

writing the instructions Mr. Becher had received when he drew up the Will. The instructions he (Mr. Wood) thought were verbal, and were dilated, and when the gentleman who drew up the Will had disposed of the six settlements, and came to provide for the widow of the Testator, he found that he had more money than he knew what to do with, and so rolled it up in the Will. The Commissioner said that Mr. Goodhue knew precisely what his words meant. In that case, then, would it not have been very easy for him to have said that all his property should be allowed to accumulate, and that his children should not enjoy it? The Commissioner of Crown Lands had impugned the integrity of a great many members of the House.

HON. MR. RICHARDS—No, no.

HON. MR. WOOD said that he did not object to the Commissioner lobbying, and he had seen him discussing this matter with several gentlemen. The interests of the community demanded that real property should not be locked up, as it would be were this Bill not passed. Out of all the Will cases that had been before the old Parliament, the Dominion Parliament, and this one, he had never heard it stated that the interests of any individual had suffered. The Commissioner himself had, two sessions ago, carried a Bill which was not only prospective but retrospective, and he (Hon. Mr. Wood) did not see how he could consistently oppose this Bill. The tendency of legislation was not to interfere with the enjoyment of property, but to allow those entitled to it to take possession. In this case that principle might be safely adopted, and the children should have the enjoyment of the property, saving the rights of the widow.

MR. COYNE also pointed out the erroneous statements of Mr. Richards, in assuming that the Deeds of Settlement were the provisions made for the children, while in truth they were for the grand-children.

**The amendment was lost, by a vote of 7 for, and 45 against it; and the Bill was then read a third time, and finally passed.**

---