...asing Lot 54. I trusted the Government would do the same for other parts of the Island, as they had done for Halifax. But any man possessing even a spark of intelligence, may see we need not expect anything from the Land Commission. I am not likely to be mistaken in my views of that institution. Twelve months ago, I said if ever there was a sham, a delusion, and a cheat attempted to be perpetrated upon a free people, it is the institution of that Land Commission. It has no basis at present; and before it takes effect, it is said we must have an Act to give validity to its proceedings. Gentlemen of the Majority know that that Act is now virtually disallowed; and its disallowance, no doubt, has been procured through the unconstitutional interference of proprietors here and in the old Country. If the Commissioners were to sit again next summer, for several months, you will be compelled to go through the same form again—for it is nothing more than a form—of passing an Act to give effect to any decision to which they may arrive. And, if the Award be not favorable to the proprietors, who have showed what power they exercise at the Colonial Office, to bias the mind of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and to come between us and the Home Government like a baleful shadow, you know their power right well. Can there be a doubt as to my convictions about the course pursued, that the whole scheme was a sham and a delusion. I am still farther convinced of this, inasmuch as when the Commissioners were sitting, it was announced in the Government organ that the only proprietors who would be bound by their decision, would be those who subscribed the Commission. There amounted to six, and one of them has since relinquished his claim, leaving five to be affected. What then, I ask, is to become of the people under the other thirty or forty proprietors of this Island, who claim to be exempt from the Award the Commissioners may give? Yet, you say, "wait!" Is that the duty of this House? Should we fold our arms and see the bone and sinew of this Colony destroyed, their homes levelled, their hearth-stones made desolate, tenants crammed into jails by land claimants, whose names "stink in the nostrils" of the whole community? Does this become our character as honest men, and trustworthy Representatives? Were we actuated by a sincere desire to promote the interests of the tenantry, we would act independently of any Award. Such a course might be more satisfactory in its results than our most sanguine expectations can form of any Award which may be given.

As regards the financial state of the Colony, I shall not say much. When the Liberals came into power in 1851, the Public Debt was exceedingly large.

Hon. Mr LONGWORTH.—But you had two years revenue to spend.

Hon. Mr WHELAN.—We had to make up for that in other respects. But allow me to ask if Treasury Warrants were at no discount from 1846 to 1851, when the Government was in the hands of a few particular friends—in the hands of men whose credit in this Colony and in England was so great, we were told, they could accomplish anything they desired? But "the men of yesterday are not the men of to-day." It is notorious Warrants were then at a great discount. It is true there was one solitary year, 1848, when, during a commercial crisis, they sold at a discount; but now small sums cannot be raised except in violation of the laws of the land. They well know they have increased the duties on many articles, for which the hardy yeomanry of this Island, whose interests they pretend to have so much at heart, must pay.

Hon. Mr LONGWORTH.—On Spirits and Wines.

Hon. Mr WHELAN.—Yes; and on Tea. I say you have demoralized this country by raising the duties on Spirits; for it has introduced an enormous amount of smuggling. In one place alone, Liquors, the duties on which amounted to £1200, have been smuggled during last year. This is an instance of your fine financial policy. You have increased the Public Debt three times, though you got the Government with £5,000 spare cash in the Treasury.

Hon. Col. GRAY.—Mr Chairman, we have heard the hon. member who has just spoken at full length before on this subject, and it is not my intention to dwell upon the question under discussion now, as my sentiments upon it were fully enunciated on Saturday. We had proceeded as far as the 7th paragraph, and were then brought back to the 4th in the Address. It occurred to me, from an observation which fell from the hon. member in reference to the purchase of the Selkirk Estate and Lot 54, that he understood only £2000 had been issued in Warrants for the two Estates.

Hon. Mr WHELAN.—Yes; and on that ground I withdrew my opposition to the paragraph under discussion, in the Address.

Hon. Mr GRAY.—It was stated a few days ago, when then the hon. member was not in his place, that £2000 was required to complete the bargain about the Selkirk Estate; and also, that £2000 in Warrants were issued for the purchase of Lot 54, making in all £4000; but the hon. member spoke as if he fancied only £2000 were paid on the whole.

Hons. Messrs. COLES and WHELAN.—That is what we understood.

Hon. Col. GRAY.—I think the contrary was clearly stated by me: but the adage is true—None are so deaf as those who do not wish to hear. I stated that as £1958 of the Warrants had been redeemed, the amount outstanding was little more than £2000.

The Committee then rose and the Chairman reported progress.

