for such rent or sum claimed, or his or their agent shall previously thereto make and subscribe an affidavit in the form prescribed in the schedule to this Act marked (A.), in the presence of, and before the Clerk of the Court out of which the summons may issue, in addition to any other affidavit which may be otherwise required by this Act; and it shall be incumbent on the plaintiff or plaintiffs, in any such last mentioned suits, upon the trial thereof, to give evidence on the truth or correctness of such affidavit; and if it shall appear that the material averments contained therein are incorrect or untrue, it shall be lawful for the Court before whom the same shall be heard, and it is hereby required, to give judgment of non-suit against the plaintiff or plaintiffs, with payment of the defendant's costs, sustained by reason thereof."

That, untill the passing of this Act the Small Debt Courts were open to suits for rent as far as an ordinary debt, no distinction being known to exist under any previous statute, and the mode of suing, as well as the form of procedure under an execution from such Courts, was by much the least expensive coercive measure that could be adopted for the recovery of rent, and, consequently the most advantageous to the tenant. And your Memorialists deem the prohibition to obtain a summons, unless property can be proved not to have been on the premises, by search made at some time within seven days previous to the day of application, including that day, is altogether a piece of class legislation, calculated to afford undue favor to the tenantry and also to interfere with a covenant usually contained in leases in this colony, whereby it is provided, that if the rent reserved by such leases shall be unpaid for a certain number of days after the time appointed for the payment thereof, it shall be lawful for the landlord "either to sue or distrain for the same."

And the 52d section of the said Act prohibits actions from being brought in the Supreme Court for sums under £10, though sums heretofore as low as £5 were recovered therein.

And as lands are usually held in parcels of from 50 to 100 acres, and generally but a small portion of each parcel is either enclosed or cleared, great facilities are afforded for driving cattle into the woods and thus evading a distress whenever the disposition exists; and the difficulty, if not the actual impossibility, in many cases of obtaining sufficient proof to justify the oath required by the Small Debt Act, must be obvious to every person acquainted with the country.

That in the preceding portion of the eighth section of the Act, whence the foregoing extract is taken, appears the following statement, namely—that by an Act passed in the 14th year of the reign of Her present Majesty Queen Victoria, intituled "An Act to regulate the costs of distress levied for payment of rent, and to amend the laws, relating to distress," such laws have been so regulated as to afford additional security, both to landlord and tenant, in all proceedings thereunder; and by the law relating to such distresses, landlords are restrained from selling property taken by them as distress, save and except at certain specified periods of the year, &c.

That your Memorialists deny that any greater security is afforded to landlords by the amended Act referred to; for the prohibition from selling stock distrained, except between the months of June and November, is found by your Memorialists seriously to obstruct the recovery of rents; and it is with great difficulty that a bailiff can be induced to undertake the execution of a warrant, under the very slight prospect of success: for between the months of June and November cattle are generally suffered to roam at large over the unenclosed parts of the country, and hence arises a difficulty either in seizing or identifying them: and if distrained during the winter months, a bond is usually given by the tenant, by which the ordinary time of sale is postponed by the statute, and the consequence is, that frequently it is ultimately evaded; although stock is known to bring as high a price during the months of March, April and May, as during any other months in the year, but in many cases it is impossible to find a market within five miles of the premises whereon the distress is levied, and the law prohibits its being removed to a greater distance, without the consent of the tenant, though it is only in towns and populous neighbourhoods that bidders of stock can be obtained.

That the discretionary power assumed by the Legislature, in passing a Bill of so much importance as the Small Debt Act without a clause suspending its operation until Her Majesty's pleasure thereon be made known, is, in the opinion of your Memorialists, at variance with the 17th section of the Royal Instructions, as transmitted to Sir John Colborne, for the guidance of the Governor or Lieut. Governor of this Colony, for the time being, and dated at Windsor the 13th December, 1838.

