

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

House of Commons, March 7th 1837.

CANADA AFFAIRS.

••• LORD JOHN RUSSELL—

Having thus stated why, in the opinion of his Majesty's government, it is impossible to yield to the demands which had been made by the Representative Assembly of Lower Canada, I shall now proceed to state the views which we have taken of the whole case, and of the remedy which we propose in order to put an end to the difficulties which have arisen in consequence of these occurrences. The first difficulty is the payment of the judges and of the King's officers in the colony. I think that when it is recollected that it is now four years and a half since the judges have received their salaries, during which period they have been left entirely to their own resources for support, the house will consider that it is high time for us to come forward and interpose the authority of Parliament in their behalf (hear, hear, hear.) Had we followed the advice of the commissioners upon this subject, we should have come forward last year and demanded of parliament the means of paying the arrears justly due to these officers; but it was thought that as some misunderstanding appeared to exist between the Assembly of Lower Canada and Lord Glenelg, it would be desirable to give them an opportunity to reconsider the subject once more, and wait to see if they still persisted in refusing these payments. With regard to the propriety of the proceeding which I am about to recommend, I apprehend that it is undoubtedly in the power of the imperial Parliament to interfere in colonial affairs, whether in legislative matters or in supply, when a pressing occasion occurs for so doing. This principle was admitted at the bar of the House of Commons by Dr. Benjamin Franklin, who, in regard to the Assembly of New York, was asked, whether, if a colony were altogether to refuse supplies, the imperial parliament could interfere, and he replied that "he could not conceive such a case to occur, though they had in some cases refused to grant permanent salaries to the officers of government, and he thought very wisely so." He was then asked again, "whether in cases where interference was justifiable the right of interfering ought not to be in the Parliament of Great Britain?" To which he replied, "that he would have no objection to it, provided the power were only used for the use and good of the colony itself." Now, this is a limitation in the justness of which I fully concur; for if we were to attempt to order the appropriation of the funds raised in the colonies to the use of the mother country, it appears to me clearly that we should be far overstepping our province and our authority (hear.) What I propose however, to-night is, simply, to apply a certain portion of the revenues of Lower Canada to the payment of such items as the Representative Assembly have already agreed to in their votes of supply in the year 1833. The total amount is £148,000, and my purpose is only to order its payment for those purposes which the assembly has already admitted, and not for any which in 1832 it may have refused to agree to. The next consideration is the manner in which the government of the province is to be carried on in future, and the nature of the legislative council which is to be adopted. It is proposed to adopt the recommendation of the commissioners, that judges shall be excluded by law from this council, as also all persons guilty of any disgraceful offence; and that no person be appointed to it until his name has been sent over here by the governor of the province. With regard to the principle or predilections upon which persons have been selected for appointment to the legislative council, I believe it has been too much the practice to select them almost entirely from amongst persons of British extraction, who form but a small numerical minority in the province, whilst the representative assembly is composed in great part of persons of french extraction, who are the majority in point of numbers, and whose views and interests in many matters are entirely at variance with those of the minority, whose feelings are represented in the legislative council. I must say that the manner in which governors of this colony have lately acted upon the authority vested in them by the acts of 1791 in this particular is not a judicious one, and I consider that to select them