Adjourned till 3 o'clock.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

Hon. Mr COLES.—A short time before we adjourned, we learned the Government had issued Warrants for the purchase of Lot 54. Before proceeding farther, I may state, I give credit to the hon. Col. Gray for acquainting the minority with the fact, when he was doubtful about us being aware of it. I believe the hon. the Leader of the Government, did so from the best of motives, knowing it would be better to give us the information then than to have the subject come up afterwards. On receiving that information, my views are completely changed in reference to the paragraph under consideration, in answer to a clause in the Speech of His Excellency. Had £2000 been authorised by this House, the minority would be justified in giving their assent to the issue of that amount; but, Sir, if they could not have purchased that property under the Land Purchase Act, they had no right to take it upon themselves to issue £2000 in Warrants. There was no necessity for it. The Land Commission had been appointed, and their decision could not have been unfavorable to the inhabitants on that property. And there is another question. These Warrants were paid off; but I would like to know by what authority. Money cannot be paid for Warrants unless in regular rotation. Why then did the Government step aside and pay them before the proper time? I hold, then, that the Treasurer in this transaction violated the Laws of the Land. There must have been some favoritism. Upon this act, I hope the majority of this House will place their veto. What is one of our dearest rights? It is that Parliament holds the purse strings, and will not allow any Government to violate the Laws of the Land in this respect to such an extent as ours has done. True, there may be a necessity sometimes to do so, as in case of war, to spend a few pounds more than has been voted for such purposes; but, what necessity was there in this case to purchase a Township of wilderness land? If one Government is allowed to do this, another may take the same liberty; and where is it to end? There was a little excuse for doing so in purchasing the Selkirk Estate. My hon. friend (Mr Whelan) intended to have moved an amendment to the paragraph under discussion before, but I discussed him from doing so, saying, I did not wish to tie down the Government too closely; but, from what has since transpired, in his absence, I move his amendment:—"We regret that your Excellency found it impossible to negotiate the Debentures which the Law authorised to be issued for the purchase of the Selkirk Estate, and that Treasury Warrants bearing a higher per centage were used for that purpose. We regret more particularly that such a course as this was pursued, especially, as we have heard that Warrants were also issued for the purchase of Lot 54—a purchase which the House of Assembly did not authorise. The House of Assembly cannot help remarking that such a course as this, so contrary to law, and so subversive of the rights and privileges of Parliament, is extremely dangerous, and calculated to destroy confidence in the Government who adopt it."

Hon. Col. GRAY.—It is not my intention, Mr Chairman, to occupy the time of this House by again recapitulating what has been already clearly stated more than once. I was under the impression my explanation given on last Saturday morning, was clearly understood by hon. members. In reference to the charge brought against the present Administration, I would ask, what is the Executive Government of this Island as now constituted, but a Committee chosen by the peoples' representatives to act in their absence? Now, the Government in their absence have acted, and in what respect have they established a bad precedent? I think it is a good—an excellent precedent; and long may the Government continue to establish such precedents, if by so doing they prevent Townships being sold to middle men for a few pounds. As I stated before, we saved £909 15s. out of the sum allowed us for the purchase of the Selkirk Estate. Are the people of this Island so very rich that they consider it a bad precedent to set, to save this amount and give it towards purchasing a Township to give to hard-working honest men? Five thousand acres of this Lot are very cheap at 10s. an acre. A gentleman of integrity now in Charlottetown would give considerable for the privilege of cutting the timber which grows on it. I wish we could get Mr Sullivan to part with his on the same terms. Is the Government to be assailed with invective because the representatives of the majority, sent here by the people, choose to purchase a Township under the Land Purchase Act? His Excellency the Lieut. Governor is allowed from time to time, to buy a Township, or two or three of them, according as the funds come in. If the Government had acted according to law as the hon. Leader of the Opposition said, they could have purchased Lot 54, at 5 per cent., payable in Debentures; but, the gentleman who sold it to us, would have required £200, or £300 on the Debentures: by paying in Warrants we saved £300, less £45. That is the bad precedent. As regards the Land Commission, my views were that it would do us much good, as will appear, no doubt, when the Despatch of the Duke of Newcastle is received. I regret do much opposition has been offered to our endeavors to carry out this scheme. We have put no money in our pockets by it; and, as long as I have the honor of retaining a seat in this Legislature, no one shall put a pound there. Is it not our glory to save? A respectable man told me a few days ago he was obliged to pay 10s. an acre for land on the Worrell Estate, when others on the Selkirk Estate were getting theirs for 6s. an acre. I cannot help it, I replied; it cost more. Land bought for 3s. an acre cannot be sold for less than 5s.; and even at that rate, I solemnly declare we will no more than clear ourselves. I asked Mr Perry when he was before the Commissioners at St. Eleanor's, if land bought by the Government at 3s. an acre could be sold for less than 5s. an acre. I blame not the late Government for purchasing at the rate they did, as I believe they could not help it. The hon. the Leader of the Opposition said, in case of war a Government may adopt such a course; but, is it not better and more glorious to take it for the promotion of peace? Who brings war upon a land? If for phantom glory men bring distress to thousands of widows and orphans, it shall be my boast to say I desire to do good for the sake of peace. What more glorious than to bring happiness and contentment to our Island homes at the lowest possible rate! Who then, that has the heart of a man beating in him will say we have set a bad precedent!

