WEEKLY CALENDAR.—DECEMBER.

Last Quarter, 6th day, 1h, 17m., evening.
New Moon, 12th day, 6h. 4m. morning.
First Quarter, 20th day, 1h. 20m., morning.
Full Moon, 27th day, 10h. 33m., evening.

DAY MONTH.	DAY WEEK.	SUN rises	SUN sets	High water morn.	High water even.	Moon sets.	Moon rises	Day's length.
		h m	h m	h m	h m	h m	h m	h m
23	Sunday	7 47	4 12	6 26	6 46	3 16	3 56	8 25
24	Monday	7 47	4 12	7 13	7 33	4 22	4 56	8 25
25	Tuesday	7 48	4 12	8 12	8 32	5 26	5 56	8 24
26	Wednesday	7 48	4 14	9 7	9 27	6 27	6 56	8 26
27	Thursday	7 48	4 15	10 2	Prime			8 27
28	Friday	7 48	4 16	10 55	5 28			8 28
29	Saturday	7 48	4 17	11 48	6 28			8 29

THE LAND COMMISSION.

Hon. Mr Coles suggested that as the country now pays a Land Commissioner, by a little additional expense, the Government could manage the whole of the lands in the Colony through the Land Office, and as payments were received from the tenants, they might be handed over to the proprietors perhaps once in six months. He thought it would be necessary to adopt some method of this kind, for the tenants would not be able to purchase the freeholds of their farms, unless they were afforded the opportunity of paying for them by easy instalments, in which case proprietors would require to retain their agents to collect the monies as they became due, and would have to pay land tax, consequently it would be unjust to allow them so low a price for their lands as might be thought sufficient were they not subjected to such an outlay.

Con. Howe pointed out two difficulties in the way of carrying out this suggestion; first, the tenants, if a majority of the constituents, might decide upon not paying purchase money at all; and, secondly, it would not do to change a man's agent without his consent. He showed that a case analogous to the one mentioned in his first objection had occurred in Nova Scotia in reference to several Counties borrowing money from the Government. After they received the money, they formed a combination and never paid it.

Hon. Mr Coles thought if the Commissioners left the land in the hands of the proprietors to be sold by them, they would accomplish little good by coming to the Colony.

Con Palmer—I would not trust any Government with the management of the estates of the proprietors.

Con Howe—If no other solution of the question be possible, would any injury arise from this plan, namely: Suppose a price fixed upon the land on every estate, and the tenant to continue paying rent, but to be privileged to turn his earnings into a kind of savings bank, by paying £5 of the purchase money of his farm, now and again, and receiving interest upon, or a reduction of rent proportionate to the amount paid. If the tenant could pay none of the purchase money he might go on paying rent, and would be no worse off than before.

Mr Wightman—I think that plan would answer better than a loan.

Con. Gray—In arguing these points, we wish you to understand that our minds are not made up on any particular scheme; we only wish to hear your views. We start objections to draw out reasons, and to make you consider your statements more fully.

Finlay McNeill, Esq., M.P.P., was prepared to endorse nearly all that was advanced by Mr Wightman, but would add that the rents on Lots 63 and 64 were generally at 1s 2d currency per acre. A few days ago 300 acres of what had been Government lands were sold for non-fulfilment of purchase, the result of which was that the purchasers lost their instalment on the land. The Government gave them 10 years to pay the purchase money; they paid the first instalment, but could not meet the second. When the other demands on the tenants are made good, they find it difficult to pay rents or purchase-money for their farms.

Con. Palmer.—You say, when other demands are paid they find it difficult to pay their rents. Now I have no doubt of that, for these other demands include the merchant's accounts. You and Mr Wightman are large merchants, and of course when the rental system is dispensed with it will be a material benefit to you.

Mr Wightman—The people take a pride in paying the merchant, but none in paying the proprietor.

Con. Hensley proposes a few questions to Mr Beck.—You live on Lot 64, Mr Beck? Yes. How many years have you resided upon that Township? 47. What rent do the people pay? 1s 6d stg. is the usual rent;—some are in arrears to the amount of £30 or £40. Are the people generally industrious? They are, and sober. What is your opinion respecting their inability to pay rent? There are many settlers on the Township with small families, whose improvements are not sufficient to enable them to make the rent out of their farms. What is the average value of the land? I think about from 2s 6d to 5s sterling an acre.