Wherefore, your Memorialists humbly pray that you will be pleased to recommend Her Majesty to disallow both the Acts mentioned in the preceding Memorial: the Education Bill, because it is opposed to the principles of fair rational taxation; and the Small Debt Act, because it excludes your Memorialists from an ordinary remedy at law to which, in common with other classes of Her Majesty's subjects, they hold themselves justly entitled to,

And your Memorialists will ever pray,

Signed

T. H. Haviland, Proprietor of Lot 56, and parts of Lots 8, 40 and 43.
David Stewart, Proprietor of Lots 7, 10, 12, Lennox Island, ½ Lot 47, and part of Lot 46—by Bruce Stewart his Attorney.
Donald McDonald, Proprietor of ⅓ of Lot 36 and ⅓ of Lot 35.
James H. Conroy, Proprietor of ¼ Lot 26, parts 38 & 45.
P. Stewart, for the Assignees of his Estate.
Wm. Hodges, Agent for William Hodges Winslow, Proprietor of Townships Nos. 24 and 33.
J. H. Byrne, for self and others, Proprietors of ½ Township No. 46, and ½ Township No. 48.
R. B. Stewart, Proprietor of Lot 30, and of part of Lot 27.
James Yeo, M. P. P., Proprietor of part of Townships No. 3, 8 and 17.
J. Ellis Ware, Proprietor of part of Township Nos. 8 and 52.
Alex. McDonald, Proprietor of part of Lot 35.
Henry Palmer, one of the Proprietors of Lot 1.
George Irving, Proprietor of parts of Lots 28, 18 and 48.
Wm. Hodges, Freeholder of part of Lot 24.
Charles Wright, Owner of land on part of Township Nos. 65 and 50.

Charlottetown, P. E. Island, June 23, 1852.

A Great Chance.—In 1788 Mr. Matthias Denman of New Jersey purchased 800 acres of land in Hamilton county, Ohio, for fifteen pence per acre. On that purchase now stands Cincinnati, the "queen city of the west."

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.

House in Committee on the Extension of the Elective Franchise Bill—Hon. J. Jardine in the chair.

Friday, Feb. 25.

Mr. Longworth characterized the Bill as one got up for the express purpose of swamping the present constituency of Charlottetown, and of ousting their present representatives from the Assembly. It was the determination of the Government party to carry it; and, as they were in the majority in the House, it would be useless to oppose it; and, therefore, beyond a simple expression of his opinion concerning it, and the recording of his vote against it, he would offer it no other opposition. With respect to the operation of the measure, throughout the country generally, it would have the effect of giving a supremacy to men without property over those who possessed it; and, in Charlottetown, it would throw undue preponderance into the hands of domestic servants.

Hon. Mr. Palmer took his stand against the Bill on the ground that it would give a political ascendancy to men destitute of property over those who possessed it. He argued that there could be no sympathy, on many probable occasions, on the part of the former with the latter—of the *unpropertied* with the *propertied* classes: as would, for instance, in all likelihood be seen, he said, if the Bill passed,—when it should become necessary to make a further provision, by increased taxation, for the support of the free education system. Then, he apprehended, the *unpropertied* classes, being a majority of the electors, would vote for no candidates but those who would pledge themselves that any increase of taxation should not fall upon them, but upon the *propertied* portion of the community. He was very far from arguing or supposing that the amount, either of a man's intelligence, or of his honesty and independence, was to be estimated by the amount of his worldly goods, or the extent of his worldly possessions; but he maintained, without fear of contradiction, that the man possessed of no property could not, in cases of taxation of property, be expected to have any sympathy with the possessors of property. In conclusion, he said, he would give the Bill his best consideration, with a view to making it a more equitable measure than it then appeared to be; provided the originators of the measure would agree to a registration of voters, which could very easily be effected; and without which there could be but very feeble guarantees afforded for the honest working of the measure: but if they refused to accede to that proposal, he would interfere no further with the measure, and merely record his vote against it.

Mr. Haviland opposed the Bill. His chief objection to the measure appeared to be, that it would put *strangers* upon an equal political footing with *natives*. He confessed that he was, and always had been, so narrow-minded as to desire to see the control of our public affairs placed in the hands of men who were natives of the soil. He thought it was very unjust indeed that men, who might be compared to migratory birds, men who merely came to try the country, should, after a brief residence, have extended to them the same privileges as those enjoyed by natives. He would not object to such men having a passing power with respect to the mere passing measures of the day, if to such measures it could be confined; but what he opposed was their having a power to influence legislation, which might not only bind the present generation of natives, but materially affect the interests of their latest posterity. Strangers could not become fully acquainted with the state of the people, the resources of the Colony, the dependence of one class upon another, or, in fact, any of our social relations, unless after having been resident in the Island for a period of four or five years, at the least; and, until then, no stranger should be permitted to have a voice in our Island Legislation, or any share in the management of public affairs. Such a privilege was not extended to strangers in any other portion of the British dominions—no, nor yet any where else.