alternately, one from the British, and then one from the French stock, would be far preferable, as well as more in accordance with the practice in the earlier periods after the passing of that act. I think by thus adopting many persons who had no hope of appointment hitherto, and by excluding all persons of doubtful character, and especially those who have been public defaulters, we shall go a great way towards effecting a reconciliation of differences upon this point. In the next place, with regard to the composition of the executive council, I propose that there should not be more than two or three official persons in that council, and that the remainder of it should be made up from the legislative council and the general assembly. It is proposed also that they should not enter into the discussion of any subject not immediately connected with the province except upon advice of the governor. I propose further, that the governor shall be at liberty to act contrary to the advice of the executive council if he think proper, but that, on so doing he should make a minute of the occurrence. By this means, whilst we give the members of the executive council a proper degree of control in the affairs of the government of the colony, we also leave the governor a discretionary power to act by himself where he conceives the duty of his office and his general instructions require it. The next question to which I have to allude is the North American Land Company. This association, I believe, has been of great use to the colony: many settlers have obtained advantages from which they could not have hoped for, either from the government or from their own individual exertions and resources. I see no reason to differ from the resolution of the commissioners in respect to this point: The assembly? it appears, pretend that the act of 1791 gives them the supreme control over all the wild lands of the province—a pretence which I cannot agree to, as the crown has never parted with its rights to grant charters for the purposes of planting or clearing as it may think fit. Another subject upon which much complaint has been made is the act of this country in reference to tenures. This act is complained of upon two grounds—first, that it was originally framed in ignorance of the tenures of the colony (hear, hear;) and, secondly, that it does not provide a means of voluntary commutation. The commissioners consider both these opinions to be well founded, and propose that as soon as any act on the subject shall have been passed by the colonial legislature, parliament shall repeal the said act. In doing this, however, I need hardly observe that great care should be taken that the vested rights of individuals under the existing system, be not prejudiced. Another complaint of the Canadas against the act of 1791, especially on the part of Upper Canada, is the embarrassment which arises out of it to trade between the two colonies. A newspaper which I hold in my hand complains that every boat which comes from the lower provinces is subject to inspection at the custom-house, and forced to pay duty, and that the passengers from Great Britain passing by this route are also subject to pay certain dues of this kind. It complains further that the general division of the duties is unfair, and above all, that they have not a full vent for their merchandize by the St. Lawrence. With a view to the adjustment of these differences it is proposed with the assent of the legislatures of the two provinces, that a joint committee should be appointed, to sit at Montreal, and which committee should be composed in the following manner, namely, of four members of the legislative councils of each province, and of eight members of each representative assembly, making twenty-four persons in all, who should have the power to prepare laws and to compare results upon all these points of reciprocal policy. One of the most important matters which would come under their notice would be the navigation of the St. Lawrence. Another would be the settlement of matters of commerce between the two colonies. Another point would be the constitution of some fair court of appeal, and of impeachment for judges and other officers of the executive. The committee would also have to direct its attention to the line of boundary. It is hoped that upon many of the points I have touched upon this committee will be able to devise measures by which the mutual interest and the good government of the two colonies may be greatly improved. With regard to the matters of supply to which I

have already alluded, it is proposed that, after securing the civil list, and the salaries of the judges and of certain government officers, the whole revenue of the colony should be left to the disposal of the Assembly for purposes of national improvement, as in the formation of roads, &c. In this situation, without any direct tax, without any debt to keep down, and whose whole revenue is raised by means of duties upon commerce, which they apply as they think proper to their own internal improvements, and the necessary expence of their assemblies, this, I think is as desirable a state of things as it is possible to conceive. With respect to any injuries or disadvantages which the Canadians are alleged to lie under in respect to the law, I can only say that they do not appear in any of the petitions before us. That the House of Assembly should be entirely elected by themselves, that the executive government should be nominated by the crown, but with certain conditions and securities, and that the House of Assembly should come to some arrangement with the upper province on the subject of trade and other international matters. Such are the general propositions which we desire to submit, with a view to bringing these complaints to an adjustment. According to this view of the case I think it can hardly be denied that these colonies are in the enjoyment of as great a portion of political freedom and of personal immunity from oppression, and of as great power to make wholesome laws, as any persons at home. Such is the condition of these colonies, and such will be their prospects if they accept the propositions which I have now laid down. If, on the other hand, they take an unfavourable view of these proposals—if they persist in maintaining that it is absolutely necessary that there should be an elective legislative council and an executive council subservient to the representative assembly, then it must very shortly come to this, that they should also have a governor of their own nomination, for none other would do their bidding (cries of hear, hear.) If this be the proposition of the Assembly of Lower Canada, it is, in another form, nothing else than demanding the total independence of the colonies from the mother country. This is a demand which, if it be persisted in, must drive parliament to the necessity of saying whether there is any form of colonial constitution under which the Canadas can be governed than that embodied in the act of 1791. But to these addresses, by which the dignity of parliament and of the country is impaired, and by accepting which we should be made responsible for acts in which we do not concur, and which we do not think desirable, I cannot agree. I, however, do not suppose that these colonies will persist in their demands; but if they do still hold out, we have not the means of carrying on the government of them here in continual resistance to their assemblies. I do not think that we could carry on the government of the colony without the legislative council; and I wish to have the advice of parliament on the subject, whether we should yield to demands which we consider would amount to the abandonment of the colony altogether, or whether we shall adopt the course I now propose, by which I hope to induce the colonists to reconsider the whole matter in dispute, and see whether those disputes had not arisen in a great part out of feelings of irritation consequent upon former disputes, and to offer such practicable measures as may induce them to abandon the greater number of those complaints. The noble Lord, after thanking the committee for the attention with which they had listened to his observations, which, however owing to the state of his health, he had been enabled very imperfectly to express, sat down amidst general cheering.

