ordinary that the h[illegible] hon. member should try to fix the tenants to the 20 years' pu[illegible] the te[illegible]ease. As to the arbitration clause, I do not see how the [illegible]ants are to receive much benefit from that—for they are bound to pay the back rents since 1858, and the current rents do not cease until the whole amount is paid up. They are only to receive credit for the instalments they may pay on account of the purchase money. Now a tenant, owing rent from 1858, will have, before he can purchase the freehold of his farm, to pay £27 as arrears. How many are in a posision to do that? Much has been said about the Worrell Estate, and perhaps, Sir, the Government have no objection to that property proving a loss to the country; at least, it would appear so, if we may judge from the way they are managing it. They have sold to one individual, 300 acres on that estate for only 5s. an acre, and this lot is of better quality than any part of the Selkirk Estate. When the present majority was in opposition, we constantly heard their complaints that the Worrell Estate would ruin the country—that the sooner it was sold off at auction, and the Land Office closed, the better for the public. Well, Sir, would it be any wonder if a loss should result from that property, when the Government are disposing of it at 5s an acre, while they are asking 10s. or 12s. an acre for lands on the Selkirk Estate and Lot 54? We were told, last evening and this morning, by members of the Government and their supporters, that it was necessary that we should pass this address as soon as possible, in order that our address of condolence to the Queen should be sent by the first mail to England. But we found them occupying the time of the House till 2 o'clock to-day, and if they will spend the time of the House in bringing charges against the late Government, they must expect a reply. We have been taunted with having done nothing for the country. That charge comes strangely from the members of the present Government, which has done nothing but run the country into debt, and cause distress to the tenantry. The liberals came into power under every disadvantage. They assumed the Government in opposition to the party which had been in possession of the Government for half a century. The most influential people in the community asserted that Responsible Government would ruin the country; but, Sir, that system first gave to the people the control over their own affairs. It was the same system which obtained in Canada, New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia. It enabled the people to turn out of office, any Government, whether liberal or tory. Why, Mr. Chairman, the Education Act, alone, was in many cases, equivalent to the remission of rent, for, previously, a poor man, educating four or five children, would have to pay as much as his rent would amount to. Again, there was the 1-9th bill. When the Currency Bill was introduced by a then member of this House, since deceased, and read first time, I considered that as it then stood, it would compel the tenantry to pay 18d to the shilling, as it recognized the English shilling at 1s. 6d. I stated my opinion to the late Mr. McLean, who did not object to it, and the 1-9th clause was, in consequence, inserted in the Bill when in Committee. When the measure was sent up to the Council, it was, through the influence of Sir Donald Campbell, sent back to the House with a suggestion that it should be altered, by making the 1-9th clause the subject of a separate Act. The suggestion was adopted, and then in violation of their pledges, the Council passed the Currency Bill, but threw out the other. The 1-9th Bill was opposed by the Tory party in the House, and in the Council it was vehemently resisted. When the liberals came into power we carried the measure in spite of the opposition of the old party. The tenants will find the benefit of that measure, if the Award is adopted. I have not time to enumerate all the acts we introduced for the benefit of the tenantry. But I will mention one. The tenant's compensation Bill—that was a just and equitable measure. It was rejected by the Secretary for the Colonies, because, in England, they were unwilling to assent to it, fearing that if they did so, they would have to pass a similar measure for Ireland. The Bill provided an arbitration as to the value of the tenants' improvements, when the landlord was turning him out of possession; yet we are now charged with hypocrisy, for opposing the arbitration clause in the Award. Hon. members who make that charge should get looking glasses, which would, perhaps, enable them to see as great hypocrites as any in the Island. It has also been stated that the liberals are now advocating Escheat, after having opposed it when in power. I have not heard of their having done so, but I said, when the Commission was talked of, that if the whole Land Question was to be referred to a Commission, we might as well have Escheat at once. Twenty years ago, I said it would be better to give the proprietors a small sum for their lands than contend hopelessly for Escheat. The late Government did what they considered beneficial to the interests of the people, by the Land Purchase Bill, but several of the present Government party voted for Escheat, and the present leader of the Government, when in this branch of the Legislature, stated he wouldnot regard despatches, and did and said all he could to embarrass the Government of the day. No wonder that gentleman should support the Award. A large portion of Lot 1 is ownedby his family; now the doubtful title is to be confirmed and the Fishery Reserves are to be given to the proprietors. The reservation of 1500 acres, which the Award allows the landlord to retain, does not limit themto wilderness lands, and if each of the several owners of Lot 1 choose to keep in his possession the full compliment of 1500 acres, the wholewould be retained. The Montgomery Estate, Lot 34 is owned by, I believe, three parties.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—They, and all the other proprietors, with whose properties I have any connection, are opposed to the Award.

Hon. Mr. COLES—Well, Mr. Chairman, this shows that if the Award should be confirmed, and the tenants on Lot 34 should even offer to pay 20 years' purchase for their holdings, the reservation clause would enable the proprietors to retain just so many of the present tenants as they might select to remain in that state forever. We have been told that the Award, if favorable to the tenantry, would be confirmed by the Government. When the subject of the Commission was first introduced into this House, their decision, it was stated, was to be final and conclusive. The Commissioners themselves said so, and this declaration induced the people to come forward with their evidence. That reminds me that the Government did not comply with the instructions from the Secretary of State, on the subject of providing what evidence might be necessary to enable the Commissioners to proceed with their investigation as soon as they arrived in the Island. The Government deny that they received a despatch to that effect. It is true that a notification appeared in the Royal Gazette, but I know that the copy of the Gazette, containing that notice, did not reach my house until after the Commissioners had opened their Court. How then could the people in the country be sufficiently informed to enable them to prepare their evidence to go before the Commissioners? And, Sir, notwithstanding that we were at first told that all the proprietors were to be bound by the Award, we are now informed that it will affect only those who have signed their consent to the Commission, and the hon. member of the Government, Mr. Haviland, says that even they are opposed to it. No good will result from the Award, although the leader of the Government says that it is better than he expected. Of that, Sir, the people will have to judge. That hon member also stated that a great boon would be conferred on the tenants by the remission of the arrears of rent up to 1858, and stated the amount of them at £30,000 or £40,-000. Assuming these figures as correct, it should be borne in mind that there are about £200,000 arrears of Quit Rents due by the proprietors, and it cannot be shewn that they have been forgiven. A conditional offer of their remission was made, but as it was not accepted; those Quit Rents are therefore in the same position as they were sixty years ago.

