

A
L E T T E R
TO THE
RIGHT HON. EARL GREY,
HER MAJESTY'S
PRINCIPAL SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,

IN WHICH
THE POLITICAL EVENTS OF THE LAST THREE YEARS ARE
BRIEFLY REVIEWED, AND REMEDIAL MEASURES SUGGESTED.
AND IN WHICH ALSO,
THE IMPERIAL GOVERNMENT IS URGED TO REPEAL ALL
DIFFERENTIAL DUTIES; TO THROW OPEN THE NAVIGATION
OF THE ST. LAWRENCE, AND TO GIVE UP ITS CONTRoul
OVER THE CANADIAN POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

BY A CANADIAN

MONTREAL;
PUBLISHED BY ARMOUR & RAMSAY.
1846.

TO THE RIGHT HON. EARL GREY.

Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies.

MY LORD :

The most enlightened of your Lordship's predecessors, the present Prime Minister of England, has declared, in a late address to his constituents, that "the administration of our Colonies demands the most earnest and deliberate attention."

In your Lordship's own admirable speech on the Corn laws, you are reported to have said :—

"He believed that if they pursued a liberal policy in other respects towards the Colonies, by extending to them the dearest rights of Englishmen, the privilege of self government, and not needlessly interfering in their domestic concerns,—that if they adopted a sound policy, politically as well as commercially, they would bind them with a chain which no power on earth could break."

Notwithstanding the despair of obtaining justice from the Imperial Government which has prevailed throughout Canada, it is believed by some and hoped by others that your Lordship's administration of the Colonial department will be a successful one. But Imperial interests, to say nothing of those of the other Colonies, will necessarily occupy a large share of your Lordship's time ; and it is to be feared that Canada will be overlooked if your Lordship should be impressed with a belief that its Government has been, and is at present, honestly administered in accordance with constitutional principles.

If we are to judge of the opinions of British statesmen by the debate in the House of Commons on the occasion of the rupture between Lord Metcalfe and his first Ministry, we have good reason to fear that erroneous impressions may have been made on the mind of your Lordship. The object of this letter, my Lord, is to remove such erroneous impressions, and to acquaint you with the true state of affairs in Canada. I shall

put your Lordship in possession of facts, and I shall do so in such an open and public manner as to challenge contradiction.

I do not expect, my Lord, that you will enter into a detailed consideration of Canadian grievances, or that you will employ your official influence to promote the success of a political party in Canada.

But I do entertain a confident hope that your Lordship will give effect to the recommendations of your much lamented relative the late Earl of Durham, and that you will entrust the Government of Canada to a Civil Governor acquainted with the practical working of representative Institutions—that you will revise the royal instructions which are altogether inconsistent with the new system of Colonial Government which has been professedly adopted by English statesmen of all parties, and that you will put an end to the perpetual interference of the Colonial Office in our local affairs. I would cite as instances of the kind of interference which I trust your Lordship will put an end to at once and for ever, the frequent reservation of bills relating to local matters, such as Rail Road and Bank Charters, and the refusals to assent to other bills, because their provisions may happen to be inconsistent with English statutes. All, my Lord, that the Canadians desire is comprised in the term “Self Government” and I need not remind your Lordship that there is nothing in that term inconsistent with an acknowledgement of the supremacy of the mother country.

Under the system of Government recommended by the Earl of Durham, your Lordship would have little trouble with Canadian affairs. Your chief difficulty would be in selecting a Governor possessed of the requisite parliamentary experience, and at the same time free from party bias—one who, instead of attempting to form a party to carry out some policy of his own, would allow Canadian public opinion to have its due weight. It is more difficult, my Lord, to find such a man than would at first be imagined.