Hon. Mr COOPER.—The hon. Leader of the Government seems to think the minority should have confidence in the present Administration, because they struck a good bargain without our consent, expecting to get it afterwards. In the first place we saw a deviation from the principles of Responsible Government; and, step by step we see a deviation from law. If they go on thus, there will soon be very little use in our coming here at all. If the consent of this Legislature was necessary in this case, they should have got it beforehand. After consent was given to purchase the Selkirk Estate, it was understood all the rest would be left in the hands of the Land Commissioners.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—I have yet to learn the land on the Worrell Estate sells at 10s an acre. If it does, the present Government have raised its price; for 6s. 8d was the highest price paid for wilderness land on that Estate. The present Government may have raised it to make the late Government unpopular; so, the man referred to, need not have been told the Estate cost more money. £18,000 were paid down for it, leaving a balance of £6,000 to be paid and there was a reduction to be made for Fishery Reserves, ponds &c., which lessened its price considerably: so, taking the whole Estate, it would not amount to more than 5s. an acre. I understood the Selkirk Estate cost more than £9,000: but the littles taken off one and put on another make a great difference. It was stated there were 80,000 acres in the Worrell Estate when we purchased it. Since that period, however, new surveyors have been put on it, and now it appears there are only 60,000 acres. In this way it is easy to make out the Selkirk was purchased on more favorable terms than the Worrell Estate. It is well known, too, there was more oppression practised on the Worrell, than on the Selkirk Estate; but anything will serve as an excuse for violating the law of the Land. I have not yet heard one good reason assigned for purchasing Lot 54. A large part of it is a wilderness. Interest must be paid on the purchase money; and the Land tax on it is lost. Now, look at the whole of the Worrell Estate. Look at St. Peter's Bay, with the beautiful farms on its margin. Where we got 12s. 6d an acre for a great part of this property, will the Government, I ask, get 12s 6d an acre for any of Lot 54? The excuse about middle men will not do. If these stepped in pending the investigations of the Commissioners, the Commission might have taken that into consideration also, and learned them a salutary lesson. The Government, too, should have assisted in punishing men who would dare to interfere in such a manner. I give my support to the amendment, not out of opposition, but from principle. At some future period we may have a Government not as trustworthy as the present; and, if this principle can be carried out, it may be turned to a very bad account in this Colony. Another Government may give 10s. an acre to a friend, instead of 7s. 6d., as mentioned in the Act.

Hon. Mr. M'AULAY.—I am not anxious to protract the business of the House in discussing matters of comparatively little importance; but I confess I do not include the amendment just proposed as a matter of this kind. There is one passage in the amendment to which I wish to advert before dwelling upon that to which it more particularly refers, which is this:—"The House of Assembly cannot help remarking that such a course as this so contrary to law &c;" Now, I would like to know what law it is which prevents the issue of Warrants.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—There was a law for issuing Debentures.

Hon. Mr. M'AULAY.—It Would appear, then, Mr. Chairman, that these are the same, which furnishes us with a specimen of their logic, and shows how fond they are of making a noise. If it is the Law of Parliament to which reference is intended to be made, then the sentence is not grammatical. To me it appears absurd, and will remain so, till more light be thrown upon it. So much for the consistency of the amendment; let us now come to its substance. The hon. gentleman on my right has expressed much sympathy for the tenantry; but, I have no reason to believe he is more inhuman than other men, nor have I reason to think he is a bit more human than those who speak less on that point. (Laughter.) When the cry "catch thief!" is heard, he runs away among the crowd and cries "catch thief!" too. Now, if the Warrants had been issued for any other purpose than the one for which they were issued—viz. to rescue tenants from the fangs of proprietary dominion, there would have been a justification for his amendment; but, if consistent to his principles he would have said, "I feel grateful to the Government for rescuing tenants from the fangs of despotic Landholders." He is aware a gentleman was about to purchase the property, but the Government stepped in and bought it for the exclusive purpose of protecting the people. For so doing he says—"Oh! cruel Government,—Why did you not allow the cruel proprietors to tear out the vitals of these tenants!" There are two reasons which prevent me from supporting the amendment:—1st, It is not properly worded; and 2dly, it censures the Government for performing an act of mercy.

Hon. Mr COLES.—For 10 settlers.