Mr. Mooney ridiculed Mr. Longworth's dread of the evils which he fancied would result from the extension of the elective franchise to domestic servants; and earnestly declared his own opinion that there was not, in any community, a more estimable member, than a faithful domestic servant, nor one more worthy of enjoying the esteem and confidence of a master, or better entitled to the full and free exercise of all the rights and privileges of a freeman. Chain up a mastiff, said the hon. member, and he will become fierce, savage, and dangerous; but feed him well, and let him have his liberty, and he will not only be inoffensive, but seek to be your faithful companion, your guardian, and your friend. So, in like manner, when men are treated like dogs, chained, kennelled, and abused, they can inspire their oppressors with no feelings but those of dread and alarm. But let those who have held them in bondage, strike off their shackles, and elevate them to the position of freemen like themselves; and they, at once, become their brethren, and may be securely depended upon as the upholders and defenders, to the last extremity, of law and order, and of every thing which tends to promote the common weal.

Mr. Mooney also indulged in a little playful sarcasm, at the expense of the hon. and learned member for Georgetown, Mr. Haviland, on the score of what he called his *nativeism* and *obstructive crotchets*. He said he could not help having a sort of liking for that young gentleman, on account of his sociability and natural amenity of temper and disposition; but yet, no sooner did they touch, in debate, on any thing like liberality and social progress, than that hon. and learned member became, all at once and altogether, restive, morose, and impracticable. As a faithful representative of an obstructive borough, it could not, however, perhaps be expected that he should be otherwise; and, on that account, therefore, he supposed they would have to bear with him. Mr. Mooney then concluded, by forcibly maintaining that the rights of a British subject were a part of himself, and that his merely removing from one part of the British empire to another, could afford no just plea or pretext for his being divested of them.

Mr. Macaulay said there was one very serious and important objection to be made to the Bill, which had, as yet, been overlooked. He meant the unconstitutionality of the House's entertaining it without the sanction of their constituencies. It was a measure intended to effect a very serious and important innovation of the representative constitution of the Island; and, with such measures, he apprehended the House had no constitutional power to deal, unless when called upon to do so by their constituents. It was, besides, an innovation for which no precedent could be found, either in the British dominions, or any where else—not even in democratic America. But, in fact, the object of the Bill was not the public benefit: it was nothing but an artifice for the effecting of a special purpose, as had already been said, and remained uncontradicted.

Hon. Mr. Coles replied generally. He maintained that the laboring and productive classes, who pay taxes and discharge all the duties and obligations of useful and honest citizens, are quite as much entitled to a voice in the legislation of the country, as their apparently more fortunate brethren, the possessors of property. Nor would such men be found less honest and independent, in the exercise of any of the rights and privileges of freemen, than men of substance or wealth, who either did, or might, accidentally, stand towards them in the position of masters. In fact, he believed the domestic servant, with a salary of £20 a year, or £50 a year, which some received, was often quite as independent, in every point of view, as he to whom he stood in the relation of a dependent. As to what had been said, by the hon. and learned member for Georgetown, concerning the admission of strangers to the political privileges of natives, and his declaration that such a regulation did not exist any where else, not even in the United States; he (Mr. Coles) begged leave to remind him that the measure did not contemplate the admission of strangers, who were foreigners, and not naturalized, but of strangers who were British subjects only. In the United States it was not necessary that a man, on removing from one State of the Union to another, should be resident in the latter for any such period as either three, four, or five years, before he could there exercise the privileges which he had enjoyed in the State which he had left. And, so far as strangers, not foreigners, were concerned, all that was intended by the Bill, was no more than that a British subject should, on removing to this Colony, from any other part of the British dominions, be entitled, after a residence of eighteen months, to those privileges of a freeman which he [illegible] ... extension of privilege to honest labour, would but slightly, if at all, diminish the legitimate influence of property; and so far is it from being certain that the change will benefit those who, as a party, may now be mainly instrumental in effecting it, that at the next general election it is not at all improbable that in some instances it may work against them. As a legislator, however, he had never been biassed by party or individual views of aggrandizement: all he aimed at was the public good. He would, however, take leave to say that the party now in power, short as their reign had been, had already done more for the people than all that had been effected for them, by their opponents, during the many years of their supremacy; but still, much as they had done and were striving to do for the people, the gain to themselves individually was not very evident. None of them had been over-remunerated for their public services; and to some the discharge of public duty had been attended by any thing but gain. So far, however, was he from wishing to see the hon. members for Charlottetown excluded from the Assembly, that none would more regret their absence than he. Without those hon. members, there would apparently be no opposition at all; and the wholesome and constitutional check to legislation would be wholly removed. Of one thing, however, he felt pretty certain, and that was, that, until those gentlemen adopted more liberal and enlightened views of policy, they would, so long as they continued members of the Assembly, never be found any where but in a feeble obstructive minority.