Lord Sydenham is considered by many in England to have been a model Governor, and yet he was the head of a party. Lord Metcalfe has received commendations from both Whigs and Tories, and yet he was not only the head of a party but he made use of the influence of the Crown in a party contest to enable him to carry the elections after a dissolution of Parliament. Sir Charles Bagot acted with the strictest impartiality, and the consequence was that he was charged with im-

becility, and with being merely a tool in the hands of his Ministers. There can be little doubt that Lord Metcalfe was influenced by these charges against his predecessor even before he left England, and that in consequence he formed a determination to prove to the world that he had a will of his own. English Sovereigns, my Lord, have too often quarrelled with their Ministers with no better reason. There are always courtiers and intriguers ready to poison the mind of the Sovereign or his representative against his constitutional advisers, and perhaps no more successful appeals have been made than those to his feelings of pride. Lord Metcalfe's warmest admirers have extolled him for his firmness, while those who disapproved of his conduct have condemned him for his obstinacy. Precisely so was it with George III. I regret, under existing circumstances, that it is impossible to avoid referring to Lord Metcalfe personally; but I feel that unless your Lordship is thoroughly convinced of the errors of that nobleman, Canada has little to hope from your administration of the Colonial department.

I assume that your Lordship approves of the recommendation of the late Earl of Durham, to introduce into those Colonies enjoying representative institutions the English system of administering the Government through responsible Ministers. You have doubtless been assured, my Lord, that Lord Metcalfe adhered to that system, and you have the verdict of the British House of Commons in his favour; and yet, unaccountable as it may seem to you, the Canadian ex-Ministers were perfectly satisfied with the declarations made by Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, Lord John Russell, and Mr. Charles Buller, on the occasion of the debate on Lord Metcalfe's conduct, in so far as they enunciated principles of Government. But, my Lord, there was deception some where, and we Canadians were compelled to believe that all parties in England had resolved to defend Lord Metcalfe, right or wrong. The Speakers in the House of Commons, whom I have named, professed to believe that Lord Metcalfe had not violated those principles, the correctness of which they admitted, and Lord Stanley distinctly charged the ex-Ministers with having demanded an instrument under the hand and seal of the Governor with reference to his future conduct, although no such proposition was either made or thought of. Again, the same noble lord read in his place in Parliament, extracts from despatches from Lord Metcalfe, in

which his lordship declared that Mr. Lafontaine, the leading member of the Administration, had expressed certain opinions, which he felt it necessary to communicate to the Imperial Government. Mr. Lafontaine has positively denied that he ever expressed such opinions. From an authorized statement made in one of the administration papers it appears, that the despatch was founded on a report made by Mr. Higginson of a private conversation with Mr. Lafontaine, which was entirely misrepresented, and which was communicated to the Colonial Secretary without Mr. Lafontaine having been offered any opportunity of explanation. And yet, Lord Metcalfe pledged himself for the truth of this report.

It is right that you my Lord, should be made acquainted with facts now universally admitted in Canada. I shall not go into detail but shall state briefly the system of conferring offices in Canada under Lord Metcalfe. There were two channels for applications for office, one through the Governor's Private Secretary, Mr. Higginson, the other through the Responsible Ministers of the country. I need scarcely inform your Lordship that the opponents of the administration generally made use of the former channel and its supporters of the latter. A constant correspondence relative to these applications and other public business was kept up between the Private Secretary and those who chose to correspond with him. The Responsible advisers of the Governor were kept in total ignorance of this correspondence and neither knew the names of applicants for office nor their chances of success until the Governor had determined on their appointment. Such my Lord is the naked truth. Let me shew the operation of this system by reference to a case with which Lord Metcalfe had nothing to do, but which is an admirable illustration of its working. An office became vacant in one of our Districts. Application was made either to the Governor personally or through his Private Secretary on behalf of a gentleman whose connections were all known to be opposed in politics to the administration. This application was not communicated to the Ministry, but the Private Secretary addressed a letter to one of the leading members of the opposition, in whose office the applicant had been a student, enquiring into his qualifications. The answer was of course in the highest degree favourable, and the appointment was determined on without the Ministers who were held responsible for it, and who were supposed by the whole country to have recommended it, hearing one

word on the subject. It is unnecessary my Lord to comment on such a proceeding. Your Lordship however will do well to bear in mind that this patronage question has been the main cause of "antagonism" in Canada.