Hon. Mr M'AULAY.—There are several there. We know it is a common occurrence with Governments to do some small acts not strictly within the *letter* of Law. After doing so, they come down to the popular branch of the Legislature and state what they have done; and if it be shown it was done for the benefit of the people, their approval is gained. The act of the Government in this instance, though it was without the *letter* of the law, was still consonant with its *spirit*. As they purchased it for the good of the people, I do not see how we can blame them.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—Last year, Mr Chairman, this House came nobly forward, and gave the Government full permission to purchase the Selkirk Estate: there were only two dissenting voices. Even the hon. member from the East Point acknowledged it was purchased on better terms than the cheapest of a large portion of the land of this Island could have been obtained for. There was nothing like captious opposition offered by the Legislature last year. In a candid and praiseworthy manner, the members of the Opposition extended their support to the Government side, with the solitary exceptions of the Leader of the Opposition and Mr Cooper. These were the only two who occupied that unenviable position. Whether or not they will reap laurels by taking the stand which they did, remains to be seen. It was admitted on both sides that the Government would be remiss in its duty if they neglected to purchase the property on terms so advantageous. This was a great admission. Now, the Government, after purchasing that Estate, had an opportunity afforded them of buying another on nearly similar terms. This is the position which we occupied when the property of the assignees of Mr Henry Winchester was offered for sale; and it was bought, as has been ably explained by the hon. Leader of the Government in this House, to afford a protection to the people who resided on that property. The Opposition admits we had power to purchase it, but say we overstepped the bounds in one particular. And what does it amount to?—That we issued securities bearing interest at 6 instead of 5 per cent. Now, we had no other alternative, as Debentures would not sell at a lower percentage. The only course which the Government could adopt, was to raise Treasury Warrants, and thus prevent the intervention of middle men, who, had the Government acted as they did, would have stepped in and made a profit out of the property at the expense of the tenantry: under these circumstances we purchased. And what is the offence?—Why, the country is put to the enormous expense of paying £20 stg. per year extra, in order to enable the Government to secure this property for the people—that being the extra interest at one per cent. on £2000 stg. This is the grave offence for which we are arraigned at the bar of public opinion. The hon. Leader of the Opposition expressed a hope that the majority of the members would put their veto upon this act of the Government; but, I hope the minority think the Government are influenced by corrupt motives, and have done this to aggrandize themselves—to benefit a few at the expense of the many—they may do as was suggested; but as no such charge can be urged against them, where is the enormity of their offence? I would not like to have such a power placed in my hands, said the hon. Leader of the Opposition; nor would I, Mr Chairman, were so irresponsible. Such a power, if not used constitutionally, might be dangerous. But we assumed not the right as a right inherent in the Government—or we would not have come down to this House in the consistent manner we have, and called upon the Legislature to sustain us.—Mr Cooper loses no opportunity which offers of attempting to bring odium on the Government. He appears to think our desire since the time we took the seals of office has been to fritter away the Constitution. In making these insinuations, I think he is not justified, especially when he professes to have the welfare of the people of Prince Edward Island at heart. Instead of making this groundless charge he ought to be prepared to yield any meed of praise to the to the present Administration to which it is entitled. Had his darling measure—a Court of Escheat—been established, would the Selkirk Estate have been thrown into the hands of the Crown at a lower than that for which it has been purchased? No; Mr Chairman, if a Court of Escheat were in operation at the present moment, and supposing for the sake of argument the Selkirk Estate were escheatable in such a Court, it would cost more than the price paid for it re-invest it in the Crown: or, in the language of the hon. member himself, to redeem the inhabitants on that property from "proprietary thraldom" Yet the hon. member rises and preaches to us about inconsistency,—though it ill becomes him. At his time of life, he should be able to draw a clear distinction between right and wrong. If we have done right, we should receive his approbation; if wrong, then we should be condemned. If what we have done is beneficial to the people, and calculated to advance their best interest, then I call upon the members of this Legislature to sustain us.

Mr OWEN.—The hon. the Leader of the Opposition stated there were no more than 10 settlers on Lot 54.

Hon. Mr COLES.—According to the Census.

Mr OWEN.—There are 40, and these have short leases of 21 years—many of which are about to expire. (Hear.) I stated yesterday the Lot was as good as Township 53 or 55, which are fully settled, or any Lots on the Worrell Estate, with the exception of 38. The only conditions on which the agent would allow persons to settle on it were either to purchase or take a lease for 21 years (Hear.) Now as long as people can get land on more favorable terms, they will not settle on farms with leases for that short period. I may state too, the land, with the exception of a block of Loyalist land, is nearly all opened up.

Hon. Mr WHELAN.—I intend to take a few minutes more, to assign reasons for supporting the amendment moved in my absence. You are aware it was my intention from the first to move that amendment; but thinking it was only £2000, which had been issued in Warrants in place of Debentures, I was willing to withdraw my opposition to the paragraph. I think, now, it would be flagrant injustice to call upon us to defend the Lieut. Governor and his advisers, in issuing Debentures for Lot 54 without the sanction of the Legislature. Much has been said about their zeal for the interests of the people, in preventing the intervention of middle men. According to the Census, there are only 10 tenants on the Lot, in all 40 settlers; and the law must be violated to save 40 people from the grasp of middle men. A far different object, I believe, was in view. We all heard, Sir, of the Emigration scheme of the friends of the Government. A colony of a certain desirable class was to be brought out, to settle, I think on that very Township. In this transaction they have been guilty of a grave political offence; and the means by which they sought to be absolved was by giving an explanation, which was done in the Speech of His Excellency. Who ever heard of anything so monstrous?—a Government committing this offence, pursuing a dangerous course, then seeking to be absolved for confessing their crime? It is a good Catholic doctrine; but I rather think we are not here in the character of Priests, to grant absolution because there has been a confession of sin. I for one do not aspire to that high office. I do not absolve them. An hon. member said the amendment was contrary to the laws of language. Will the hon. member point out the sentence in which this departure from these laws occurs?