Mr Philip Burns, from Lot 50, examined by Con. Hensley.—How much land have you, Mr Burns? 270 acres; and for this I pay £20 annually; there is a mill stream upon the property. In 100 years, the rent rises to £50. Are the tenants able to pay their rents? I am not able to pay mine, and others are like me. There is not a man upon the Lot who can pay his rent off his farm. What value do you set upon the land? For the fee simple, with time to pay, from 7s to 8s; the average I would say ought not to be more than from 6s to 7s.

Mr Burnett corroborated the statement of Mr Beck.

Mr M'Lure appeared as a delegate from Lot 65, and Mr Bathelomer Lelacheur from Lot 64. The tenants on these Lots, the delegates represented to be oppressed with high rents—about £9 for 100 acres. Not more than ¼ of the land is fit for cultivation. Some tenants are £30, others £50 in arrears. Mr Lelacheur stated that he was on Lot 64 fifty-five years. His father was detailed from Guernsey by a magistrate, the late Mr Cambridge. The land which his father thought he was going to possess was bordering upon the East River, not far from Charlottetown; but when he came to it, he found it was 5 miles in the interior. The family afterwards moved to Murray Harbour, and bought land there at the rate of £50 per hundred acres. His father previous to leaving Guernsey paid £800 for the freehold of 1500 acres, which he retained for a number of years, and then sold to Mr Worrell at 4s 6d an acre. The tenantry on Lot 64, besides the poverty of the land, had other difficulties to contend with. On account of the destruction of the forest years ago, fence poles and firewood could not be easily obtained.

Con. Hensley called a delegation from Lots 50 and 51, and after reading the memorial from Lot 51, questioned Mr James Rice, one of the delegates—You have a lease, Mr Rice? Yes. On what terms? The lease is at 1s an acre, and for 999 years. How long have you been on the place? 12 years. Are the tenants all in arrears? Yes. If they were afforded an opportunity of purchasing, you think the rate would require to be very low? Yes. At what rate do you think? 6s an acre, with 10 years to pay. Who is your agent? Mr Haviland, and he never distrained upon any of us; nor did we ever shave a horse's tail on his account.

Hon Heath Haviland—Your Excellencies, this Lot belongs to two branches of the Montgomery family. For one of those parties, Mr Deane is agent. Mr Deane, I believe, gave his tenants a clear receipt for one year's rent; but they are now in arrears of 3 years. In 1846, the proprietor of the part of Lot 50 for which I am acting as agent, gave up £1000 of arrears of rent, to the tenants, and gave them new leases. For the first few years the rent, as stipulated in the new leases, was only to be 6d an acre, and afterwards was not to rise higher than 2s6d.

The tenants from this portion of the Township spoke highly of their agent.

Court adjourned at 5½ o'clock p.m.

Thursday, Sept. 20, 1860.

M Lawrence Peters from Lot 44, came forward for examination.

Mr Cooper, before the examination was proceeded with, wished to show how the French settlers on the Township were driven out of their property, and how they obtained land on another. He commenced his remarks by saying that one of these Acadian French had informed him that he had settled on a point of land in the south west corner of Bells Bay. Mr Cambridge obtained possession of this part of land, to (Mr Cooper) had no doubt, by tearing some leaves out of the Register, as there was no title of it on record.

Con. Ritchie—Mr Cooper, you mentioned this at Charlottetown, and ought not to repeat it, as it is a very serious charge.

Con. Hensley—I may state the Registrar of Deeds searched the Registers in my presence, and it did not appear that any leaves had been torn out.

Mr Cooper—It might not have been the original register which you examined.

Con. Gray—Such an act would bring disgrace upon the whole country.

Con. Ritchie—I will go further, and say that no public man should make such a statement until he had examined the records for himself.

Mr Cooper—It was not easy for me to do it. I may remark in reference to the case of Archibald Campbell, who settled at the place which I mentioned, that the land was on the east boundary, and was to run west to the line of the Township; but at that time it appeared, the Township line was not run. Afterwards, when it was run on the road, Mr Anthony Bagnio received a block of land there, and he exacted 200 acres from Campbell in lieu of improvements upon the property, and when he died, left it to his widow. After his death, the son of Mr Cambridge went to the widow, and desired her to show him the land her husband had exacted. She gave it to him, and when he had examined it, he told her it was no good, and threw it into the fire. The widow went to Charlottetown to see about it, but could not meet with any redress. Archibald Campbell died, and his property fell into the widow. Some years after, a Mr Lewis came as agent for the Lot, and sent for Francis Gallant, who was then living on the property, and told him he was sent by the