Hon. Mr. Whelan said he had intended to take no part in the debate, because the principle of the Bill before the Committee had been so frequently discussed in the present Session, as well as in the last, as to leave it almost impossible for any new arguments to be advanced or combatted. The objections urged by the honorable gentlemen opposite, during the present discussion, were not new to the House, with the exception, perhaps, of one observation which fell from the hon. and learned member for Georgetown (Mr. Macaulay), which was to this effect—that we should not pass the Bill now before the Committee, because our constituents are not known to have expressed any decided opinion on the matter, nor to have given any instructions to their representatives in regard to it. This was certainly one objection for which he (Hon. Mr. Whelan) was not prepared, and he could not account for its use upon any other ground than a most melancholy poverty of argument which prevailed in the hon. and learned gentleman's brain. The objection to which he had adverted, implied subserviency to the unconstitutional and unparliamentary doctrine that the representatives of the people were not at liberty to legislate freely upon any questions affecting their interests or their rights, without the consent of their constituencies thereto had and obtained. This doctrine would receive no countenance from him (Hon. Mr. W.). It would be perfectly just and reasonable for the people to obstruct the free action of their representatives, by degrading them into the condition of delegates, if the legislation of the latter should, at any time, have a tendency to curtail public liberty; but, when the object of legislation was the very reverse—was, in short, the enlargement of the public liberty and the protection of public right, then it was the duty of the representatives of the people to act from the independent dictates of their own judgment. He (Hon. Mr. W.) had always entertained this estimate of his duties and his responsibilities; and he had invariably acted up to it, since he held a seat in that House. But if it be wrong, as the honorable gentlemen opposite seemed to think it was, to legislate upon a public question without asking the advice of our constituents, why does the hon. member for Georgetown invite the attention of the House to a much greater innovation on the established constitution of the country than was ever yet proposed, when he knows that not one constituency in the country has expressed an opinion on the matter. He (Hon. Mr. W.) alluded to the favourite obstructive scheme of making the Legislative Council an elective body—a question with which the hon. member for Georgetown has now, for two years, been threatening the existence of the other Branch of the Legislature. The hon. member, in the fulness of his distress, inveighed against the Bill before the Committee on another ground. There was no instance, he said, of any of the Colonies going so far, in extending the elective franchise; and not satisfied with looking to the Colonies, he gave us the whole continent of America to search for examples of similar liberality. He (Hon. Mr. W.) was afraid that the hon. and learned gentleman's historical knowledge was at fault, else he would not have made his challenge quite so general. He ought to have remembered, that two hundred and fifty years ago, when these Colonies were founded by the English, from which the present United States have sprung, the privilege of election was granted to all men alike. Although so great a space of time has elapsed since the planting of those Colonies, still their posterity need not be ashamed to look back to their history for some valuable lessons in political science: and it is remarkable that their descendants have largely benefited by their wisdom; for many of the institutions of the now republican States are based upon the early charters. Popular suffrage, under these charters, was allowed to the fullest extent. Under these, no other qualifications were required for an elector, than the simple circumstances of his being a subject of the Crown, and a resident of the country in which he claimed the right to vote. Nor does history say that the privilege was ever abused, or that the property of the State was endangered. But why need we go to the United States, or to the early English Colonies, when, in the sister Province of Nova Scotia, we find that the franchise has been enjoyed without a higher qualification than the Bill before the Committee proposes to establish for this Colony. The honorable member for Charlottetown (Mr. Longworth) deprecated the power which it would place in the hands of servants; whilst the learned member for Georgetown (Mr. Haviland) seemed filled with alarm, and apprehended the worst consequences to the security and preservation of property. He (Hon. Mr. W.) had no fears upon this subject: property had never been endangered in other countries, and in less enlightened times, where the privilege asked for, on behalf of the people of this Island, was enjoyed in the very fullest measure. And, with respect to the policy of extending this privilege to servants and other labourers—to the men of no property—he could imagine no evil consequences would arise. This class, it is true, might have no fine edifices or broad acres to boast of; but their services were not only as essential to the maintenance of the social fabric, as the services of a more fortunate class of men; but they were in fact, more serviceable to society—for without labour, or the instruments of labour, society would soon fall into its original elements—and wealth and property, which are but the offspring of labour, must cease to exercise any influence in the social scale. And whilst such was the importance of this class in the community, why should they be denied privileges freely accorded to others [illegible]

