

House, in its second session, passed a Bill for purchasing such alleged claims, as is explained in the third paragraph of their Petition to the House of Commons, forwarded in 1840.

7. Resolved, That considering said Bill, and the opinion expressed by the Legislative Council of the same, in their Resolution of 28th April 1840 (folios 89 and 90 of Legislative Council Journals), and that there was no chance of these proprietary claimants making any offer which would come near to what the colony could pay, the House felt themselves called on to pass said Bill a second time.

8. Resolved, That as the question is to be henceforth a public question, it is expedient to give publicity to all the leading important facts of the case, and that therefore a committee be forthwith named, to make a list of such despatches received from ministers, and of such answers thereto by governors, and of such reports and examinations made by the House of Assembly, and of such petitions and addresses by the House of Assembly, the Legislative Council, or the people of the colony, as may seem necessary. That the same shall be printed, and 500 copies thereof forwarded, under the direction of said committee, to Joseph Hume, Esq. as agent for the House of Assembly, and that said committee be directed to request Mr. Hume to cause same to be distributed to such Members of the Imperial Parliament, and other influential individuals, as he may think most likely to advocate the cause of the oppressed cultivators of this island.

9. Whereas the Legislative Council did, on the 28th April 1840, pass five Resolutions, the third of which distinctly charges the majority of the House of Assembly with deluding the people whom they represent, and is in all its bearings highly insulting—(see folio 90 of Journal of Legislative Council)—

Resolved, That the present House of Assembly, in the various procedures wherein they have had to communicate with the Legislative Council, have shown no disrespect to that body, nor will any part of *their* Resolutions bear any interpretation of reflection on the moral character of any individual of that body. The original and unwise granting the soil of the colony to a few, and providing that these should have a seat in the Legislature, has set those in opposition to the mass of the people on that most important subject, of the price of rent to be paid for the wilderness; and at the same time has given these few the power of exercising a similar influence in all the departments of public business; and therefore, though the members of the House of Assembly, as individuals, entertained no ill-will to the members of the Council, yet, as a public body, the House of Assembly was bound to represent the injuries occasioned by this unfortunate constitution. That under the circumstances of the colony, the House of Assembly could do no less than state the peculiar interests existent in the Legislative Council. How far such statement was consistent with the fact, will appear from sundry of these present Resolutions; and they represented this conduct not as a system propagated by those at present in the Council, but as a necessary consequence of said constitutional defect, particularly alluding thereto in the Resolutions and Addresses of the sessions of 1839, and fully describing same in the sixth Resolution of 1840, (folio 146, of Journals of House of Assembly.) But the Legislative Council, in their reply thereto, refer to alleged "notoriety," represent the majority of the House of Assembly as turbulent demagogues, who had devised a plan for plundering the rich, and who, as the Legislative Council had resisted this, were anxious to divert the popular odium incident on the failure of such scheme from themselves to the Council. How far this is consistent with fact will appear from the subsequent part of this Resolution, and from others of these present Resolutions. But in the mean time it may be remarked, that the making the *present House* the originators of the alleged invasion of the rights of property, is in strange contradiction with the report of the Earl of Durham, particularly that part where he states that "in every other colony there has been such a degree of *laches* on the part of the Government, as in equity to preclude it from any enforcement of the conditions upon which the original grants were made; but in Prince Edward Island, scarcely at any time have five years been suffered to elapse without some appeal to the colonial ministers, praying that the Crown would resume the grants it had made, as a measure not merely justifiable, but as the only measure that could free the province from the evils these excessive grants had inflicted." How far it is fact that the delusion of the leaders of the present majority of the House of Assembly "has been the cause of the tenantry allowing their rents to fall into arrear," may be in part illustrated by an Address to the King, wherein it is stated that *this unfortunate disposition of the lands* has produced great evil, and that "the greater number of our settlers are leaseholders, under the large proprietors, and are at this day sinking under the pressure of accumulated rents, which they are unable to pay"—and this is of date April 1829, when not one of the present members of the House of Assembly had a seat in that body; and when two, now members of the Legislative Council, were members of the House of Assembly, viz. the Honourable the Attorney-general, and the Honourable George Dalrymple, who also were both members of the joint committee of the Council and House of Assembly appointed to prepare such Address.

10. Resolved, further, in regard to said Resolution, that it is unfounded, because that the question was agitated before many of the members of this Assembly were born, before others had left Britain, before any one of their whole body had the most distant idea of obtaining a seat therein. Further, that it was advocated by the Honourable George Dalrymple, now a member of the Legislative Council, then a member of the House of Assembly from 1830 to 1835, and the measure of escheat, which goes farther than the Bill rejected by the Legislative Council, was acknowledged by the Honourable the Surveyor-general, and the then Solicitor-general (Lawson), "to be a lawful measure, and one likely to result in great benefits