It would not be absolutely necessary, it being the prerogative of the Crown to appoint all Courts of Justice, and to regulate their proceedings, provided they are conformable to the known laws of the Island; but it would be highly advisable, inasmuch as a regular course as well of re-investing the Crown with the Lands liable to Escheat, as to point out the mode in which those who think themselves aggrieved may traverse the Inquisition.

In 1839, the Lieut. Governor submitted to the House of As-

sembly, a correspondence between the Colonial office, and Sir Charles Saxton conveying the following information.

In regard to the second Query which you have submitted, I have to inform you, that His Majesty’s Government cannot undertake to make a fresh Grant to Proprietors redeeming their Quit Rents.

The last point upon which you desire information is the mode in which parties desiring of effecting a commutation of their Quit Rents should proceed, in order to effect that object. Upon this subject, I have to refer you to the authorities within the Colony, by whom the details of the plan will be arranged, and to whom the commutation money should be paid.

This despatch of Earl Grey, 12th Feb, 1851, will leave more than one interpretation.

“Sir—On your proceeding to assume the Government of Prince Edward Island, I am particularly anxious to direct your attention to a question which, perhaps, affects more than any other the political and social well-being of its community.

It appears to me of the highest importance that some satisfactory arrangement of it should now take place, when the inhabitants of the Island are soon about to exercise a still larger share of control over its public affairs than they have hitherto enjoyed.

I allude to the subject of the Landed Tenures.

“But while thus maintaining the law, you will also use the influence which you may possess to induce the owners of lands and their tenants to come to an amicable arrangement with each other, and give your best assistance, with a view to passing any legislative measure which may be required to complete such arrangement; but you will not fail to recollect, and to impress upon the Legislature, the necessity of abstaining from the introduction into such laws of any provisions which may infringe upon the rights of property.”

Contrast this Despatch of Earl Grey with the report of the Earl of Durham, who was sent to British North America to report the evils which existed in the governments of the several Colonies.

One of the most remarkable instances of evils resulting from profuse grants of land is to be found in Prince Edward’s Island. Nearly the whole of the island (about 1,400,000 acres) was alienated in one day, in very large grants, chiefly to absentees, and upon conditions which have been wholly disregarded. The extreme improvidence which dictated these grants is obvious; the neglect of the Government as to enforcing the conditions of the grants, in spite of the constant efforts of the people and the legislature to force upon its attention the evils under which they labour, is not less so.

The great bulk of the island is still possessed by absentees, who hold it as a sort of reversionary interest, which requires no present attention, but may become valuable someday or other through the growing wants of the inhabitants. But in the mean time, the inhabitants are subjected to the greatest inconvenience, nay, to the most serious injury, from the state of property inland. The absent proprietors neither improve the land, nor will let others improve it. They retain the land, and keep it in a state of wilderness.

“The history of Prince Edward Island, so far as relates to the system of land-granting, is most brief. The whole of the land was granted in one day to absentee proprietors upon terms which have never been fulfilled. To this original profusion may be attributed all the evils under which this island has laboured, and to which, in spite of unremitting exertions on the part of the provincial legislature to enforce upon the Home Government the necessity of applying some remedy, it is still exposed. In every other colony there has been such a degree of fashes upon the part of the Government as in equity to preclude it from any enforcement of the original conditions upon which grants were made; but in Prince Edward Island scarcely at any time have five years been suffered to elapse without some appeal to the colonial minister, praying that the Crown would resume the grants it had made, as a measure not merely legally justifiable, but as the only measure that could free the Province from the evils that these excessive grants had inflicted.

Upon one occasion the representations of the Assembly temporarily prevailed; process of escheat was adopted, and two townships were resumed by the Crown; but the influence of the absentee proprietors prevailed with the Home Government to stop the measures which had been commenced, and from that time to the present nothing has been done to enforce the settlement of the grants, the greater number of which yet remain chiefly in a wild state.