Hon. Col. GRAY—Mr. Chairman, the hon. leader of the Opposition has gone over a great deal of ground, a large portion of which is irrelevant to the question before the Committee. But there were one or two particulars in his speech, with reference to which I wish to make explanations. The statements to which I allude affect the Government, and the first of them has reference to the official conduct of a public officer, a gentleman who is most able and efficient in discharging the duties which his situation devolves upon him. An attack upon that officer necessarily involves censure on the Government which employs him. The gentleman to whom I refer is the Commissioner of Public Lands. The hon. Leader of the Opposition stated, that 300 acres of the Worrell Estate had been sold at the price of 5s. per acre, while for land of inferior quality, on the Selkirk Estate and Lot 54, Government were asking 10s. or 12s. per acre. Having heard this statement, I made it my business to enquire of the Commissioner of Public Lands the particulars of the sale referred to, and I found that, of the whole area of 300 acres, no more than 180 were fit for cultivation. The remaining 120 being not worth a farthing per acre. From this state of facts it will be seen that the price paid for the only available land was 8s. 6d. per acre. And with reference to the other part of the hon. member's charge, I have ascertained that land of better quality can be bought, on the Selkirk Estate and Lot 54, for 5s. per acre. I may mention also that the 300 acres are situate at a distance of some 6 miles from a road. The other matter has a personal reference. I allude to the assertion that the Leader of the Government had sent a letter to Belfast, advising that the Volunteers and Orangemen should turn out, to attend and take part in a public meeting in King's County. I now ask the hon. member which Leader of the Government he referred to?

Hon. Mr. COLES—I was not aware that there are two leaders of the Government.

Hon. Col. GRAY—The explanation I am about to give reminds me of an anecdote which was current in Canada *some* years ago. There was a gentleman there, of the name of McNab, who believing himself the head of the clan of that name, was in the habit of leaving at Government House, his card, inscribed "The McNab." After some time, another claimant of the title appeared and his right to the Chieftanship was asserted on his card, under the designation of "The *other* McNab." (Laughter.) I am happy to inform the hon. member that *the* Leader of the Government is the Hon. Edward Palmer, the President of the Executive Council. I am content to be recognized as the Leader of the Government *in this House*. This explanation will I trust be satisfactory to the hon. member. With regard to the alleged letter, if, as I presume, I am supposed to be the writer, especially as it is alleged to have been sent to Belfast, I am happy that I am present in this House to answer the statement of the leader of the opposition. And I now sir, before this Committee and the Country declare that it is utterly untrue and without the shadow of foundation. So far from having acted as asserted, I never put pen to paper, on the subject of a public meeting, except to decline an invitation to be present. And in that letter, I simply stated the reasons for my non-compliance with the request which I had received. Those reasons were two fold. In the first place, I mentioned that the state of my health would not justify my attendance, and further, that I did not consider it advisable to canvas an award not yet received. As a member of this House I do not consider myself as the representative of the people of Belfast alone. I am here, sir, to act, according to the best of my judgement and abilities, for the interests of the whole Island, and if I were guilty of conduct such as I have been charged with, I should consider myself unworthy of a seat in this Assembly. Every hon. member should consider himself as the representative of both friends and foes, and I would never sanction an assemblage of people of any particular political predilections, for the purpose of preventing a full and free discussion of all matters of public interest. Having made this statement, Mr. Chairman, I trust that the hon. leader will give me the name of the party from whom he received his information.

Hon. Mr. COLES—My informant is a member of this House, who was told it, by a person who was present at the meeting referred to.

Hon. Col. GRAY—If that hon. member is at present in the House, I trust he will rise and state the grounds on which he made the communication.

Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN—As I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that I am the party to whom the hon. member, Mr. Coles', observation applies, I may state that a Mr. Compton, whose christian name I am not acquainted with, informed me, that the hon. member, Col. Gray, had written to Captain Munn, of the Wood Islands, to muster his forces and proceed to the meeting at Montague Bridge, with a view of preventing the passage of any resolutions the liberals might propose, and supporting those introduced by the supporters of the Government.

Hon. Col. GRAY—I trust that the hon. member is satisfied with my disclaimer, and that he will ascertain, and let me have the name of his informant.

Hon. Mr. WIGHTMAN promised to do so. At a subsequent day, Mr. Wightman named Mr. Joseph Compton as his informant.

Hon. Mr. POPE—Mr. Chairman, the hon. leader of the opposition has asserted that the Government and the Colonial Secretary knew that Mr Wightman was in the Island, and that the latter had given him a letter, authorizing him to get information on the subject of his mission from the various public offices in the Island. I deny that such was the case, and as he has declared that his informant would not tell a lie, it is but fair that he should give his name, and I now call upon him to do so.

Hon. Mr. COLES declined doing so, without the authority of the party referred to, who, here peated, he did not believe, would state what was untrue.