Hon. Mr M'AULAY.—In these words—"The House of Assembly cannot help remarking that such a course as this, so contrary to law, &c." In the first place, it is not true; it is not contrary to any law to which you can refer; and so, must be contrary to the law of Language.

Hon. Mr WHELAN.—The hon. member does not now complain of the construction of the sentence, but of a fact involved. That the course of the Government was contrary to law, we have the testimony of the hon. member from Queen's County.

Hon. Mr LONGWORTH.—We passed a law last year to extend the provisions of the Land Purchase Bill, which authorised us to issue Debentures for £10,000, bearing interest at 5 per cent.

Hon. Mr WHELAN.—But, Sir, they did not do that; they issued them at 6 per cent.

Hon Mr M'AULAY.—And where is the law to prevent them?

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—It is contrary to that law.

Hon. Mr. M'AULAY.—But that law says nothing on the subject.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—It was at least contrary to its spirit to issue Warrants at 6 per cent.

Hon. Mr. M'AULAY.—The law to which the hon. member refers gives special power to issue Debentures for a certain amount.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN.—But they issued Treasury Warrants at a higher per centage than Debentures; and no man will say they acted according to the spirit of statute in giving 6 instead of 5 per cent. The hon. member may cavil, but he cannot get over the fact that they committed a great political offence, pursued a dangerous course, and one which cannot be justified.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—I was a little amused at the hon. member from Queen's County in saying it was unconstitutional to pass a law to prevent proprietors from distraining for rent pending the investigations of the Land Commissioners, and now saying they acted contrary to law to benefit a few tenants. When coming to these halls, I met many of his constituents, who had write in their pockets from the proprietor, to appear at Georgetown, tho' their rent was not due till the first of March. If the hon. member would turn his attention to these suffering tenants, instead of endeavoring to benefit ten or fifteen tenants on Lot 54 who would not thank him, I think it would be much better. When these people petition this Legislature for protection against their Landlords, they are told it would be unconstitutional to grant their petition. But now to hear him and his hon. colleagues, you would think they are the only friends the tenants have. This may do for the proprietors, but I question if it will satisfy the tenantry of this Island.

Hon. Col. GRAY—Mr. Chairman, I believe the hon. member who has just sat down, is not so ignorant of the laws of this Island as he professes to be, for he must know it would be a gross violation of the constitution to pass a law to prevent the payment of rents. The people of this country may be hood-winked a little longer by such speeches, but let them remember the instructions of Her Majesty to His Excellency the Lieut. Governor on this head are positive. It has been said we have called upon hon. members of this Committee to sustain us in a breach of our local laws—but I deny the charge. I have so much confidence in the gentleman who administers the Government of this Island, that I believe he would not imperil his position by interfering with Her Majesty's instructions in sending a Bill of this nature home without a suspending clause. A Bill to prevent distraining for rent must have such a clause before it would receive Her Majesty's assent. I served Her Majesty twenty-three years at the risk of my life in many a field, and I will not adhere to Her if she violates the rights of Magna Charta. Even Her Majesty's coronation oath binds Her not to interfere with the Courts of Judicature; nor with the rights of property between man and man. To attempt to carry out the object proposed would be likely to result in establishing Martial Law in this Island. The idea is preposterous. The hon. member knows as well as I do—and he should know much better, for he has had a seat in this Legislature many years, I only two—it could never be carried out. I know my rights as a free man, and the power of my Sovereign. Her Majesty has frequently declared through the Secretary of State she will not interfere with the rights of property. Let the people read Lord Durham's instructions on this point and not allow themselves to be deluded by supposing it is in the power of this Legislature to pass such an Act; or that, if passed there would be a tithe of a chance of its receiving the Royal assent. What have I to gain from the love of proprietors or tenants? I do my duty, and in doing it leah to the side of mercy; but I would be sorry to induce hopes in any poor man, which there is no prospect of ever being realized.

Hon. Mr. COLES—I am surprised to hear the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member who has just spoken. It appears the hon. member will be a good subject and serve Her Majesty, just as long as he has his own way. But it is strange to me if he has not attempted to hood-wink the tenantry by telling them they must lay down their heads and tamely submit to the proceedings of their proprietors. Her Majesty's coronation oath will not allow Her to interfere with the Courts, we are told. Is a law which passes both branches of the Legislature here going to interfere with the Courts of Judicature? No, Sir. The people of this Colony were deprived by the predecessors of Her Majesty's representative of legal power to investigate the titles of proprietors. It is a wonder to me a gentleman who has fought the battles of his country should now be cowed down in this manner, and be afraid to give his vote for a Bill of this character. We have a law on our Statute Book already which has interfered with them; for it prevents a proprietor from selling a tenant's stock between the months of December and June. Now certainly the one would be quite as constitutional as the other.