The repeated efforts of the legislature of the Island to compel the forfeiture of these grants, induced the Home Government, at the same time that it refused to accede to the measures proposed for the purpose, to recommend another measure as a substitute. Accordingly, Lord Goderich, when Secretary of State for the Colonies, suggested that a tax should be imposed upon all wild land, and this suggestion was repeated by Lord Stanley, and at a later period by Lord Glenelg. The Assembly, regarding such a measure as inadequate, declined at first to entertain it, but at length, finding that there was no chance of obtaining the sanction of the Imperial Government to any bill for the escheat of the waste lands, they passed an Act imposing a tax of 4 s. per 100 acres. This Act was reserved for the allowance of the King in Council, and upon the representations of the absentee proprietors, such allowance was refused.”

To understand the rights of property in wild Lands in a New Country, I shall quote from the highest Law authorities.

“And the art of agriculture, by a regular connexion and consequence, introduced and established the idea of a more permanent property in the soil, than had hitherto been received and adopted. It was clear that the earth would not produce her fruits in sufficient quantities, without the assistance of tillage; but who would be at the pains of tilling it, if another might watch an opportunity to seize upon and enjoy the product of his industry, art, and labour?”

The only question remaining is, how this property came actually vested; or what it is that gave a man an exclusive right to retain in a permanent manner that specific land, which before belonged generally to every body, but particularly to nobody. And, as we before observed, that occupancy gave the right to the temporary use of the soil, so it is agreed upon all hands, that occupancy gave also the original right to the permanent property in the substance of the earth itself; which excludes every one else but the owner from the use of it. There is indeed some difference among the writers on natural law, concerning the reason why occupancy should convey the right, and invest one with this absolute property; Grotius and Puffendorf insisting that this right of occupancy is founded on a tacit and implied assent of mankind the first occupant should become the owner; and Barbeyrac, Titius, Mr. Locke, and others, holding, that there is no such implied assent, neither is it necessary that there should be; for that the very act of occupancy, alone, being a degree of bodily labour, is, from a principle of natural justice, without any consent or compact, sufficient of itself to gain a title.”—Blackstone’s Commentaries.

Mr. Locke says, “that the labour of a man’s body and the work of his hands, we may say are properly his. Whosoever then he removes out of the state that nature hath provided and left it in, he hath mixed his labour with, and joined to it something that is his own, and thereby makes it his property.” (On Gov. c. 5.)

“This universal principle we find well described in the Laws of Menu, Son of Brahma, “Sages who know former times, pronounce cultivated land to be the property of him who cut away the wood, cleared and tilled it; and the antelope, of the first hunter, who or who mortally wounded it.” Sir Wm. Jones, 341.

In taking a review of the Extracts which I have read, I may remark, that wherever the royal assent is given to any acts or document, it is given in council, and will be found upon the most close enquiry, to be just and equitable. But whenever we find, that Ministers or Governors have made use of the name of the Sovereign to serve one party, and injure others, all such acts are contrary to the royal intentions, and in opposition to good government.

By the conditions of the Grants, the Grantees were to settle their Grants within four years, with Foreigners, or the Grants were void and of no effect.

Aliens could not be Freeholders, and to place British subjects in the position of aliens, was to deprive British subjects of their birth-right; but this was not intended by the grants, wherein it is made plain, that if the Grants were not settled with foreigners, within four years, the grants were void, and the lands were to revert to the Crown; this is the express act and order from the Sovereign, and if it had been obeyed, and acted upon, British subjects would have obtained land directly from the Crown.

The first petition of the people, for an Escheat of the forfeited lands, commenced in the year 1787, and it appears to have been followed up, until their applications received

the favorable consideration of the Home Government, in the year 1802, when instructions were given to the Governor here, that the forfeited Lands should be re-vested in the Crown.