Hon. Mr. POPE—The hon. member accuses the Government with occupying time unnecessarily, in this discussion. Sir, the Government and its supporters in the House are anxious to pass the address as speedily as possible; but how can it pass, without delay, when he and his party take up the time of the committee, day after day in talking of every matter they can possibly rake up, as foundations for attacks upon the Government? The charges thus made against the Government cannot go abroad, uncontradicted. The case of Mr. Wightman proves this. The leader of the opposition well knows that none of the Government but the Lieut. Governor and hon. Mr. Palmer were aware of that person being in the Island, nor what was his business, yet he gets up and publicly states that the whole Government knew all about him, and that the Colonial Secretary had given him facilities to prosecute his mission. His object is to prejudice the minds of the people against the Government, and, so long as he sees a chance of doing that, he cares but little for the truth or falsehood of his statements. Equally false and groundless is his assertion that the hon. member, Col. Gray, induced the people of Belfast to go out of Queen's County, to control a public meeting in King's. Although the leader of the Government in this House did nothing of the sort, I can recollect the time of my first election, when the hon. member, Mr. Whelan and a parcel of bullies from Charlottetown, came to overawe myself and my supporters, and prevent the people from recording their votes in my favor. The leader of the Opposition says that the Commission has caused distress to the tenantry. If such be the case, the people have only himself and his party to thank for it—as proprietors, seeing the hostility to the Award that they are continually exciting—by holding meetings in different parts of the country, denouncing the Award and passing resolutions praying for a dissolution, and abusing them through their press would be justified in treating them in a manner very different from that in which they otherwise would. The editor of the Opposition organ, the *Examiner*, at first condemned the Award, and now says that the Government are bound to confirm it. One part of it, they could not but approve, as it recommended a measure which they themselves introduced when they held office. I refer to the loan of £100,000. Now, if any good at all is likely to come from the Commission, they should support it; but if they were half as honest as they profess to be they would wait until the Award comes out, and not be trying to excite the minds of the people aginst it, before they know what it is. The proprietors, I believe, are generally opposed to the arbitration clause, and they have good grounds for endeavoring to have it rejected, when they can point to the meetings of the tenantry denouncing it. We have heard of Bonds and other securities taken for back rents. For myself, as owner of half of Lot 27, and as, since the 7th October last, agent for Lot 19, I can say that, to the best of my belief, I have taken no bond, note of hand, or other security for rent; nor have I issued a distress warrant, nor adopted any compulsive measures to collect arrears of rent, since the Commission was issued. But when I see the tenantry backing up the Opposition and abusing the Government of which I am a member, I will not promise to continue to act in the same manner. As the hon. member, Mr. Sinclair, said, the proprietors would be great fools if they did not take security for all that was due them. The Government has been accused of deception in connection with this Commission. It has been said that they were not sincere in the professions they made of expected benefits from it. Sir, the resolutions of this House, which led to the organization of the commission, speak for themselves. Remission of arrears of rent and the right of purchase are specially mentioned in them. At the time we passed, the resolutions I said I would support the commission, as, if it did no good, it could do no harm. I held out no false hopes to the people; but I believe good will arise to the tenants of those proprietors who assented to the commission. The remission of the large amounts of arrears will be a great boon to the poor people, and the self-styled liberals are doing their utmost to deprive them of it. And if the arbitration clause can be carried into operation, it would confer great advantages, and if the opposition sincerely desire to advance the interests of the tenants, they should put their shoulders to the wheel and assist the Government in giving effect to the Award instead of doing all they can in opposition to it. If they are of opinion that no good will result from the action of the Government on the land question, why do they not propose some measure on the subject? Perhaps the reason is that they are afraid that a declaration of their policy would turn the present Government out of power and bring them into office against their wishes. (Laughter.) In a late number of the *Examiner* the editor, the exponent of the views of the opposition stated that they would not like to take the reins just now—that the financial state of the colony would cause a great deal of trouble to them, and that therefore they had better not take office at present. (Laughter.) To revert to the subject of Mr. Wightman, or the Spy, as he has been called, other members of the Government have denied all knowledge of him, and for myself, I declare that I never saw him—never knew that he occupied an office in this building, whether it was the Grand Jury Room or any other apartment; and I have reason to believe that the officials employed in the building knew no more of him than I did. It appears that he was sent by the Commissioners with a letter to the Lieut. Governor, requesting that he might have access to the public records of the Island. How was His Excellency to act? Suppose he had refused compliance with that request. In that case the Government would have been charged with having burked the Commission by withholding necessary information after the Commission had expressly asked for it. If it be true, as has been stated, that Mr Wightman acted as some hon. members have alleged, I do not justify his conduct; but, Sir, are the Government responsible for his acts? The Commissioners sent him here, and I believe he was selected for the mission by the Hon. Mr. Howe, the Commissioner named by this House. In nominating that gentleman the majority manifested to the minority their desire of satisfying the tenantry, and they are entitled to credit for sincerity by selecting so great a liberal and known friend to the poor as the Hon. Mr. Howe. Whether good may or may not result from the Commission, it is our duty to wait until the result of it is before us. The House is pledged to carry out the Award in good faith. The Government has done its duty in the matter. The hon. member, Mr. Conroy, stated that the Spy travelled in company with friends of the proprietors, and it has been insinuated that he had been appointed by the Government; this has been done with a view of creating a prejudice against the Government. Mr. Wightman may have travelled with a friend of the proprietors in the district represented by the hon. member, but at Bedeque his companion was Mr. Edward Moynagh, who is not generally supposed to be very favorable to proprietors nor the Government. (Laughter.) However, I shall not take up more time in this stage of the discussion, which would not have arisen had it not been for the explanation of the Award, given from memory, by the Hon. Mr. Howe. I thought at the time, and am of the same opinion now, that it was injudicious on the part of that gentleman to give that explanation.

Progress reported.

THURSDAY MORNING, Feb. 27.

Committee on address resumed.

Mr. DOYLE—Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about this Award, and the Government have told us that the people will receive great benefit from it—that the tenantry will have the privilege of becoming freeholders on easy terms. But I, for one, do not see much prospect of that under the Award, as explained by the Hon. Mr. Howe. A tenant may tender to the proprietor a price he can afford to pay for the freehold of his land, but, if it is refused, how many of these tenants can incur the expense and annoyance of an arbitration? And what prospect is there that the influence of the proprietor will not prevail on the arbitration? In the case of Township lands owned by several proprietors, the right of reserving 1500 acres to each may take the whole Township out of the Award, and the tenant will not be in a position to have an arbitration, if he wished to do so. It may be said that no proprietor could do so, but on the lot on which I live, which is owned by the Messrs. Palmer, a letter was received from one of them, stating that he would not agree to be bound by the Award. Again, the Award does not affect the holders of leases for less than 40 years. In my opinion those are the very cases which are entitled to protection more than any others. For the poor people, who take such leases, may be turned out and lose their improvements at the expiration of their term. Looking at these facts, I cannot see the great boon that the people are to receive from the doings of the Commission. As to the Spy, the Government say that they knew nothing about him. I do not for a moment say that their statement is false, but it is certainly strange that they should have been so ignorant, for I saw him in my district, and the people generally were told that he had been sent on by a Company to see about the practicability of building a railroad and establishing a fishery, and that he was seeking information about the value of lands with a view to raising sheep. After these representations the people were asked what they valued their lands at, and, as might be expected, they asked more than double their worth. If the Commissioners did not think that the evidence that had been given in their presence was sufficient to enable them to come to a decision—if they thought that the people had told them untruths, and chose to take the evidence of a Spy in preference and base their award on that, I think, with the hon. member Mr. Owen, that it is quite immaterial whether the Award comes out or not.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—Mr. Chairman, I was not in the House when the hon. member commenced his speech, but that portion of it which I did hear was conceived in very bad taste. It is, in my opinion, unhandsome to abuse an absent man, who consequently has no means of answering for himself. I would rather see the adoption of the good old English practice of meeting an opponent face to face, and affording him an opportunity of replying to any charge against him, but the absent and the dead cannot repel any attacks upon their characters. It may be that, if the character of this person who has been stigmatized as a Spy, and accused of telling lies to deceive the people, were analyzed, he would be entitled to be considered as a gentleman fully as much as the hon. member himself. What authority is there for accusing Mr. Wightman of having told lies? Suppose he had asked a farmer what he would be willing to take for his farm, if a railroad should be constructed through or near it, or an extensive fishery established in its vicinity, there would be nothing improper in that. I have never heard that he said positively that a railroad or a fishery would be established. But, Sir, we are, as has been often said in the course of the debate, fighting with shadows. It will be quite time enough to discuss these matters when the Award is before us, and the range which the debate has taken shows that the Opposition care but little for the public time. I shall briefly reply to one statement which was made yesterday by the hon. member Mr. Conroy. He said that this Spy was sent either to the proprietors or to the Government. Sir, I challenge him to prove his assertion—to prove that he was sent to one or the other. For myself, as one member of the Government, I can state that I never knew of his having been in the Island until a day or two before the House rose. As to the inference drawn from the hon. member's assertion, that Mr. Wightman while at Tignish stopped at the house of a friend of the proprietors, I can tell him that the agents of Sir Samuel and Mr. Edward Cunard, of Mr Sullivan, nor my father, who is a proprietor, nor Mr. Cundall, never heard anything about him until the great discovery was made by outsiders.