Mr. Macaulay explained, that he thought there was a wide difference between interfering with the mode of returning members to the Assembly, and the proposing to effect a change in the mode of constituting the Upper House, or Legislative Council, the members of which were not representatives of the people at all. In the one instance, it would be an interference with the representative materials of the constitution. In the other, there would be no interference with the popular rights at all, except for the purpose of extending them, which the hon. member for King's County (Mr. Whelan) admitted was perfectly justifiable.

Mr. Davies was indeed surprised to hear it asserted by so learned and well informed a gentleman as the hon. member for Georgetown, Mr. Macaulay, that the exercise of the elective franchise by persons having no property qualification, was unprecedented and unheard of. It was the exercise of that privilege, in the original British Colonies of North America, by all resident British subjects, independently of all property qualifications, to which the people of the United States were mainly indebted for their free institutions and the establishment of that political constitution which is the admiration of the world, and the principles of which they spread—for spread they must and will—will diffuse the blessings of rational freedom and social unanimity and happiness over regions of the earth where they are as yet unknown. The hon. member expressed his hearty concurrence in the principles of the Bill, and said it should have his best support.

Hon. Mr. Lord thought all distinctions amongst men, which had no other or better foundation than the possession or non-possession of property were unjust, absurd, and hateful. There was nothing in the mere possession of property which ought to entitle him, or any other man, to greater political rights and privileges than were to be conceded to the persevering and industrious artisan, the faithful domestic servant, or the honest day-labourer, although they might be destitute of every thing like a property qualification. The clerks in their counting houses, the sail-makers in their lofts, the workmen in their ship-yards, the labourers upon their wharfs, were all as much entitled to a voice in the Legislation of the country as they who were enriched by their labours. The possession of property was by no means, at all times, an evidence either of superior intelligence or of superior worth of any kind, in the possessor; and in all that is truly estimable in man, the servant would frequently be found vastly superior to his master. The principles of the Bill were founded in reason and justice; and the measure should have his cordial support.

Hon. the Speaker said that, from his own personal experience, he knew that it was impossible for a stranger to acquire any thing like such a knowledge of the country, its capabilities, or the condition of the people, during even a three (?) years residence in the Colony, as could justly entitle them to a voice in its legislation.

[The Hon. the Speaker spoke in an unusually low key, and the Reporter cannot, therefore, state, with any certainty, what was further said by him on this occasion. The impression upon the Reporter's mind, however, is that the Hon. the Speaker was quite favourable to the general principles of the Bill.]

Mr. Montgomery objected to one of the details of the measure, that men itinerating as labourers, from one part of the country to another, frequently evade the operation of the Statute Labour Act altogether; which, indeed, it was very easy for such men to do, as the labour throughout the Island was not all performed, either on the same day, or in the same week; and that consequently such men, although evading the road tax altogether, would yet be allowed to exercise the elective franchise. The hon. member objected to some other details of the measure; but his objections to them were seemingly answered to his satisfaction, by the Hon. Mr. Coles.