In the year 1838, Lord Glenelg signified, that the government could not make a new grant, and consequently could not alter the conditions of the first grants by any indulgence. In the year 1839, the Earl of Durham the Governor General of this Island, gave in his report to the Queen, to show, that to resume the forfeited grants was not only legally justifiable; but the only way to relieve the people from the evils, the grants had inflicted. And according to the purchase Bill, which received the royal assent lately; it is enacted, that the government shall not purchase any lands, until the title has undergone an investigation, and it was the opinion of the Crown Law Officers in the year 1832, that the Governor had full power, to constitute a court of Escheats and forfeitures, to investigate the titles of land liable to forfeiture. This is the first side of the case which is perfectly in accordance with royal intentions, and now for the other side of the case which is contrary to the Royal intentions. When the people were applying to the Home Government, for an Escheat of the forfeited Lands, between the years 1787 and 1802, they in their innocence believed, they had the Governor and the Colonial authorities on their side; but they were greatly deceived, for when an Escheat was apparently on the point of being granted, it reduced the value of the Grantees’ claims to a mere trifle, and while the Colonial authorities and leading men in the Island, appeared to go with the people for an Escheat, they were negotiating with such of the Grantees (as were not in the secret) for their Townships, and when they, the colonial authorities, had a sufficient number of Townships in their own hands, the Bills which the legislature had passed in the year 1803, with the Royal assent, which was to re-vest the Crown with the forfeited Lands, were destroyed after they were returned to the Island, it was said, by the Governor himself, General Fanning, and by such means British subjects were deprived of their birth right, by conspirators. Working men wanted land, and they had no other way to obtain land, but as aliens, to become tenants, but as the people were dissatisfied with the Colonial authorities, and new proprietors, it became necessary for them to remove the blame from themselves upon Ministers, and accordingly the Governor obtained despatches from the Colonial office and made proclamation in the year 1818, giving the grantees indulgence for ten years, to settle their grants with any persons; but although the Governor gave indulgence to some of the grantees, he did not give it to all, and although he bound the Tenantry, he did not bind himself, for about the same time the indulgence was proclaimed, he escheated two Townships, to give grants of Land, to his family and dependants, for them to sell again to working men. I believe the despatches from Ministers have been sought for by the colonial authorities, and proprietors, to discourage all application for an Escheat of the forfeited Lands, and Minister’s despatches in general, will bear two or three constructions, and although they have discouraged an Escheat, they have never said, that we are not intitled to it. Earl Grey, in his despatch says, he is bound to adhere to the decisions repeatedly given by his predecessors; but no decision has been given: a decision in a case, where the liberty and property of fifty or sixty thousand people are at stake, must be settled by higher authorities than a Minister’s despatch. Now, if the first side of the case is consistent with the British constitution, and honorable to the sovereign, the latter is quite the reverse. By the first, British subjects would have retained their birth-right, and their freedom, and would have obtained land from government at a moderate price to be paid into the Treasury, for public improvement. By the latter, British subjects have been treated as aliens, and made bondsmen to defaulters, who gained £100 a man for deceiving him; or one pound an acre for the land he had forfeited, which sums went to reward impostors, and enable them to corrupt a party to serve them; if the first was the advice of faithful public servants to the sovereign, the latter is the actions and language of traitors. I need not quote the charter, which is printed up behind the chair. For I think it will be allowed, that in the compact between the sovereign and the subjects; that the sovereign shall not treat the subjects as aliens, nor authorize one subject to make bondsmen of other subjects, so as to deprive them of their property, neither shall the sovereign authorize any Minister or Governor to dig a pit, or lay a snare for working men coming into this Island, which they, as a matter of course, must fall into and be deprived of the improvement they make upon the land, nor shall any servant of the Crown forbid the laws to be put in force, which law would release British subjects from bondage and restore them to their rights, of which they have been deprived; such acts when perpetrated are not to be imputed to the sovereign, they are the acts of traitors, who disobey and dishonor the sovereign, and bring the imperial government into disrepute.