MR. LEADER said it was his intention to oppose the resolutions of the noble lord, by all the means which the usages of the house would permit. The Canadians complained of grievances—they did not seek to establish a commonwealth; but, unless you acceded to their just demands, you would compel them to throw themselves into the arms of a neighbouring republic. The noble lord said, that if the council was made elective, the interests of the people would predominate. What an objection to come from the noble lord! The noble lord propose not that the legislative council should be made to harmonise with the assembly, and the majority of the people, but that the majority of the people, and the legislative assembly, should be compelled to bend to the vicious principles of the legis-

lative council (hear, hear) We were told that this was a contest between the French and English Canadians, that it was a contest of races; this was not the truth. In the assembly there were many English members, and the majority of those English members were always found voting with what was called the French party. The contest, therefore, was not a contest of races, but of principle—of oligarchy against democracy—of the great majority on one side which had been hitherto ground down and kept under by the miserable minority on the other. The hon. gentleman then read various extracts from the reports of the commissioners, and observed that their arguments were precisely those which were used against granting corporations to Ireland. He was much surprised to see the commissioners appointed by a liberal government going for arguments to the other side of the house against having an elective legislative council (hear), and ending their report by recommending that the constitution of Canada should be taken away altogether, and that a coercion bill should be adopted towards that country. He appealed from their decision, however to that house, to know if they would sanction such a proceeding (hear). It should be recollected that the legislative council was but an experiment when it was first adopted. Mr. Pitt said so at that time, and the House of Commons at that time said that it was a bad experiment and must fail (hear, hear). The hon. member here read a passage from the speech of Mr. Fox relative to the legislative council, in which he said that this country should not adopt for Canada a servile imitation of its own House of Lords, as was recommended by the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, for they could only give them the semblance and not the substance of such an Assembly, for they could not have the claim to reverence and respect which the British House of Peers commanded. Such was the opinion of Mr. Fox, and the experience of over forty years had proved that he was right. Mr. Fox, in 1791, proposed that the legislative council should be elective, and he (Mr. Leader) was then only proposing the very same thing that Mr. Fox proposed, in 1791. The case is much stronger now than it was then, for they had not the experience of forty years to guide them, whereas Mr. Fox was only uttering a prediction. He would ask the noble lord if he was prepared to resist such authority; he supposed the noble lord would persist in his resolutions, but he would tell him if he did so he would find it in a very short time impossible to rule Canada, except by force of arms (hear, hear;) and he would ask if England was likely to reap either glory or profit in such a contest? The cases of Canada and Ireland were parallel. The Canadians had been complaining of their grievances for thirty years unavailingly; they were attached to the British constitution; but it should be recollected that on the other side of the St. Lawrence there was a great and powerful republic ready to receive them, and into which they would certainly be received if the noble lord persisted in resisting their just and unanimous demand (hear.) He appealed to members of that House who preferred representative government to arbitrary rule; he appealed to every man who professed justice to injustice, and, most of all he appealed to the liberal Irish members to assist him, if not to obtain justice, at least, to prevent the infliction of the grossest injustice by destroying the constitution of Canada. The hon. member concluded by moving, as an amendment, "That it is advisable to make the legislative council of that province an elective council."