Mr. CONROY—I wish to state that a gentleman of Tignish, with whom Mr. Wightman stopped, told me that he had stated the nature of his business, as I represented it. I told him then that Mr. Wightman was an impostor, and that I did not believe him.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—The Government do not and cannot know whether it was judicious or injudicious that Mr. Wightman should be sent here. That was the act of the Commissioners alone, and was matter for their judgment, and they alone are responsible for it. Neither the Government, the proprietors, or the tenants had anything to do with his employment. If the result of his employment should be advantageous to the people, the Commissioners will be entitled to the credit, if the reverse, they are liable to the odium. The hon. Leader of the Opposition harped a great deal on the fact that the Hon. Mr. Palmer knew that Mr. Wightman was here, and that, therefore, the Government should be held responsible. Now, Sir, suppose that gentleman had been told by the Lieut. Governor confidentially, and that the Commissioners wished the fact to be kept secret. It would be only a matter of common honesty and prudence that Mr. Palmer should not reveal it, even to his colleagues. And I contend that if it had been divulged, the press would have teemed with diatribes against the Government. The people would have been told that they could not expect any benefit from the Award, as the proprietors who held seats in the Government had got hold of the party sent to obtain evidence on the matters to be settled by the Commission—that the proprietary party would take care to put their case before him to the exclusion of the other side. When the Commission was once issued the Government had no control, the whole matter rested with the Commissioners. I admit that I think it would have been better if the Commissioners had, instead of employing Mr. Wightman, come back to the Island and judged for themselves, but the matter was wholly and solely within their own discretion. It will, however, be time enough to abuse Mr. Wightman when the evidence he collected, and the suggestions he has made to the Commissioners who employed him is made known. I have heard that he stated, while in the Island, that if the proprietors knew what he would report about them they would hang him. The Leader of the Opposition stated that the Government sanctioned his employment, basing his assertion on the fact that they had paid him. Why, Sir, what alternative had the Government? They had to pay him, as he was employed by the Commissioners, and if they had not, the Opposition would have charged us with having defeated the Award by our penuriousness; and Messrs. Gray, Ritchie and Howe would naturally say that we were indeed a model Government—that we had appointed a Commission to settle our difficulties, and that we had refused to pay the man whom they had sent to the Island for the purpose of obtaining evidence on the subject referred to their decision, and they might, in consequence, throw up their Commission in disgust. In making these observations I must not be considered as justifying any report Mr. Wightman may have made to his employers; nor do I approve of their act in having sent him here in the manner they are represented to have done; but they and they alone are responsible for his mission and its results, whatever they may be, and the Government were bound to pay him.

Hon. the SPEAKER—Mr. Chairman, this debate has taken so very wide a range, that I believe it will be found to be without precedent in any of the other Colonies. It would be more regular and becoming to discuss the Award and the several topics connected with the Commission when these matters shall come before us in another shape. As to this Mr. Wightman, I knew nothing about him until a day or two before the close of last session. I then asked several members of the Government if they were aware of his business, and they professed themselves as ignorant on the subject as myself. I heard that he had been travelling about the western part of the Island, and telling the people that he was endeavoring to ascertain how it would do to establish a railroad. I was also informed that he had employed a clerk, but with reference to what has been said about his recording the prices of land, I was given to understand that he set down his own, not the tenant's exaggerated value. Having been recommended by Commissioner Howe, it is not just or courteous to judge him so harshly as some hon. members have done. The House should withhold its opinion until his report is before us. I am sorry that the example set by the Opposition in Nova Scotia has not been followed here. In that province the address passed unanimously, the discussion on the matters referred to in the speech being deferred until they should respectively come up for discussion. Here we have been wasting time and delaying the business of the country unnecessarily, as all the subjects comprised in this debate will be taken up again seperately.

Hon. Mr. COLES—It is all very well, Mr. Chairman, for the hon. Speaker and others of the majority to complain of the time spent in this discussion, but one member has as much right to express his opinion as another, and the greatest amount of talking has come from the Government side of the House. I am not sorry for the discussion. We are holding our own and gaining a little. We gained to-day the information that the Government knew that this Mr. Wightman was here, for the hon. Speaker says now that he found out that fact and communicated it to members of the Government. I stated yesterday that Mr Wightman had an office in the building, and that he had a letter from the Government. I presumed that, as usual in all such cases, the letter was from the Colonial Secretary's Office. It has been denied that the Secretary wrote the letter referred to. Such may be the case, but I contend that if it came from the Secretary's Office, that office, as the head of the department, is responsible. When I was called upon to give the name of my informant I declined to do so, not feeling myself justified, without his authority. The way I got my information was this. On my return from New Brunswick last summer, a person called on me and asked if I could give him the address of the Commissioners sitting in that province. I did so, and asked him for what purpose he required it. He told me that he had been employed in preparing certain papers for Mr. Wightman, which the latter had directed him to forward to the Commissioners in New Brunswick. I then asked him where Mr. Wightman had located himself while engaged in Charlottetown. He told me that they occupied an office in this building, first the Secretary's private office, and next the Grand Jury Room. Several documents were prepared, and use had been made of the returns of the last Census. I asked what authority had Mr. Wightman to obtain access to these papers. He replied that Mr. Wightman had letters authorizing the public officers to give him any information he might require. He went further, and told me that all he had received for three months' services was £2 10*s*. This is but poor remuneration for such a period of labor, and the case is very hard upon a poor young man with a young family. Having received his permission, I now name Mr. Job Bevan as my informant, and he said that letters from the Lieut. Governor and the Hon. Mr. Palmer were lying about the office. Now, Sir, I maintain that the Government is responsible for the acts of Mr. Wightman. The Leader knew of his business, and gave letters authorizing access to the several public offices, and even to that of the Clerk of this House. I have now given the name of my informant, and I do think it a very strange thing that Mr. Wightman and his assistant should occupy an office in this building, and the Government be ignorant of the fact.