When persons having no other claim to the Land but a forfeited grant, and no authority in law or equity to demand rent but a corrupt Colonial Government, to suspend the Law by an unconstitutional despatch from Ministers; so that the title of the Land should not be tried, it became an easy matter for impostors to deceive ignorant labouring men, and make them believe that they were the owners of the Land and had an indulgence from the sovereign to make any persons atorn to them. But this is not the truth, it is quite the reverse; it is a deliberate falsehood with a fraudulent intent to deprive British subjects of their birth-right, and to a share of the public Land; but such acts are not to be imputed to the sovereign, they are the acts of a colonial government, corrupted by the property extorted by fraud from the people, with a license from Ministers to suspend the trial of the title to the Land, and employ troops to collect the rents imposed by fraud!

Yet that same Minister, Earl Grey, in his Despatch, says, that the settlement of the Land Question is a matter of the highest importance to the political and social well-being of our community; but the Honourable, the Leader of the Government, says, it is a mere will-o-the-wisp; and a majority of this House, the Representatives of those defrauded and oppressed men, decided, that the subject was unworthy of being considered in Committee on the State of the Colony.

But, the witticisms of the Leader of the Government, with his will-o-the-wisp, and loose-fish, although they are not the most elegant phrases, are very significant; and if rightly understood, may throw some light on the subject.

What I have understood by a will-o-the-wisp, it is a light floating or dancing over bogs and pits, and bewildered travellers who follow it, in expectation of its being the light of a house where they might find a comfortable lodging to rest in, generally find themselves in a bog, and the indulgence of 1816, and Minister’s Despatches on the Land Question, were all will-o-the-wisps to bewilder the people and lead them astray, and not only the labouring people, but their Representatives also.

But when the Honourable Colonial Secretary, speaks with so much contempt of the two or three loose-fish, I can only infer, that he means that the rest are in his net or have swallowed the bait, and taken the hook. But if it is so, it is a poor prospect for the defrauded Tenantry, to find their Representatives upon the hook, or in the net of the Colonial Secretary. But, if it should prove true, that their Representatives have other ends to serve than the interests of their constituents, the people will have to take their case into their own hands, and make a better return next time. It is my desire, as much as my duty, to support Responsible

Government, but it is not parties but principles that direct me, for instance, when it is intended to pay the expenses of one Branch of the Legislature without making them elective, they are no longer responsible to the people in any way, and when the Government dispense with one part of an Act, and execute another part, that is, to purchase the Land without an investigation of the titles, this is not liberal, of the Government as they professed, but the reverse, they are supporting defaulters and deceivers and punishing the deceived and defrauded, and therefore, I cannot support such measures neither shall bait, hook, or net drag me into supporting the like. The highest Law authorities say, that it is a principle of justice, allowed by mankind in general, that whoever reclaims Land from its natural wild state, and brings it under cultivation at his own cost and labor, has the best right to the Land. But our Colonial Government, having left the forfeited Land in the hands of the defaulters, and the ungranted and reserved Lands, for any impostor to assume an ownership over it, without cost or labour, and if they can, by any means of deceit, make the labouring man atorn to them as their Landlord, our Government maintains, that any such attornment, however fraudulently imposed, gives defaulters and impostors, the best title to the Land, together with the Tenant’s improvements. In the Earl of Durham’s the Governor-General’s Report, it is declared, that for the Crown to resume the forfeited grants, is not only lawful and justifiable, but the only way to free the people from the evils such grants have inflicted.

But our liberal Government maintains, that the only way to settle the people, is for the Government to purchase the Land, not from defaulters and impostors, at first hand for three shillings an acre, but at second hand, and at double prices from forestallers at 6s an acre, so that they may sell it again to the defrauded people, at twelve shillings and sixpence an acre. In the purchase Bill it is enacted, (and that Act has the Royal Assent) that before the Government can purchase any Land, the Commissioner shall cause the title of such Land to be investigated, and report the results, of such investigation to the Government, but the Government have thought proper to dispense with that part of the act, and being a secret tribunal, they investigated the titles to suit purposes, they examined the trustees but all the Government knew that the titles was forfeited, but they preferred making the tenants pay 12s 6d an acre for their land to an investigation of the titles according to Law.

