

cided it to be valid. And though I am unable to state the description of land on which frogs are always found, yet I have the best authority for saying that whether they are numerous on Lot 54 or not, the soil there is of a very good quality. The Government are assailed for paying a higher rate for this Township than for the Selkirk estate; but if they had not agreed to accept the offer at £2000, other parties were prepared to step in and take possession; then the Government would have been charged with neglecting opportunities, and the hon. leader of the Opposition would have been the very first to raise the cry. Members of the Government have been accused of once opposing the Land Purchase Bill and afterwards adopting the measure. I can say for myself that I never opposed the Bill, and defy any hon. member to prove that I ever voted against it. I heartily wish all the land on the Island could be purchased under its provisions. But I was opposed to the Loan Bill, and will ever be so, for I consider it to be unjust in principle.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—I cannot understand the great objection of certain parties to the Loan Bill, as the amount of interest which it specified was only four per cent. The hon. member for Georgetown almost leaped into a passion when alluding to the action of the late Government in disposing of Warrants at a discount for the Road service. This was, he said, an unconstitutional proceeding, but I would like to hear him prove his assertion. A sum was voted by the House for the contingent expenses of roads and bridges, and the Government considered it quite proper to obtain money to meet the orders on the Road Correspondent, by appropriating a part of this sum to make up the deficiency caused by the discount allowed. But the present Government when in need of money under such circumstances, are assisted by the Bank for political purposes.

Hon. Mr. LONGWORTH.—There has been none received from the Bank for the Road Service.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—Well, an arrangement was made with the Bank last year to receive money from it; and we cannot tell to what purpose it is applied. As to issuing Warrants without authority, I contend that the late Government would never have adopted such a course; however, as the amount issued by the Government appears to have been only £2000, and thereby the estate was procured on more reasonable terms, perhaps we should not raise further objections on the point.

The paragraph was then agreed to, as was also the fifth.

The sixth paragraph was then read.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—This paragraph, Mr. Chairman, is in answer to one in the Speech which states that the Land Commission has investigated with the utmost care and diligence those questions submitted to it. Now, Sir, I dare say this was easily done, for the only questions submitted to it by the Government were the resolutions passed by this House two years ago, which were repudiated by the Duke of Newcastle. His Grace stated that he had referred the resolutions to Sir Samuel Canard, who with other proprietors, was of opinion that the labors of such a Commission as was proposed by the House would be unsatisfactory, as it would terminate only in a report which would not be binding on any of the parties, and suggested that three Referees be appointed with power to hear and determine all the questions in dispute. This proposal was concurred in by the Duke, and the resolutions rejected, because they did not include all the questions at issue, and would lead to nothing binding. Still these resolutions thus repudiated, and the Act of last Session to give effect to the award, with perhaps the exception of a despatch or two from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, were all that the Government submitted to the Commissioners; and I will undertake to show that if these gentlemen investigated with diligence the questions brought before them, it was independently of any assistance from the present Government. The Duke of Newcastle in his despatch in answer to that of the Lieutenant Governor enclosing the resolutions of the House last session agreeing to the Commission says:—

“It will be desirable that previous arrangements should be made as far as practicable, for having at hand all wit-

nesses, and all documentary evidence which the Commission is likely to require, so that the time needed for their actual sitting in the Island may be reduced within the most moderate compass consistent with the due and complete accomplishment of the enquiry.”

Now, Sir, the Government made no preparation of this kind at all. When the Commissioners arrived, instead of any previous arrangements having been made, the Government appeared to do everything to thwart the enquiry. The *Royal Gazette* containing the notice of the time that the Commission would commence its sittings, though that paper is usually issued on Tuesday morning, did not appear until Wednesday, the day on which the Court opened, as if to keep the people in ignorance of the fact. The Commissioners themselves after they began their labors were evidently most desirous to sift the whole question. And the Government did that much honor to the liberal party as to appoint Mr. Hensley one of the Counsel for the tenantry. They did not bring forward their own Attorney General, though he is in the receipt of some £350 of the public money, because, I suppose, they considered Mr. Hensley more competent than he to conduct the case. They also procured from New Brunswick the services of another very competent legal gentleman, Mr. Thompson, who proved himself to be very able, and gave general satisfaction. As regards the lawyers retained, then, I cannot complain of the conduct of the Government. But what kind of a brief did they place in these gentlemen's hands! Nothing but the resolutions referred to. The Speech therefore goes too far with respect to the Land Commission, if by the expression, “questions submitted to it,” be meant those submitted by the Government. The day on which the Royal Commissioners opened their court, I asked the question whether every person who so desired would be permitted to submit matter for their consideration, and Mr. Hensley replied that he understood the Government had no objections to any individual coming forward to give information.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—That statement is incorrect.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—These were the words, as nearly as I can remember, employed by Mr. Hensley. Now, Sir, I would like to ask, what had the Government to do with it!

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—Then why complain that they did not give in a brief!

Hon. Mr. COLES.—Their place was to submit to the Commissioners whatever questions were in dispute between Landlords and Tenants, but not to dictate who should be permitted to come forward and give evidence in reference to these questions. Let us see what was the result of the permission granted by the Court. I myself, and others came forward and made statements for the information of the Commissioners with respect to the questions they were called upon to investigate. But opposition was met with from the Government. When my friend on the left, Mr. Cooper, was proceeding with his evidence, he was interrupted by the Colonial Secretary with some statement about a clause in an old Act, which he said could be proved, by reference to the manuscript Journals of the House, and when the particular journal was enquired for, it was ascertained to be at the Colonial Secretary's own house, who had carried it from the Clerk's office, out of which no document of the kind should ever be taken. Another case of opposition to parties desirous of furnishing information to the Commissioners was that experienced by some delegates who applied to the Government for documents containing statistics in reference to the number of paupers, &c., and their request was never attended to.

Hon. Mr. HAVILAND.—No application was made to the Government for such documents.

Hon. Mr. COLES.—Well, it was made to some member of the Government,—I believe to the hon. member himself.