MR. ROEBUCK seconded the amendment.

MR. ROEBUCK rose and said, that sometime ago he had urged the government to do justice to Ireland on the great principle of universal justice, that no people could be governed well if their own feelings were not consulted. To that broad principle as regarded Ireland, ministers seemed partially willing to accede; therefore he was sorry to see them retrograde in respect to the Canadians; but it was in vain to look for any thing like steadiness of principle from individuals holding office (hear.) His Majesty's Ministers came down to the house with resolutions respecting Canada, which entirely nullified their former intentions. They denied justice to Canada, and yet appeared willing to grant it to Ireland; and what was the reason? because Ireland was at the door, and Canada was distant (hear.) Ireland threatened, and hence she had a show of justice conceded to her which was refused to Canada (hear.) He looked for support in witnessing these resolutions from the Irish members; and he trusted

that all absent members would be marked by their constituents. What is the question? It is whether we are to do justice to a people under England, but distant? The case of the two countries, Canada and Ireland, was parallel. In Canada the majority of the population were Catholic; so were they indisputably in Ireland. The great bulk of the population of Ireland were borne down and trampled upon by a miserable, monopolizing minority; so were they in Canada. The parallel was complete, each fighting against a miserable monopoly, which was upheld by the power of the government. Ireland on our own shores had been a shame to England for centuries, and Canada had not been a shame to us for so long a time, because she had not been in our possession for so long a period [hear.] In 1791, Lord John Russell stated, and no doubt truly that England granted a constitution to Canada, which was to be a sort of a reflection of the British Constitution; it was so, the shadow, but not the reality. There was a Governor who was to represent the King of England, but did that functionary so represent royalty [hear.] He [Mr. R.] would not say that the King was Lord Gosford or Lord Glenelg. The Governor or the King, which ever he might be called, perhaps might be found sitting under that gallery. [Here the hon. member pointed to the stranger's gallery.] Every one who knew any thing of colonial policy, knew well that there was a power behind the colonial minister stronger than the minister himself [hear.] Again he would say that the House of Commons did not resemble the House of Assembly, inasmuch as the House of Commons did not represent the wishes and the wants of the people of this country, whereas the House of Assembly did represent the wants and wishes of the people of Canada; therefore the representation of Canada did not resemble that of this country [series of hear, hear.] Three separate schemes had been proposed in order to defeat the Canadians. The first was, that the money was to be paid over by the House of Assembly to the government, and this the house refused, knowing full well that the same corrupt set of officers would have the management of its disbursement. Then another scheme, equally discreditable and shuffling, had been attempted, and the noble lord is now supporting a set of resolutions which are little better; and this was done in order to get rid of the responsibility; and still keeping the power in their hands, they offered to allow the representatives to sit for life; but this proposition had been indignantly refused by the Canadians. And what line of conduct did the Governor pursue? He had put his hand into their pockets and prevented them managing their own revenues, and he hoped for such acts Lord Gosford and Lord Aylmer would be made to account; for twice had the people of Canada been robbed in this manner. The House of Assembly had demanded the accounts of the receiver general, and they had been refused. The Legislative Council had refused them, and therefore the House of Assembly had acted as they had done in refusing any more supplies. After which the governor had demanded the accounts of the receiver general, who had been a defaulter, who was a defaulter for years, and still remains a defaulter to the tune of one hundred thousand pounds; but he had not been proceeded against. On the contrary, he had been protected by the Legislative Council, and was protected by the Governor and the official party [hear.] This sort of business had been going on for twenty-five years, and nothing had been done to get the money returned, which could now amount to little less than £150,000, by people who had been sent out from England, who had taken the money of the people of Canada and spent it. The House of Assembly then demanded that they should, as the representatives of the people, have the control of the expenditure of the revenues—but this had been denied by the Legislative Council. Afterwards another disgraceful scheme had been attempted, viz: to divide the revenues of Canada into two portions for disbursement; but the people knowing that a third and the largest portion would be kept from their management, they refused to accede to the proposition; and as the Legislative Council had, on all occasions, and in every manner, stood in the way of reform, the House of Assembly had petitioned the parliament of this country, and had entrusted that petition to him, [Mr. R.] and which he had the pleasure to recommend to the attention of that house. This petition, important as it was, had been designated by the noble lord opposite, [Stanley, we believe] by a name which he could assure him had not been forgotten on the other side of the Atlantic. He had called it "an impotent scream;" and this had come from the noble lord who had in some measure attempted reform in that country, but which had only the effect of putting other men into the Legislative Council, and did not change any of the measures, inasmuch as the government said they must choose the council themselves.—The question was, would the house allow these speculating serfs to go on in this way, or would they give the people of Canada reform, and allow them to manage their own revenues? The House of Assembly had, as the real representatives of Canada, deputed him to present a set of resolutions, 92 in number, the matter of which might have been usefully comprised in a much smaller compass, to that house, and in which he took very great interest. And what had the government done? They have done that which he considered added insult to neglect. They had every information which they possibly could have on the subject from people well acquainted with the wants and wishes of the inhabitants, namely, from their natural protectors, their representatives, and to which nothing could be added [hear, hear]. The government had sent out three commissioners, which he would again say was a matter of additional insult when men were so sent out who did not know the language, were not acquainted with their laws, and who did not understand their interests [hear, hear]. The first was a kind of country squire, a peer now; the other two were Sir G. Gipps and Sir Charles Grey. The honorable and learned gentlemen then read

