

the purpose of employing the people, and considered "by the Governor in Council" on 16th March, 1754. The petition states, "the subscribers having observed the daily decrease of the inhabitants of this town, with the great poverty of many that remain for want of employment for the laboring poor, are of opinion that nothing can conduce more to prevent a farther decrease of our inhabitants, and to the supply of the town with provisions, than the making out-settlements," &c. The petition concludes with the following paragraph, which is very indicative of the dangers of venturing beyond the limits of the town: "As the said undertaking will be attended with the immediate expense of at least £500 to the proposers, we humbly pray your Honor will indulge us for the first year with such a military force as may be thought necessary, and one or two blockhouses so situated as you shall judge most proper for our protection and defence, which may at the same time contribute to the security of the lots and settlement on the Dartmouth shore."

In a few days after the Council considered a petition of Mr. Charles Cooke, offering to settle a township at Mahone Bay, and asking for assistance in erecting a blockhouse, &c., referring also to the importance of "employing several indolent persons, and of keeping several good men from leaving the colony."

The Council decided to send a sloop-of-war with the blockhouse prepared by petitioner, and a company of Rangers to protect the settlers from the Indians.

That the hostility of the Indians was instigated by France, for the purpose of driving the English from Nova Scotia, or at least of restricting them to narrow limits, is evident from a most impudent proposal for a peace, made by Mon. le Loutre in the name of the Indians, the conditions of which would deprive the English of half the province, and would necessitate the destruction of Fort Lawrence. It very modestly specifies that as long as the English pass along the highways, they shall be treated as friends, but on their venturing into the forests, they would be regarded as enemies.

In the proceedings of the Council on the 31st day of July we find the following characteristic entry respecting this letter, "which, being read and considered, the contents appeared too insolent and absurd to be answered through the author;" it was, however, resolved that the Indians should be informed that, if they desired peace, they must come to Halifax, where they would be "treated with on reasonable conditions."

NOTE D.

Whether these two distinguished officers were ever at Shelburne, only their relatives can decide. Had they been American Generals, they would have had volumes written about them. Mr. Sabine, the republican biographer of the Loyalists, disposes of them in the following manner:

"His (Anthony Barelly's) son, Colonel Delancy Barelly, an aide-de-camp to George the Fourth, died in 1826. He had repeatedly distinguished himself, particularly at Waterloo."

This notice has certainly the merit of *brevity*. I may mention here, that his father, who was a leading man, was at one time Speaker of the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia. Under the head of "Stephen Delancy," Mr. Sabine says "a son of his was raised to Wellington, and was killed at Waterloo." This gallant officer is only entitled to a passing notice, consisting of thirteen words! A tombstone could scarcely be a more laconic biographer.

Hundreds of instances of the sacrifices of loyalists might be collected, but the information respecting the different persons who forfeited valuable properties and went through great privations and sufferings (the fate of all the Loyalists,) can only be obtained from their relatives and descendants. The instance referred to is introduced here, not because it is in any way distinguishable from the case of others, who adhered to the British Crown; but because the writer, having had all the original correspon-