Mr. Yeo spoke against the measure. The Reporter could not distinctly make out all that was said by the hon. member; he, however, understood him to say, in concluding his speech, that at elections in future, old and respectable electors would run great risks of personal abuse and injury; and that every thing would have to give way before the clamour and outrage of a set of unruly boys.

Hon. Mr. Warburton reminded his colleague, Mr. Yeo, that he had lately, at a public meeting of his constituents, expressed a willingness to vote not only for universal suffrage, but vote by ballot; and he, therefore, advised him to propose the latter measure, as it might afford protection to the old and respectable electors who, he was afraid, would be exposed to abuse and injury, from irreverent and unruly striplings, under the operation of the Bill before the Committee, should it become law without some protective clause.

R. B. Irving, Reporter.

Saturday, Feb. 19.

TENANT COMPENSATION BILL.

The Bill to secure Compensation to Tenants in Prince Edward Island, and thereby to promote the improvement of the Soil, was read a second time, and committed to a Committee of the whole House—Dr. Jardine in the Chair.

On the clause being read which provides, that where a party shall feel aggrieved by the award of the Arbitrators appointed to give effect to the provisions of the Act, an Appeal from such decision may be had to the Supreme Court, and authorises the said Court, should it appear to them, on hearing such Appeal, that the objections of the appellant are valid, to cancel, alter and amend the said award, and, if necessary, to appoint an arbitrator or valuator to make a new award, a considerable discussion ensued—Mr. Mooney, Mr. Davies and the Hon. Mr. Lord expressing themselves strongly in favour of making the award of the arbitrators final. These honorable gentlemen based their arguments chiefly on the costliness and probable ruinous consequences of appeals, and the consequent necessity of preventing litigation. A large majority of members, however, were as strongly in favour of retaining the appeal clause, as it stood in the Bill—and on the question being put thereon, it was agreed to, with but one dissentient—Mr. Mooney.

All the other clauses of the Bill were agreed to unanimously.

Mr. Fraser then said, that he thought it would be advisable to consider the propriety of adding a clause to the Bill, with the view of restricting proprietors to the recovery of six years' back rents. He understood it was the opinion of the former Solicitor General (Mr. Palmer), that the Statute of Limitations did not apply to Rents; and that the tenants might be proceeded against for any amount of back rents. He (Mr. Fraser) considered this a serious evil, which ought, if possible, to be remedied in some way. It was, however, thought by hon. members, that such a clause would be foreign to the intention of the Bill—which ought to stand solely upon its own merits. It was further contended that even if such a clause were inserted, it would not have the effect intended, as it might be the means of the Bill being thrown out of the Council. The matter was therefore allowed to drop. The Speaker resumed the Chair, and the Bill was reported without any amendment.

On the Speaker putting the question, that the Report of the Committee be agreed to,

Mr. Mooney moved, that the Appeal Clause be struck out of the Bill.

The House divided on the motion—all voting against it, except Mr. Mooney.

The Free Education (amendment) Bill, was read a third time, and passed.

The Hon. Mr. Lord introduced a Bill to regulate the working of Mills on the Brooks and Rivers of this Island,—which was read the first time.

The Hon. Colonial Secretary presented several documents to the House being a correspondence between the Earl of Elgin and Sir A. Bannerman, intimating that the Smithsonian Institution in the United States had presented to the Governor General, five sets of their publications, one of which the Governor General had appropriated to this Island. A Resolution was passed, thanking the regents of the Smithsonian Institution for the donation, and appropriating them to the use of the Legislative Library.

GLEANINGS FROM LATE PAPERS.