extracts from the report of the commissioners, and contended that it contained statements from facts, without coming to any conclusion on them. Others were contradictory, but in no case was there any information in it which had not been before mentioned; and were they to take this statement as a set off against the opinions of the people of Canada [hear.] The plan of the people of Canada was a bold and comprehensive one, and showed that they understood their interests, as contrasted with that of the noble lord, which the honorable and learned member described as a cut-purse plan. The plan of the Canadians put to shame the chicanery of that of the noble lord; but it had been said that this plan gave the French the predominance over that of the others, but this is denied. He was glad to hear the argument which had been applied a few nights ago respecting the Irish corporations, because the majority of the Canadians, like the Irish, spoke a different language—they were of a different religion, and had been persecuted. On that debate he [Mr. Roebuck] made use of the same arguments which he had that night made, but how differently had his observations been received.—On the former occasion certain gentlemen appeared well pleased with his line of argument, because it was in favor of their plan; but now the same arguments were applied nearly under the same circumstances for Canada, they were any thing but pleasant—[a laugh]—and he would tell the house the reason, because they were afraid the people of Ireland, but they were not so of the Canadians. The honorable and learned member here read other extracts from the report of the commissioners, and at considerable length contended that it was not only contradictory but incorrect, inasmuch as it stated that the French Canadians in some instances formed the majority of the popular party, and in others that the English were the majority for the elective system, and the French against it. The Canadians do not want either the French or the British Canadian, what they demand is the elective principle, and not that it should be a question of races of persons who should govern them. The honorable and learned member, after reading other extracts from the report, stated that it appeared to him to be a piebald affair: for Sir George Gipps and Sir Charles Grey have written parts of it, or each one, and poor Lord Gosford, he had written one too [hear, hear]—each of which contradicted the other. The Canadians did not wish to make this a French question or an English question, and all he asked in their behalf was, that they should have justice whether they spoke English or French. It was to the interest of the people of England that the Canadians should be well governed; indeed, as much so, as it was for the people of Canada. Then it was asked, who were the English party? Why, he would answer, the agriculturists, and they had the same interests as the Canadians; and if it so happened that the legislative council had been opposed to good government, how come it that they opposed it? The French Canadian people wanted peace & security in which they could carry on their trades and other pursuits in which they are engaged. They are loyal, good-natured, and industrious people, and why should the agricultural population and the inhabitants of Quebec, Montreal, &c., be deprived of beneficent measures because they might be descended from the English people or the French people? Those who had attempted this line of conduct had raised the shout of French, Catholic, and Republican government, thinking the people of England would swallow the stupid, dull, bigoted horror—[cheers]—and so it would amongst those who did not understand the question [hear]. One of the plans recommended by the commissioners was, that every voter should give a single vote for each candidate. This plan he thought suspicious. And another was, that 3,000 persons speaking the English language should return a member, but that it should require six thousand speaking the French language to do so; was this fair, he would ask [hear.] The noble lord was giving a victory to one of the parties. But would the remedy be an adequate one? He felt assured it would not be adequate, & that next year would bring a stoppage of the supplies, the same cries from the official herd, and perhaps a fresh commission, and another pettifogging scheme. The remedy was inadequate according to the ministers' own showing. The ministry shuffled. They did not carry out their own principles. They should be bold, according to their own ideas, and do away at once with the House of Assembly. It was an impolitic measure. It would be the cause that there would be the loss of all respect on the part of Canada towards this country. The people of Canada would look to themselves the moment these resolutions passed. The outcry would first be direct against our manufactures. The banner of independence would soon be raised, as in Texas. The Americans would rush across the frontier to the assistance of the Canadians, and the English would be driven at one fell swoop from out of Canada. We should thus separate from the Canadians not as brothers, and with a mutual friendship, and for our mutual interests, but as foes, and with feelings of hatred which it would require years to alleviate, after an ignominious defeat, & amid the execrations of the millions whom we had successively injured and insulted [cheers].