Mr. SINCLAIR—Hon. members appear to steer a course as far as possible from the question at issue. By running into the actions of the late Government, they keep up a continual skirmish. When the question was about to be put, it received quite a new turn. We discovered that instead of Debentures, which were authorized to be issued at 5 per cent, Treasury Warrants were issued without the consent of this Legislature at 6 per cent, for the purchase of Lot 54. Till then I was prepared to vote for the original paragraph. I think it was very bad policy in the Government to purchase a Township at the present juncture; and, especially when it is in a wilderness state, and more liable to be escheated than any other Township. The reason for purchasing it could not have been to reach a large number of tenants, for there are only 40 settlers on the Lot; and, under all the circumstances of the case, supposing they could have bought it with Debentures, I think it would have exhibited very bad policy to have done so. But to purchase under such an extraordinary stretch of power, deserves, in my opinion, the censure of this House. We should look with a jealous eye upon any Government that would do so. It is our duty to tell them they have exceeded their authority and therefore cannot allow them to pass an Act to justify their conduct. (Laughter)

Mr HOWAT—We have been told the whole affair about the Land Commission has been knocked in the head—that the Bill sent home to give effect to the award of the Commissioners has not been graciously received. Last year had we not resolutions introduced to upset the establishment of that Commission. On listening to their plausible arguments too, I was almost shaken myself, tho' there was not one word of truth in them. (Laughter) Their idea was the country could place no confidence in these gentlemen; but, I would like to know, what confidence can the country place in *them*? I caution the country against listening to their insinuations, or in taking heed to their gloomy assertions—saying the whole thing is a failure. There is every prospect of a fair termination of the question. Gloom is, we know, produced by various causes. In listening to them I was reminded of what an elderly gentleman in my neighborhood once told me, and his gray head denoted he was not far from his end. Being in a very gloomy mood one day he said he thought there was going to be a terrible winter—six feet of snow. He saw something on the breast-bone of a goose which led him to think so. I tried to pacify him. The winter, however, passed away, was very fine, and the old man died before spring. (Laughter.) Now what may be the cause of the gloom on the part of these gentlemen, I leave you to infer, I gave my vote for the purchase of the Selkirk estate, because I believed it would be self-sustaining. I desire to see every man a freeholder at his own expense. As to the legality or illegality of the question at issue, I do not enter upon it. The Land Comission was established by the action of the majority, tho' in various stages of its progress the minority tried to claim the merit. If the hon. Commissioners do not understand their position, they have received hints how they may back out; but I believe they are not like children who take hold of a toy, play with it awhile, and then throw it away. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr WHELAN—The hon. member has related an anecdote about an old man and a goose; and we know, Mr. Chairman, a goose once saved the imperial city of Rome. (Laughter.) I believe the results of the Land Commission, in which the hon member places so much confidence, will be as in the case of the old man with the breast-bone of the goose—it will die before winter is over. He talks of the Commission having been brought to its present stage of progress by the action of the majority. Will he tell us what progress? I rather think it is a retrograde movement. The law to give validity to it is dead—nullified by the British Government, notwithstanding this great majority which had such influence at Downing Street. In spite of the influence of these gentlemen it has been hung up there, which is the next thing to being disallowed. There is a stronger influence than theirs at the Colonial Office, whose tools, servants and minions, I believe they are. The hon. member has paraded his own disinterested feelings in reference to this matter; but I would ask what have I to gain from landlord or tenant. He often accuses others of private motives to make a display of his own disinterestedness.

The Speaker now took the chair, and the Chairman reported progress.

Adjourned till 10 o'clock to-morrow.

THURSDAY, Feb. 28, 1861.

House resumed the consideration of the Address.

Mr. DOYLE—Last year we passed a Bill to enable the Government to buy the Selkirk estate. I supported it be cause I thought the terms on which it could be purchased were as favorable as the award of the Land Commission would be. I think, too, the Government deserves credit for saving £800 on the bargain. I was willing to vote for the paragraph till I learned £2,000 were issued in warrants at 6 per cent, for the purchase of Lot 54. Now I think I am in duty bound to support the amendment.

Mr. COOPER—I have one question to ask. In the Speech of His Excellency there is no mention of Lot 54; but the affair is spoken of here as being made public. Is it intended to be kept out to conceal the transaction from Her Majesty's Government? This question deserves some answer from this Government.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND—The hon member, Mr. Chairman, knows well it has not been omitted, for it states:—"The unusual expenses of the past year, which were incurred, principally, by the purchase of the Estates of non-resident Proprietors, &c," which has been read and re-read during this long debate, in which there has been but a rehash of the same arguments. As he has found fault with the principles of the present Government, I would ask him to find a panacea for the evils of this country. How does he expect to do it? Year after year he has tried Escheat. The Land Purchase Bill and the Land Commission were tried, and he has repudiated the whole three. Will he propose a fourth remedy?