I shall trouble your Lordship with one other illustration of Lord Metcalfe's views on the subject of Responsible Government. Previous to His Excellency's appointment as Governor, as your Lordship will see by a reference to Lord Durham's report, the existence of Orange Societies had caused considerable dissatisfaction in Canada. The Liberal party had always demanded their suppression, but they had been to a certain extent countenanced by the Government. The leaders of the liberal party then in the Ministry were distinctly pledged as public men to use their endeavours to discountenance these Societies. Accordingly they recommended the same Executive action, which had been tried with so much success in Ireland by the Marquis of Normanby under the Whig administration. They recommended that in issuing commissions of the Peace notorious Orangemen should be excluded. Lord Metcalfe objected to this recommendation as of course he had a right to do. The Ex-Ministers would have been quite prepared to go to the country on the Orange question, and with Lord Metcalfe's views he ought to have forced them to that issue. But His Excellency was not then prepared for a Ministerial crisis. After a long discussion, finding that his Ministers were determined that, under their administration, Orangeism must be discountenanced, His Excellency himself suggested that if action must be taken, he would prefer that an act of Parliament should be passed. The Ministers willing to conciliate and to meet his views as far as they consistently could, yielded the point, and against their better judgment resolved to remove the grievance of Orangeism by legislation. What, my Lord, has been the result? The Ex-Ministers have been held up to the English and Canadian public as the authors of an arbitrary and unconstitutional proceeding. The bill against Orangeism was prepared and submitted to Lord Metcalfe before its introduction in the House of Assembly. Various alterations were suggested by His Excellency, and acceded to by the Ministry. The bill was at last introduced and passed both Houses by very large majorities. While it was pending before Parliament, the Private Secretary of the Governor took care to express himself in strong terms against it, as can be proved by a member of the Assembly, a supporter of the administration, whom he endeavoured to influence to vote

against it. This fact has not yet been denied in Canada, and if denied in England the member referred to is ready to maintain its truth. Your Lordship's experience as an English Statesman will enable you to judge whether any Minister would endure the interference of the household of the Sovereign with his policy. Since the opposition to Mr. Fox's India bill I recollect no case in English history in which the influence of the Crown has been openly employed against the Minister through the Sovereign's personal *attachés*. I must not however dwell on this subject. The bill, as I have stated, passed both Houses of Parliament, and the royal assent was expected as a matter of course. Your Lordship will scarcely believe that after all that had taken place, notwithstanding that legislation had been recommended by himself, Lord Metcalfe announced his determination of reserving the bill as one of an unusual character which he could not assent to consistently with his instructions.

Your Lordship will be able to judge from the facts which I have stated whether Lord Metcalfe has carried out the system of Government which prevails in England, and which was recommended by the Earl of Durham. The ex-Ministers maintain that he did not, and hence the "antagonism" between him and them, which led to their resignation; and, my Lord, if his previous conduct had been inconsistent with English practice, most assuredly all must admit that what followed was grossly so. On the resignation of his Ministers, it was expected that some leader of the opposite party would have been charged to form a new administration; such would have been English practice; but instead of that, Lord Metcalfe sent for parliamentary supporters of the ex-Ministry, one by one, and endeavoured to convince them that he was right and the Ministers wrong, and that he was most anxious to carry out a liberal policy through the instrumentality of other men. To the honour of Canada be it said, that all these attempts failed. The ex-ministers were sustained by their party, with but one or two exceptions. Still no ministry was formed, and the session terminated after a public announcement in the House by a gentleman (Hon. Mr. Viger) who afterwards accepted office, that an administration was about being formed. After a short time two gentlemen were gazetted as members of the Executive Council, but without office. The various departments of the Government were conducted for months by subordinate officers, and during all this time secret negotiations were carried on with individuals without political influence, the object of which was the formation of