On motion of Mr. HUME the debate was adjourned.

Wednesday, the 8th March, 1837.

RESUMED DEBATE.

MR. LABOUCHERE had come down to the house prepared to give a silent, but reluctant vote in favour of the resolutions; but something had transpired in the course of the discussions upon them, which made him desirous of stating in a few words, the grounds on which that vote

would be founded. It had fallen to his lot on any occasions, to address the house on the state of affairs existing in the colony, to which the resolutions under consideration referred; and his object had ever been to retain these colonies to the mother country by every means in his power as long as it could be done; but above all that they should act towards the Canadas liberally and justly, in order that if a separation should sooner or later take place, they might have a good case, and not be liable to the imputation of having neglected their duty to, or the interests of, the mother country. Having entertained this opinion, he had frequently urged upon the house what appeared to him to be well founded grievances on the part of the Canadians, whether arising from a mistaken view taken by the government abroad, or by the offices at home, and had expressed his opinions against the principles adopted by the governments of the day. He had always felt strongly that, in order to secure the affections of the people of that country, that it was the interest as well as the duty of parliament to leave to them, as far as was possible, the management of their own concerns. There was one limit only to that general rule, viz: that as long as Canada, or any other colony, remained a part of the British Empire, he would not consent to the degradation of the British Crown [cheers.] He would not say they were approaching such a dangerous state of things in Canada, because he had observed, during the present discussion, it was admitted on all sides that some interference on the part of government was necessary. Things in fact had come to a stand still, if he might use such an expression in reference to matters of government, and they must now move either in one direction or another, and the question was in which direction they were to move? Hon. gentlemen had commented on the evils arising from stopping the supplies, and were they not on the verge of the dissolution of all society? He [Mr. L.] regretted exceedingly to hear the language which had been applied to the judges by the honorable member for Bath, who had called them "howling officials"; because, whether looking to that statement, or to the situation in which these parties were placed, such thing could not happen without bringing the law into contempt, and that was an evil which he [Mr. Labouchere] would not consent should exist, without endeavouring to provide against it. Now, what was the principal demand which was made? It was this—that the legislative council should be made elective. He would speak frankly on the subject. He entertained the same opinion that was expressed by Mr. Fox—namely, that it was a most unfortunate circumstance, when these colonies were established, that the legislative councils were not made elective. The consequence had been to place the people in violent opposition to each other; and he was quite sure that, if the council had been elective, no difference of opinion would have arisen between the English and French population. Let the house look to the case of Louisiana. That state was analogous, in point of inhabitants, with Lower-Canada. There was a very large French, and a small American population, but both parties live under equal laws. No man was asked from whence he came, and, though there was a social, there was no political separation. On an abstract ground, therefore, he considered that it was not indefensible to say that a legislative council should be elective. Hon. gentlemen might contend that it was inconsistent that that should be the case; but, in truth and fact, in the oldest colonies of America, one-half of them had been actually governed by legislative councils so elected. Mr. Fox regretted that the legislative council had not been elective, and Mr. Pitt's answer was, it was only an experiment. And what was the opinion of two of the commissioners, Lord Gosford and Sir Charles Grey? They conceived that it was an unfortunate circumstance that, at an earlier period, the elective principle not been introduced into the legislative council; and that at least some modification of the present system was desirable. He agreed with the commissioners. He had no abstract objection to the Legislative Council being elective, and he must say that he had not heard argument, founded on reason or precedent, drawn from colonial history, against that proposition. The question was now narrowed considerably—namely, whether he was prepared to take the alternative and vote for these resolutions, or express his opinion that the legislative council should be immediately elective? There were however other considerations, because the immediate change would be fraught with danger to individuals, and nothing therefore would induce him to give his consent to that proposi-