Hon. Mr. YEO—Here we are now five days discussing these points, and spending £30 or £40 each day. Many poor people in the country would be glad to get a shilling of the money. And what benefit will these discussions be to hundreds of poor people. Here they are jumping up one after another like merry-andrews with their master. Laughter.) I think it is most ridiculous, and against the interests of the country to be spending the time in the way hon. members are doing.

At this point the discussion again turned on the probable benefits of the Land Commission.

Mr. HOLM remarked that the hon. leader of the Opposition throughout every stage of the proceedings connected with the establishing of the Land Commission, had expressed his opinion on the floor of the House that it would do no good; that he did so both before and after the Commission was established. Members in the minority now appeared to manifest much sympathy for the tenantry, and in these things he (Mr. Holm) saw their inconsistency.

Hon. Mr. COLES denied having ever said he had no faith in the Land Commission; and said such could not be shown.

Mr. COOPER after referring to matters connected with the appointment of the Commission said—he believed when the subject would be fully investigated by the Commissioners and their award given, that the Royal assent to a Bill to confirm it would not be withheld. He could not see it would be the duty of the Ministry to give their assent to an Act to confirm their decision, as it would enable them to give a decision favorable to one party. But he (Mr. Cooper) believed the Commissioners would do justice to all parties, and in such a manner as would leave no doubt about an Act to confirm their decision receiving the Royal assent.

Hon. Col. GRAY said he was heartily glad to hear the hon. member express his sentiments in the manner in which he had just done. However much he (Col. Gray) may have been opposed to Mr. Cooper's views in reference to his hobby—Escheat, he was then glad to be able to say he coincided with him; and would also bear testimony to his consistency during the long period Mr. Cooper held a seat in the Legislature.

Hon. Mr. COLES addressed the Committee; referring to the Dispatches of His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, and showing that a great change had evidently taken place in the views and feelings of the Duke in reference to the Act to confirm the Award of the Commissioners.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH addressed the Committee at considerable length. After referring to the discursive character of the debate, Mr. Longworth said he thought good would result from the labors of the Commissioners; and that their investigations would terminate in such a manner as would bring satisfaction and peace to the home of the poor man. Notwithstanding what he had heard about hon. members in the minority being actuated by the purest motives as have the Government carried on well, he was afraid if their motives were probed to the core the contrary would appear; for he was apprehensive they were not prompted by a desire to see this long agitated question finally settled.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN said he would defy the hon. member to put his finger on one speech of his, or vote given by him to justify such an imputation; and that it was a base insinuation to hint it was from a desire to get office. Much had been said about the desire to purchase Lot 54 to avert the consequences of the interference of middle men, but he (Mr. Whelan) thought there was no great desire on the part of any one to purchase it. According to the last census there were only 16 tenants there! but the member from that District says there are 40. His statement however as given before the Commissioners at Georgetown differs somewhat from the one given here

Mr. OWEN—I said it would compare favorably with any Lot in the Worrell Estate, with the exception of 38.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN—Well, we will take his own correction. The impression to be conveyed to every man's mind was, that it was equal to any Lot in King's County. He asserted there were only a few rent payers on it. When asked respecting the value of 51, 53 and 66, he stated the actual value was about 10s. an acre.

Mr. OWEN—I beg his pardon; I did not say they were worth as much per acre as Lot 53, but that the people on that Township would rather pay 10s an acre than be in the position they were.

Hon. Mr. WHELAN—There is his statement—that the land in King's County is worth no more than 10s an acre. He did not say the people would make an effort, but that 54 was of inferior quality; but here he states it is one of the best in the County.

Mr. OWEN—I valued Lot 53 on account of its position, and not on account of the quality of the land. I said I would not value 51, 54, 66, and a part of Lot 52, as highly as Lot 53; because three of the finest rivers in the County flowed through this Township.

A few other hon. members on both sides having addressed the Committee on the subject of the Land Commission and Lot 54, the Chairman put the amendment, which was lost on the same division as the previous amendments—11 to 14.

Adjourned till 3 o'clock.

Special Notices.

HOLLOWAY'S PILLS AND OINTMENT.

Stomach and Kidneys.—Between these two organs there exists a close and intimate relation, which is demonstrated by the wasting which occurs in all diseases afflicting the kidneys. The disordered stomach is often the first index of renal irregularities. Holloway's remedies used at that juncture would cut short many a serious and fatal attack. They act with wonderful efficacy on every organ of secretion, but especially do they regulate the stomach, liver and kidneys, in restoring their healthy functions, and casting out any obstructions or impurities. It is necessary for the Ointment to be well rubbed over the affected parts twice daily, when it is absorbed; and much augment the purifying and salutary influence of the Pills.

TIME the true Test,—EXPERIENCE the best Guide.

AN OLD STANDARD REMEDY.