Hon. Mr. POPE—The hon. member stated that his informant told him that Mr. Wightman had a letter from the Colonial Secretary.

Hon. Mr. COLES—Well, Sir, if it came from the Secretary's office, it was an official document, for which the Government must be held responsible. It is immaterial who wrote it, whether the Secretary or a Clerk. As to the report of Mr. Wightman, perhaps the Government are acting wisely in keeping it secret; but when that individual was here, he might have conferred with members of this House on the subject of the value of the lands, and would, after hearing their several opinions, have been better able to form a just estimate than by the course he adopted. It has been admitted that his business was known to some hon. members while the House was still in session. The hon. member, Col. Gray, made an erroneous statement with reference to the relative value of land on Lot 34 and the Selkirk Estate The real difference is not more than about 4s. per acre. It has been reported that the proprietors are not pleased with the Award—it may be so—but if they think that before the Commissioners the people valued the lands too low, there is every reason to believe that, induced by Mr. Wightman's misrepresentations, they estimated them far too highly. I was glad to hear the explanation given by the hon. member for Georgetown, as to the appointment of Mr. Wightman, for it relieves me from the statements made by one of the proprietors, to the effect, that I had been the means of his being sent here. The Lieut. Governor may have been quite right in telling the leader of his Government of his mission; and if that gentleman thought his colleagues leaky—that they could not keep a secret, he was quite right in not communicating the matter to them. But this only shows what a chain of sand the Government is, the moment you shake it a little it falls to pieces. If any of their measures happen to succeed, they are very ready to take credit for it, as a Government measure; but let anything go wrong, and the chain at once falls to pieces—they then throw the responsibility on the Lieut Governor. Their conduct reminds me of a juggler who was in Charlottetown last summer, and exhibited a chain, the links of which he shifted and transposed into every variety of combinations. When I was in the Government we were always careful to aassume the responsibility of our measures and not put it on the Lieut. Governor, but at present no one can tell where responsibility rests. The members of the Government have done the best to exonerate themselves from any connection with this Mr. Wightman, and, while I believe that they did not know from the first that he was in the Island, but after they did know of his presence, they should have let others know it also.

H.

CORRESPONDENCE.

EDUCATION AND THE CHURCH.

No. 7.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR;—You are already aware that I have addressed several letters to the Editor of the 'Protestant' in reply to an attack, made by him, some time ago, on St. Dunstan's College. Mr. Laird has declined to insert in his columns several of those letters, although he ceases not to attack me both by leading articles, and also by anonymous communications of the most violent description, for I presume he endorses the sentiments and expressions of his correspondents who write against me. Considering the very unfair manner in which I have been treated by your "Evangelical" contemporary, and the low, rabid, and even obscene communications which he inserts, I think it would be degrading myself too low any longer to address him directly. I shall, therefore, address the remainder of my letters on "Education and the Church" to you, hoping that as you have kindly inserted in the 'Examiner' the six which I have already written, you will in like manner give insertion to this one and the others which I may write on the same subject. My object in writing those communications is to remove certain prejudices, which, from continual misrepresentation, exist to a greater or less extent, among many of our Protestant neighbours. Some there are who may say that it is useless for me or any one else to attempt to remove any of those prejudices, in consequence of the ignorance and violent antipathy to Catholics which prevail among many of those who read the low anti-Catholic journals of this Island; that the editors and correspondents of those journals will not scruple to descend to the use of the lowest and most unseemly language to misrepresent and slander Catholics, to appeal to the vilest passions of the human breast, and to stir up religious hatred and strife in this colony. But I entertain a much higher opinion of many of the Protestants of this community than to suppose that they are not thoroughly disgusted at the unchristian violence and vile obscenity by which the "Protestant" panders to the low taste and morbid feelings of some of its readers; and I would be doing an injustice to all those who are desirous of preserving their families from corruption, were I to say that they would permit to enter their homes a journal whose pages are so polluted as is the 'Protestant' of the 8th inst. I feel assured that the virulence of my opponents, far from injuring me or the cause which I have espoused, will only tend to bring shame and confusion on its authors, cause many to enquire into the truth of what I have advanced, and to convince them that a very large share of odium is most unjustly heaped on Catholics by those who should use their influence to promote in our midst, not religious animosity and rancour, but that brotherly, Christian feeling so strongly recommended by Him at whose birth angels sang "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men of good will." Mr. Laird and his assistants may labor to stir up and increase ill-feeling and strife; I shall use my humble endeavours to promote a spirit of charity and peace.

The Editor of the 'Protestant,' in his issue of the 8th inst., is pleased to indulge in a large share of bad temper and misrepresentation. Because I am unwilling to accept as witnesses against Catholicity its most bitter enemies, he concludes per saltum—and a very long leap it is—that my logic with regard to Protestants is "the old fiery alternative, RECANT or BURN." This is very gentlemanly and Christian! To give you a further idea of the moderate, dignified language of my worthy friend of the 'Protestant,' I will give a few more extracts from his last production:—"Mr. McDonald is but a cat's paw." "He has something, which, though borrowed too, is really his own (very sensible!) pert assurance." "His shameful position is, when unmasked, just this: a 'heretic' cannot speak the truth." "Education would walk free, but Rome chains it. It would oppose tyranny of all kinds; but Rome yokes it to the despot's car. Education would guide the mind, but Rome drags it a captive and slave after the chariot of the Pope. It is born for noble ends, but Rome makes it a hewer of wood and drawer of water." "The Rector should never forget that one of our firmest beliefs is that popery like Judas, cries master, and kisses Him, whilst it delivers Jesus to be crucified." These extracts require no comment. By the last Mr. Laird has "unmasked" himself, and shown very clearly the "evangelical" spirit by which he is actuated. When a person is forced to employ language like this, there is every reason to suppose that his cause is a bad one, and cannot be defended by truthful statement and dispassionate argument. Has Mr. Laird ever read the following:—"Bad temper, unfairness, and violence in a disputant, greatly damage his cause, in the judgment of all calm and impartial men; while the party assailed by such weapons is always sure to win sympathy, and to gain on public opinion."