tion. He did not wish to speak disrespectfully of the Legislative Assembly, but as regarded its conduct to the executive council, it had endeavoured to establish claims which no colony ought to be allowed to set up. With respect to those individuals who had acquired tenures under the Tenures Act, he must say that it would be positive injustice to them if that act should be repealed; indeed it would be neither more nor less than spoliation. Having made up his mind that it was the duty of the house to interfere and put an end to the present distracted state of things and to enable the machinery of government to move, he conceived that it was the duty of government to propose such a measure as should go as little beyond the principle of the constitution as possible, and that measure he thought would be the result of the resolutions which his noble friend had proposed. It would be the means of putting an end to that state of things which prevented the officers of government from receiving their salaries. At the same time he should certainly have found it difficult to vote for the resolution with reference to not making the legislative council an elective body, if it had not been accompanied with the proposition for making that body more fitted to perform its functions than was the case at present. On a former occasion it had been stated that the legislative council merely re-echoed the screams of the Governor; he did not mean to say it had improved since that time, though the commissioners considered it in a colorable degree; in all its essential points however it remained the same. He thought it would be an unfortunate circumstance if it should go forth to Canada that all the fault was on the side of the House of Assembly, and the hon. member who had last addressed the house had endeavoured to argue the case as between the House of Assembly and the legislative council, and in favor of the one and against the other. But the Commissioners had stated that the legislative council had obstructed bills which had been passed for forming local government, and he, therefore, thought it hard, with this fact staring them in the face, that the fault should be stated to be all on one side. While he thought the government right in not introducing the elective principle into the legislative council, yet he was glad that they had pledged themselves to look into the composition of the legislative council, with a view to the amendment of the principle upon which it was established. He was quite aware that the resolutions would not be received with favour by either of the extreme parties in that house; but there was a middle party; a party that struggled against extremes, & who were deeply attached to the liberties of their country, and he did hope that those honorable members would support an extreme measure, which, he was free to admit, could only be justified by an extreme case. He should be extremely sorry that these resolutions should go out to Canada, accompanied with the impression that the Imperial Parliament was not disposed to look into any grievance, more especially as regarded the constitution of the legislative council, a change in which was essential, in order to maintain and secure the confidence and attachment of the people of Canada

WINES, &c.

FOR SALE by the Subscriber:
8 Hogsheads Superior Madeira Wine,
2 Quarter Casks do Constantine do
50 Cases Superior Old Port (2 & 3 doz each)
45 Do do Sherry, (do do)
42 Do do Madeira, (do do)
93 Do pure Hollands Gin, warranted (1 doz each)
20 Cases Warren's Blacking.
G. D. BALZARETTI.
20th March, 1837.

NOTICE

THE subscriber offers for sale, in addition to a large assortment of FANCY GOODS—Men's, Women's and Children's India Rubber shoes, French galoches and a good assortment of shoes of all descriptions.
C. GINGUE.
No. 9 Hope Street

NOTICE.

ALL Persons having claims against the estate of the late LOUIS PAQUET, Merchant in the Suburbs of St Roch, are requested to forward their accounts duly attested; and those who are indebted to the said estate, to pay immediately to the undersigned.
G. D. BALZARETTI, Curator.
March, 20th 1837.