For COUGHS, COLDS and CONSUMPTION, and all PULMONARY COMPLAINTS, use the

VEGETABLE PULMONARY BALSAM,

which has maintained its high reputation for nearly *forty years*, and is recommended by many of the most *eminent physicians and gentlemen* in the country, among whom are Rev. Josiah Lich, Phila.; Rev. Dr Lyman Beecher, New York; the late Prof. Leonard Woods, Andover Theological Seminary; L. P. Thompson, former Secretary of State, Vt.; Drs. Merrill, Perry, Abell, Parker, Berry, and many others; by the Press, and by the largest and oldest dealers in drugs and medicines in the United States and Canada.

Extracts from Letters received from Physicians.

"I with confidence recommend it as superior to any other preparation for the above complaints." "It has a superiority over every kind of medicine used, and has been used for lung complaints with wonderful success." "I am satisfied it is a valuable medicine." "It is a safe, convenient, and very efficacious medicine." "To my knowledge, it has never disappointed the reasonable expectations of those who have used it." "I confidently recommend its use in all complaints of the chest, as equal, if not superior, to any other medicine within my knowledge." "Of all the principal remedies used for coughs, I am satisfied yours is the best, and hope it will be better known and more generally used." "I have prescribed your balsam, and regard it as the most valuable and effective remedy within my knowledge."

Price,—Small size, 50 cts.; Large size, $1. *Be careful to get the genuine*, which is prepared *only by* REED, CUTLER & CO., Boston, and sold by dealers generally. d8—6m

DISEASES OF THE CHEST AND LUNGS.

These diseases are too well known to require any description. How many thousand are every year carried to the silent grave by that dreadful scourge Consumption, which always commences with a sligh cough. Keep the blood pure and healthy by taking a few doses of JUDSON'S MOUNTAIN HERB PILLS each week, and disease of any kind is impossible. Consumption and Lung difficulties always arise from particles of matter deposited in the air-cells by bad blood. Purify that stream of life and it will very soon carry off and destroy the poisonous matter; and like a crystal river flowing through a desert, will bring with it and leave throughout the body, the elements of health and strength. As the river leaving the elements of fertility in its course, cause the before barren waste to bloom with flowers and fruit, so pure blood causes the frame to rejoice in strength and health, and bloom with unfading beauty.

Judson's Mountain Herb Pills are sold by all Dealers in Medicine.

MRS. WINSLOW,

An experienced nurse and female physician, has a Soothing Syrup for children teething, which greatly facilitates the process of teething, by softening the gums, reducing all inflammation—will allay all pain, and is sure to regulate the bowels. Depend upon it, mothers, it will give rest to yourselves, and relief and health to your infants. Perfectly safe in all cases. See advertisement in another column.

PURIFY THE BLOOD.

With corrupt, disordered or vitiated blood, you must be sick all over. It may burst out in pimples or Sores, or in some active disease, or it may merely keep you listless, depressed and good for nothing. But you cannot have good health while your blood is impure. Ayer's Sarsaparilla purges out these impurities and stimulates the organs of life into vigorous action, restoring the health and expelling disease. Hence it rapidly cures a variety of complaints which are caused by impurity of the blood; such as *Scrofula or Kings Evil, Tumors, Ulcers, Sores, Eruptions, Pimples, Blotches, Boils, St. Anthony's Fire, Rose, or Erysipelas, Tetter or Salt Rheum, Scald head, Ringworm, Cancer or Cancerous Tumors, Sore Eyes, Female Diseases*, such as *Retention, Irregularity, Suppression, Whites, Sterility Syphilis or Venereal Diseases, Liver Complaints and Heart Diseases.* Try AYER'S SARSAPARILLA, and see for yourself the surprising activity with which it cleanses the blood and cures the disorders.

AYER'S CHERRY PECTORIAL is so universally known to surpass every other remedy for the cure of *Coughs, Colds Influenza Hoarseness Croup Bronchitis Incipient Consumption*, and for the relief of Consumptive Patients in advanced stages of the disease, that it is useless here to recount the evidence of its virtues. The world knows them.

AYER'S CATHARTIC PILLS—*for Costiveness, Dyspepsia, Indigestion, Dysentry, Foul Stomach, Jaundice, Headache, Heartburn, Fits, Rheumatism, Dropsy, Worms*, and in short for all the purposes of a purgative medicine.

Prepared by J. C. AYER & Co., Lowell, Mass. and sold by W. H. WATSON, General Agent for P. E. Island.

COCOAINE.

A NEW AND DESIRABLE PREPARATION FOR THE HAIR.—We with pleasure refer our readers to the preparations of Messrs. Joseph Burnett & Co., of Boston.

The want of their Cocoaine has long been felt in order to dispense with the many inferior preparations now in use.

It contains a very large proportion of Cocoa-Nut Oil, so celebrated for imparting to the hair a glossy and smooth appearance, which, together with its other properties, strengthens the hair and gives it a healthy and vigorous growth. We speak, after giving it a trial, and can conscientiously recommend it to the old and young as being a preparation of