Visit of the Authoress of "Uncle Tom's Cabin."—The following letter, to Dr. Wardlaw, dated December 4, 1852, was read on Tuesday last, at the second annual meeting of the Glasgow Female New Association for the Abolition of Slavery:—Dear Sir,—I was most deeply and gratefully touched by your kind letter, and by its certainly very unexpected contents. That Christian hearts in good old Scotland should turn so warmly towards me seems to me like a dream; yet it is no less a most pleasant one. For myself, I can claim no merit in that work which has been the cause of this. It was an instinctive irresistible outburst, and had no more merit in it than a mother's wailing for her first-born. The success of the work, so strange, so utterly unexpected, only astonishes me. I can only say that this bubble of my mind has risen on the mighty stream of a *divine purpose*, and even a bubble may go far on such a tide. I am much of my time pressed down with a heavy sadness, "for the hurt of the daughter of my people," it is so horrible, so sad—such a dishonour to Christ and his cause. But, again, when I see that a spirit above me is issuing this feeble work book—choosing the weak things of this world to confound the mighty—then I have hope. Why has he given it this success, unless he means some mercy to the cause? Please to say to those Christian friends who have sent me the invitation in your letter that I gladly accept it—though, when I get there, I fear that they may be disappointed. I never was much to see, and now I am in feeble health—worn and weary. I am now putting through the press another work, "A Key to Uncle Tom's Cabin," containing all the facts and documents which confirm the story;—truth, darker, and sadder, and more painful to write than the fiction was. I shall call heaven and earth to witness to the deeds which have been done here! Alas! that I should do it. Should God spare my life till April, I trust to mingle prayers and Christian affection with the Christians of Scotland.—Yours in the Gospel of Jesus:—H. B. Stowe.

Look before you leap.—Melbourne, Nov. 12, 1852.—Comfort is unknown here—that is, in the town; although a house and garden in the bush is a very different thing. At present, all the varieties of the English climate, and in far greater severity—especially with regard to floods of rain, and dense clouds of hot, blinding dust—rage in the golden land. There are thousands of persons, many of them women and children, daily landing at the wharf, who cannot either for love or money get places wherein to lay their heads. Imagine a gloomy day (of which there are many at the present season), the rain descending in torrents, and the unpaved streets a morass; the river steamers running up and down the Yarra between the town and Hobson's Bay (where the shipping are anchored) all day long, to convey at each trip hundreds of newly arrived emigrants: the passengers are landed, bag and baggage, on the wharf, among hundreds of their fellow sufferers, and are left ruthlessly to their fate. The men of the different parties disperse about the town in quest of lodgings; the women seat themselves upon their piled-up luggage, gathering their wondering children around them, and await the husbands or brothers' return with hope and confidence. Husbands, fathers, and brothers do return, but after long absence, with wearied feet, flushed faces, and sinking hearts. They have made a tour of the town, and there is no lodging to be had—they are absolutely houseless. Besides this, every article of consumption is enormously dear—store room for luggage (if found at all) is ruinous. Again the men start wildly on the same errand, and again return unsuccessful. I have seen tears rolling down more than one manly fellow's face, as he has stood contemplating his wife and children reduced to such hard necessities; and it is painful to witness the stunned look of despair, or, the agony of grief and tears with which the English women receive the cruel intelligence, and clasp with streaming eyes their homeless little ones to their hearts. The feverish bustle and excitement at the wharf are increased by a novel kind of sale or market, which is incessantly being held and which, in itself, is also a disagreeable and ominous "sign of the times." The wares thus sold in the open air consist of the household furniture, the little lots of goods brought out as speculations, or often the personal 'kit' only of many of these people, who, unable to find storage for their things, except at a rent which would in a few days or weeks swallow up their whole intrinsic value, are compelled to sacrifice their property for anything that it will fetch. In short, there is a disagreeable effect about this first landing—a kind of damper thrown upon the hopes and prospects—a change in the bright ideas originally formed—a demolition of the visionary castles built since leaving Europe, which (or I am much mistaken in the expression of the human countenance) very few fail to feel on touching the shore.—*Dickens' Household Words.*

THE CONVICT v. THE FREE EMIGRANT IN AUSTRALIA.

A recent letter says:—"But the worst of all is the dreadful state of society, through all the convicts being let loose upon us from Van Diemen's Land. I believe in less than one month after they are landed they are in Melbourne, and on the road to the gold fields. I should think near 200 persons have been robbed of their gold in coming down. They could have it sent by an escort well guarded for 6d. per ounce, but still many are so foolish as to secrete it about their persons, and lately it has been impossible to hide it from those wretched robbers called 'bushrangers,' in gangs of six or eight well-armed men, well mounted on horseback, and most probably stolen horses. Sometimes fifty stolen horses are advertised in one paper. These wretches will stop a party and march them off the road, tie them up to trees, and strip them