This gentleman, thinking to "gain a victory," to borrow his own words, "by decoying away from the point, as certain birds do to prevent harm coming upon their young," challenges me to state what my authority is in "matters of faith." He has thus virtually acknowledged his defeat on the main question at issue between us; for, in the 'Protestant' of the 8th ult., he said "we shall not be at the trouble to follow him, at least until he acknowledges by word or deed that the decrees of the Congregation of the Index are uncalled for and unjust; and until he explains why the said decrees have not, as he says, been promulgated in this Island. After he has fairly met us on this point we may then take up and discuss some of the other strange decrees of the Church of Rome." My opponent having bade farewell to the "Index," is now extremely desirous to "discuss" my authority in "matters of faith." Although this is, from his own declaration, an indirect acknowledgment that I have "fairly met" all his objections regarding the Index Expurgatorius, yet it would have been more honorable and candid on his part to have directly owned his discomfiture. He appears quite tired of the subject of education. I am not, and I would respectfully invite him to "return to the question at issue," and listen patiently to a few more observations and "facts" which I shall bring under his consideration.

Many of those whom the Rev. Dr. Maitland calls "illiterate agitators" labor to induce the belief that previous to the Reformation the world was in a state of barbarism, that no efforts were made for the encouragement of education; and that Italy, being the residence of the head of that Church, which teaches that "Ignorance is the mother of devotion," was necessarily the head quarters of "ignorance and superstition." I have already adduced numerous proofs to show the injustice of these calumnies; but as the subject is one of much importance, I shall bring forward a few more of those facts which appear to have the effect of exciting the ire of my opponents. Many eminent Protestants have done the Popes the justice to admit that they have labored in every possible way to promote those studies which can improve the mind. The North American Review has said that "The great ascendancy of the PAPAL POWER, and the influence of Italian genius on the literature and the fine arts of all countries, made ITALY ESSENTIALLY THE CENTRE OF LIGHT—THE SOVEREIGN OF THOUGHT—THE CAPITAL OF CIVILIZATION!"

Hallam, the celebrated Protestant historian, says:—"It may be said, with some truth, that Italy supplied the fire, from which other nations in this first, as afterwards in the second era of the revival of letters, lighted their own torches. Lanfranc, Anselm, Peter Lombard, the founder of systematic theology, in the twelfth century; Irnerius, the restorer of jurisprudence, Gratian, the author of the first compilation of Canon law; the school of Solerno, that guided medical art in all countries: the first great work that makes an epoch in anatomy,—are as truly and exclusively the boast of Italy as the restoration of Greek literature, and of classical taste in the fifteenth century." (Lit. of Europe, vol. 1 ch. 1. n. 81.)

The same writer, denying that learning declined in the thirteenth century, observes, that "In a general view the thirteenth century was an age of activity and ardour, though not in every respect the best directed; the fertility of the modern languages in versification; the creation, we may almost say, of Italian and English in this period; the great concourse of students to the Universities; the acute, and sometimes profound reasoning of the scholastic philosophy, which was now in its most palmy state; the accumulation of knowledge, whether derived from original research or from Arabian sources of information, which we find in the geometers, the physicians, the natural philosophers of Europe; are sufficient to repel the charge of having fallen back, or even remained altogether stationary, in comparison with the preceding century." (N. 86.) The same writer says of the period between 1250 and 1494: "It is an age in many respects highly brilliant; the age of poetry and letters, of art, and of continual improvement." (Mid. Ages, ch. III.)

Dr. Nevin very justly admits that "It is a most childish fancy certainly to suppose that the revival of learning began properly with the sixteenth century. It dates at least from the eleventh; and there is abundance of evidence that the progress made between that and the age of the Reformation was quite as real and important as any that has taken place since. All sorts of learning were in active exercise before Protestantism came in to share their credit with the Roman Church. So in the case of criticism, controversy and the learned languages, Latin, Greek and Hebrew." ("Modern Civilization," M. R. March, 1851.)

Hallam further observes that "It was from Italy that the light of philological learning spread over Europe" (n. 24). "The result must be to convince us of our great obligations to Italy for her renewal of classical learning. What might have been the intellectual progress of Europe if she never had gone back to the fountains of Greek and Roman genius, it is impossible to determine. It would be difficult to find any man of high reputation in modern times who has not reaped benefit, directly or through others, from the revival of ancient learning. We have the greatest reason to doubt whether, without the Italians of these ages, it would ever have occurred" (ch. 2.) This Protestant writer does justice to the claims of Pope Nicholas V. on the gratitude of the literary world when he says—"Letters had no patron so important as Nicholas V. who became Pope in 1447; nor has any later occupant of that chair, without excepting Leo X., deserved equal praise as an encourager of learning........EVERY SCHOLAR WHO NEEDED MAINTENANCE, WHICH WAS OF COURSE THE COMMON CASE, FOUND IT AT THE COURT OF ROME" (Vol. 1. ch. III.) "Italy," says this author, "the genial soil where the literature of antiquity had been first cultivated, still retained her superiority in the fine perception of its beauties, and in the power of retracing them by spiritual imitations. It was the land of taste and sensibility; never surely more so, than in the age of Raffaelle as well as Ariosto. If the successors of Leo X. did not attain so splendid a name, they were, perhaps, ...not less munificent or sedulous in encouraging polite and useful letters."

To these honorable testimonies in proof that the Popes did not encourage "Ignorance" as "the mother of devotion," as their caluminators shamelessly assert, I may add the attestation of the Protestant Ranke, who, notwithstanding his prejudices, candidly makes the following admission:—

"In harmony with these views (he had been tracing to their elemental combinations the respective movements of Protestantism and Catholicity) is the fact, that literature on the Catholic side had attained to far greater perfection of regularity and form. We may indeed assert that the modern classical forms and character of literature in Italy owe their developement and finish to the auspices of the Church; in Spain, as far as the genius of the nation admitted; in France with the most brilliant results. In the Germanic nations this classical tendency obtained no such triumph. Still less successful was the imitation of the antique amongst the Protestants of those nations. At the period in question the Catholic world was united, classical, monarchical: the Protestant, divided, romantic, republican." (Ranke's History of the Popes.) These extracts I recommend to the attentive consideration of Mr. Laird and his assistants. Were I to enter into particulars regarding all that which the Popes have done for the encouragement of every study that can improve the mind, I would fill volumes. The much maligned Pontiffs used every possible means to rescue men from ignorance; a fact which, although denied by some "illiterate agitators," is candidly admitted by the most respectable Protestant writers of the present time. Italy, far from being that land of mental darkness which some gentlemen represent her, is admitted by her enlightened enemies to be the "centre of light—the sovereign of thought—the capital of civilization," and well did she deserve to be thus addressed by Byron—

"Italia! too—Italia! looking on thee,
Full flashes on the soul the light of ages;
——still
The fount at which the parting mind assuages
Her thirst of knowledge, quaffing there her fill,
Flows from the eternal source of Rome's imperial
hill." [Childe Harold, Canto III. CX.