The fifth section of the Purchase Bill, declares that

It shall be the duty of such “The Commissioner of Public Lands,” from time to time, when any such tender for the sale of lands shall be referred to him by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, to examine into the same, and the descriptions and particulars thereof, and to investigate, or cause to be investigated, the title of such lands, and he shall make a report of the result of such examination and investigation to the Government.

If the Government were to purchase the rest of the Land at the same price it would incur a debt of £300,000, to be paid by labouring people who were defrauded of defaulters impostors and forestallers for purposes of corruption. But if the titles of the Lands were publicly investigated it would in all probability yield from £100,000 to £150,000 for the Colonial Treasury to be employed in public improvements, and the Resolution which I am to move is to carry out the investigation of the titles more generally according to the intentions of the act.

Mr. COOPER, then moved the following Resolution which was seconded by Mr. Laird.

“Whereas Her Majesty has been graciously pleased to give her assent to an Act for the purchase of Lands on behalf of the Government, and it is provided in the Fifth Section, that it shall be the duty of the Commissioners to investigate, or cause to be investigated, the Titles of such Lands, and make a report of the results of such examination and investigation to Government; and whereas the Titles of such Lands were to have been made perfect by the performance of certain conditions, Resolved, Therefore, that a Court of competent Jurisdiction be appointed to investigate and decide upon the Titles of all Lands liable to forfeiture, and also, to try the fraud in practice, to make British subjects Tenants upon forfeited Lands, instead of aliens as intended by the grant.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—Mr. Chairman, after the long written address with which the hon. member has favored the committee, I shall direct his and their attention to a few despatches and other documents which have a bearing on this subject, and of the nature of which the hon. member was well aware, although it did not suit his purpose to refer to them. As I think he is a little astray on this subject, I shall endeavour to set him right, and before adducing the documents I have alluded to, I will ask him, if he was not pledged to his constituents not to agitate this question?

Mr. COOPER.—No.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—Then all I can say is, that I have been misinformed, for it has been stated to me that the hon. member was pledged not to propose or advocate any measure which did not meet the approval of the liberal party. He knows that this measure has not their approval, and thus his constituents are deceived by him.

Mr. COOPER.—I deny it.

Hon. COL. SECRETARY.—Why, his election under such a promise proves the truth of my assertion and I can say further that he stated on the floor of this House, that he was pledged to support the liberal party. The hon. member seems to be very sore on the subject of my expression the other evening about the “loose fish,” and has thought fit to insinuate that those of the liberal party who do not choose to go with him on this question are acting from improper motives; that, as he expresses it, they are entangled in the meshes of a Government net, and have taken the bait. It is just possible, Mr. Chairman, that, in agitating this question, he sees, in imagination, a rich bait waiting for his acceptance. The observation about the “loose fish” were made by me in the discussion of a totally different question, the Legislative Council pay bill, but, sir, I contend that he is now even something more than a “loose fish” in the liberal ranks, for he cannot deny that he was pledged not to go for any measure which should not be approved by the liberal party. As to his observation that the men of to-day are not the men of yesterday, implying that I have changed my opinions on this subject, I can tell him that no member of the House can vote on this question with more freedom than myself. From my first introduction into public life to the present hour, I have always stated that I would not vote for Escheat, and I have so expressed myself, not that I was unfavorable to it, but because I considered that the agitation of the question would be productive of no good results as the object was unattainable. Believing that Escheat was impracticable, I have introduced and carried other measures for the benefit of the people at the expense of the proprietors. This course I promised my constituents at my first election that I would pursue. They approved of it and returned me, and I have been returned to this House at every subsequent election, and I have followed the same policy of dealing with the land question, moderately, but to some practical effect. Under these circumstances I consider myself at perfect liberty to oppose the resolution of the hon. member and in doing so, I shall endeavor, as the common saying is, to give it a black eye. (Laughter.) The hon. member has attempted to prop up his case, and injure the Government, by asserting that, before the purchase of the Worrel Estate, they did not