

III. Mr. Becher having failed in his attempt to introduce his own statements in evidence before the Committee, on the 20th January, 1871, published a pamphlet, and circulated it amongst not only Members of the Legislature, but mutual friends and acquaintances. Its purport will be inferred from our remarks thereon, and which we again print, with Mr. Becher's replies and our answers.

*Remarks on the Pamphlet circulated by Mr. BECHER, in opposition to the Bill, and respectfully submitted by F. W. THOMAS and BENJAMIN CRONYN, two of the Petitioners for the Bill:*

1. Its intent is obvious. Mr. Becher now attempts to influence Honourable Members by his own one-sided statements in explanation of the Will, when these were held to be inadmissible by the Private Bill Committee.

2. If Mr. Becher's opposition is only prompted by his duty as Trustee, he should not impugn the decision of the Committee, the proper tribunal in that behalf; and it is quite unfair to the promoters of the Bill, as well as disrespectful to the Committee, that he should disregard that decision.

3. Mr. Becher alleges that the evidence he intended to offer, and which was rejected by the Committee, could not be contradicted. We assert the contrary, and would have willingly left the Committee to judge of the weight to be attached thereto, if the Committee had not deemed this course objectionable.

4. The case of the promoters rested upon the agreement come to between the widow and all the children of the Testator, to distribute the available residue of the estate, and which the Legislature could be properly asked to sanction, without assuming to alter the Will, or to do violence to the intentions of the Testator, but rather to facilitate these intentions and the better to secure the peace and welfare of his family.

5. Mr. Hillyard Cameron, the counsel consulted by Mr. Becher, advised him that the shares of Mr. Goodhue's children were vested interests, and Mr. Cameron emphatically adhered to this in his argument before the Committee, and it was one of the grounds on which he contended the Bill should be adopted. Mr. Becher incorporated this opinion in his petition against the Bill, but now