I would wish to add some other observations in this communication, but I fear that I have already taken up too much of your space.

I have the honor to remain,
Your very obd't and much obliged serv't,
A. McDONALD.

St. Dunstan's College, March 12th, 1862.

THE MONTAGUE MEETING.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR—It is said it is the boast and glory of Britain that its people know how to respect the laws, even while they consider them to be injurious, and how to correct them by quiet and orderly procedure. It is illegal to conspire secretly to overthrow the law, and certainly it is illegal to conspire secretly to make law. All measures calculated to improve our social condition ought to be conducted openly and honorably. The laws of our country undoubtedly secure to us the right of petition, the right of petition secures to us the right to meet publicly for the free discussion of public affairs. This is one of the first blessings we enjoy as subjects of the British realm.

The meeting at Montague Bridge was called for the third and fourth districts of King's County to meet for the free discussion of the Land Question. The persons requesting the meeting to be called and the individual who called the meeting, had no party end in view, as such, yet it is freely admitted that Mr. M. Rowe, as one holding liberal sentiments, called the meeting, and as such the liberals were expected, and by all open and honorable minded persons, they would have been allowed to organize the meeting and propose their resolutions.

That parties who had no knowledge of why, what, and wherefore the meeting originated, should rush in and seize the whole and sole control of the meeting, shows no just claim to honorable conduct, superior intelligence, or gentlemanly breeding. However, the meeting was called, the day arrived, the people assembled, and especially the people of this neighbourhood came with the expectation of hearing the subject discussed by both political parties openly, freely, and honorably, without interruption.

The materials of which the meeting was composed are ministers of the Gospel, members of Parliament, editors of public journals, Justices of the Peace, inferior officers of the Government, gentlemen from Charlottetown, Land proprietors, and Land agents, electors from the third and fourth districts, and a large number of people from the following settlements in Queen's County, Murray Harbour Road, Orwell, Belfast, Wood Islands, Flat River, and Ronah Settlement. The persons from these settlements appeared to take the most prominent and active part in the meeting, and that in an obtrusive and disorderly manner. Why did they do so? I am told, upon the solemn asserveration, that it is "God's truth, that those people from Queen's County are all Orangemen," that they come to "keep peace and order," and that the Revd. Mr. ——— has visited all the Lodges in those settlements since the meeting was advertised. That the Revd. Gentleman did, is a fact, the Monday evening previous to the meeting, lecture in Brown's Creek Church upon his favorite theme, and sold a number of his books to reimburse him in the fifty pounds expended for publication, and did, as he well knew how, touch the strings that most pathetically move the Scotchman's sensibility; and, as one who boasts of being an Orangeman said to me, he had no doubt but that the Revd. gentleman's object was to prepare the people for the meeting. Were the two barrels of bread, and the liquor for which contributions were made in Georgetown, and brought to the meeting and so eagerly devoured—was it, or was it not, for those who came from Queen's County? Does not this argue that certain gents of Georgetown, and others at the time in Georgetown, knew of their coming? Can it be supposed that the Georgetonians made this provision for the electors of the two districts? Do those agents so express their sympathy and benevolence on other occasions? Who, upon weighing those things, but will conclude that there was a previous knowledge and arrangement of this body of men coming to this meeting? If they came for "peace and order," why did they not act orderly? Had they done so they would be entitled to credit. Is it not more than apparent that they came at the bidding of their commanders, and acted in spirit and unison with their leaders?

It is by no means astonishing that the people should act as they did, when the facts are known, that they have been told and drilled by their "Heads, Leaders," and "ministers coming among them" to believe that all Protestants who are not Orangemen are Catholics," "worse than Catholics," and are denounced as "rotten Protestants"—that all "Liberal Protestants are Catholics," "hypocrites, traitors, jesuits,"—that if the Liberals were allowed to get the Government, the present Governor was to be removed, and that a Catholic Priest would be made Governor. It is reported that the Revd. George Sutherland, when lecturing on the Warm Road, went through the motion of tucking up his sleeves, and said that if the Liberals got the Government, the Catholics would have their hands in their blood; that they would walk in their blood; that their cattle would be taken from them, and not a hen would be left at their door; their farms would be taxed so that they never could free them. Those things and a great deal more are told to me as being "God's truth." The story so industriously circulated amongst them, that hundreds of Catholics were to be at the meeting, is quite in keeping with the rest. Are not the people to be pitied as well as blamed for those things? Those teachings began about twelve months before the last general election, and have been continued ever since. The people are become so excited with it that a bare word is sufficient to set them in a blaze.

The moral influence of the meeting was decidedly in favour of the Liberals—their forbearance has won the respect and sympathy of numbers who resolutely supported the Conservatives at the last election; they now express themselves as disgusted, mortified, and ashamed of the sayings and doings of those from whom they expected better things.

The mask has been torn off, and the secret workings of a corrupt faction have been exposed. Their strength and tactics for the next election have been laid open, when a full harvest of their shameful doings may be expected.

Respectfully,
MANOAH ROWE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR—The public will remember that about the middle of February, 1861, a large number of Belfasters pledged themselves, in an address to the Lieut. Governor, to be "ready on any emergency with THEIR voices and THEIR hearts to sustain His Excellency and Government, and to resist and suppress," &c., or in other words, to put down and crush every attempt that might be made by persons having the moral pluck to call their tyrannical rulers to the bar of public opinion, and there have their policy and their acts publicly canvassed and discussed.

The Belfasters did not suffer one year to pass away when they availed themselves of an "emergency" to put their bullying threat into practice. For, at Montague Bridge, on the occasion of the public meeting recently held there, no fewer than 300 of those promised "voices" were employed in the shape of the most savage yelling by an Orange rabble from Belfast, for the undisguised purpose of stifling public opinion, and preventing a portion of Her Majesty's subjects from bringing their grievances legitimately and constitutionally to the notice of their representatives.

Had the Belfasters kept themselves within the limits of their own district "on any emergency," they might there use their "voices and their hearts" to their very hearts' content. And as yelling is a function peculiar to all savages, the Belfasters might yell and howl to the utmost distention of their lungs in sustaining "His Excellency and Government," and no one would be disposed to find fault with them for doing so. But when they invaded the territory of King's County, with the avowed intention of preventing the passage of any resolution that might have a tendency to expose the corrupt policy or diminish the usurped power of the party who at present mis-govern this ill-fated Colony, they deserve the scorn and contempt, if not the utter execration of all well-minded and right-thinking men; and, no doubt, they will be treated accordingly.

I see by the 'Islander' of the 28th ult., that Col. Gray denies having written to the Captains of the Volunteer Companies in Belfast, desiring them to be at the meeting with their men. I am not at all surprised at this denial of the gallant Col.: it is quite in keeping with his character, for the honorable and gallant Col. has been ever "ready on any emergency" to deny, in the most emphatical terms, whatever charge might be alleged against himself or his colleagues in the Government, no matter how well-founded those charges might be. However, it is of very little consequence to the people of this county whether Col. Gray did or did not write letters to the gentlemen alluded to. It is sufficient for us to know that they were all there with their men, and that Col. Gray's constituents, Volunteers and Orangemen from Belfast, constituted the greater part of all who attended the meeting; and if they had conducted themselves like civilized beings, the affair would not be quite so bad. Their presence at the meeting might be tolerated; but if ever any set of beings earned for themselves the character of "Kamtschatkans" the Belfast Orangemen did it on the day of the Montague Bridge Meeting. That their presence and conduct at the meeting were a direct insult of the grossest character to the people of King's County and their representatives, is a fact which cannot be denied. But where will the people of this County find scope for their just indignation at a Government, who encouraged and invited such fellows to come amongst them, and who even boasted of having them there to insult and interrupt the people at a public meeting, regularly and constitutionally convened for the purpose of discussing a public question. The only just conclusion that can naturally be drawn in reference to the action of the Government and their supporters in connexion with the Montague Bridge meeting, and many other meetings of the kind, is, that they cannot now sustain their policy at a public meeting in any constituency within the Island (Belfast alone excepted), without a gang of Orangemen at their back; indeed, there is but one opinion now, in this part of the country regarding this matter.

In conclusion, I beg to state for the information of the Government and their supporters, that instead of adding to their influence in King's County, by bringing an army of Orangemen from Belfast to the Montague Bridge meeting, they but very materially diminished it. They will know to their cost, when the day of reckoning comes round, when they have to render an account of their stewardship, that Orange lectures and Orange interlopers from Belfast or elsewhere, will go but a very short way to "sustain" them in King's County. I would also warn the Belfasters that if they continue to insult the people of this County by repeating their very unwelcome visits hereafter, they will, some day or other, be quite likely to find their mistake.

I am, Mr. Editor,
Yours most truly,
A CONSERVATIVE.

Three Rivers, March 7th, 1862.

SAINT PETER'S BAY NAVIGATION—AGRICULTURAL BANKS OF ISSUE..ABOLITION OF LANDLORDISM—ST. PETERS AND GRAND RIVER PLANK ROAD.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

It does not anywhere appear, Sir, that either your own readers or the general public have been made aware of the very important and useful improvements lately effected at the harbor-mouth or entrance to this beautiful Bay. Let it be now known, therefore, that these improvements are of such a gigantic and useful nature as to insure to St. Peter's Bay a channel for ships of almost the largest tonnage, and one which, evenly, without any harbor lights, will be sufficiently conspicuous to all mariners seeking it.

After this, we may fairly anticipate more or less attention from commercial men and traders desirous of securing the rich harvests of our most industrious farmers in return for their cash or other favors. The Insurance Offices, too, will, no doubt, be anxious to renew their quondam acquaintance with the business of our Bay, upon finding it to be altogether impossible, henceforth, for insolvent or damaged brigantines seeking to indemnify their suffering owners, on some safe and convenient stranding-ground, to be accommodated in this quarter. It would appear, from the tradition of the place, that during the early times of French settlement or occupation, our Bay could rejoice in a good channel at its entrance; but, doubtless, these shifting sands which they (the French) left after them, were due to sympathy, or perhaps some more potent malediction. Be this as it may, our intelligent and hardy farmers at length resolved upon "trying conclusions" with this mysterious marine phenomenon; and the primary purport of this February epistle is to proclaim their triumph. Not caring particularly—after the high example of the present Colonial cabinet—to stake the issue upon "ascendancy" of any sort, except indeed the very material and legitimate one of "mind over matter," nor approaching the stormy tidal difficulty either as "Protestants" or as "Catholics" in the abstract, "tories," or even "liberals," but as honest men, and self respecting and mutually obliging neighbors, they deemed themselves equal to the undertaking, and of course they succeeded. And now a monument, high as "Pelion piled on Ossa," shall henceforth commemorate their joint triumph, according as the ebb and flow of ocean shall fling the floating sands into the teeth of this right royal "cheveaux-de-fris" of heavy rooted timber projecting from dry land to the channel's brink. But I shall leave the description of the work and of the greater depth of channel which it insures, to the worthy men who will now be approaching the Legislature for the petty remuneration offered to success. I prefer invoking the example which it offers to the inhabitants of the Island generally. They behold the material interests of the Colony, and even the sacred sentiments of Christianity subordinated to "party government," or rather to the political support of a few more fortunate individual officials filling false positions (constitutionally) in the public departments thereof. They behold this, and yet they seem not to have sufficiently realized their own plenary powers (under responsible Government) for crushing the abuse. What Government or Governor dare to dispute their political liberties, or their rights over the legislature of which they are the authors and constituents.

Take, for instance, this land abuse and its bribed advocates. What is there to prevent the local Legislature from passing a law for the speedy abolition of all landlordism in the Colony? Canada treated her seigneurs, or landlords, with claims identical to those of ours, to the like legislation, by which eleven millions of acres were released from feudal tenure. These Canadian gentlemen had, of course, their paid advocates in and out of Parliament; but the law was passed all the same; a Commission was appointed under it to ascertain and report upon the value of each seigniory or estate, with a view to indemnity; and to this Commission the seigneurs had to look for the amount of compensation allowed them for the surrender and abolition of their proprietary claims. And with respect to payment, I believe that by levying merely a shilling in the pound upon the emancipated censitaires or tenant farmers for twenty years (or the value of their farms) and devoting this to a consolidated or sink