a coalition administration which would be subservient to the Governor. After many months delay, the object was gained, and a dissolution of Parliament was resorted to. The very course adopted by Sir Francis Head in 1836, of making the Crown a party in the election contest, and which was so strongly deprecated by the Earl of Durham, was again resorted to by Lord Metcalfe. But the latter nobleman went a step further than his predecessor. Sir Francis Head had resorted to vulgar clap-trap; he had declared to the people, through the Official Gazette—"If you quarrel with me, you quarrel with your bread and butter." Support me and I will furnish you with all you want, "men, women and money." Lord Metcalfe's addresses are not deficient in clap-trap, but deception of a more shameful kind was resorted to. Let me cite one or two instances among many. Your Lordship must be aware how much the people in every new country suffer from bad roads. The grievance is one that can only be remedied by time, and by the settlement of the country. It is, however, universally felt. Pending the elections, one of the demi-official organs of Lord Metcalfe was authorized to submit to the country a plan in detail for the expenditure of no less a sum than £500,000 on the interior roads. The article was headed in attractive terms, "GOVERNOR GENERAL'S INTERIOR ROADS." Now, my Lord, English statesmen will scarcely credit me, when I assure them, that this was merely an electioneering trick, or, as it might be more properly termed, a base fraud upon the country. No such scheme was ever submitted to Parliament by the Ministry, under whose sanction it was demi-officially announced.

Again, my Lord, let me call your attention to the great political question of the day—University Reform. Every effort was used to persuade the people, pending the elections, that Lord Metcalfe and his new Ministers were determined to carry as comprehensive a measure on this subject as the Ex-Ministers had proposed. The party went to the hustings with the cry of "*liberal measures*" on their lips, but with a hatred of those measures in their hearts. The people of this country, my Lord, demand and will insist on having an University established free from sectarian influence. They were deceived by Lord Metcalfe as they have often been by previous Governors, but their day of triumph will come at last. No University bill has been carried through Parliament by the present Canadian Ministry, and although their leader Mr. Draper publicly declared in his place during the first Session that he would stand or fall by his bill, he nevertheless postponed its consideration till the next Session, and then made it an open question, and suffered himself

to be shamefully defeated. It is believed, my Lord, that one of your predecessors either Lord Stanley or Mr. Gladstone insisted that the question should be made an open one, in order to enable members of the Tory party to come into the administration. This is the general belief, but as the despatches of the Minister are carefully concealed from the Canadian public there is no certainty on the subject.

I shall not fatigue your Lordship by citing other instances in which the people of Canada were deceived at the last election. Lord Metcalfe had an apparent triumph. His Ministry elected their candidate for Speakership by a majority of three. Had all the members been present that majority, it is believed, would have been only one. But Government influence was at work. One member returned on the liberal interest was almost immediately bought off with office. It is a fact, my Lord, that he never took his seat in the House. The people were so disgusted with his conduct that his former opponent was elected without difficulty. Several of the returns were contested; one of the most important was that for the city of Montreal. The petition was set aside as informal by a party vote, and the merits never enquired into. The petitioners believe that they were treated with the grossest injustice, and the fact is notorious that the present members for Montreal never could have obtained, and could not now obtain, a majority of the votes of the qualified electors. And yet, my Lord, by this Montreal election, illegally carried, Lord Metcalfe obtained his majority. I shall trouble your Lordship with with one or two more election cases. The return of Mr. Small, a member of the late administration, was petitioned against on the ground of want of qualification. The Government party had a majority on the committee, and not only was Mr. Small, who had proved a sufficient qualification according to English decisions, unseated, but his opponent, with a minority of votes, was declared the sitting member. The return of Mr. Gowan, Grand Master of the Orangemen, was petitioned against, also, on the ground of want of qualification. The House, by a party vote, refused to entertain the petition on account of an alleged error in a point of form. The return of Mr. Riddell, a supporter of the Government, was petitioned against by Mr. Hincks, a member of the late administration. In this case alone, a majority of liberals was struck on the committee. The Government party attempted to pass a resolution that the committee was dissolved at the opening of the second session, but although the whole influence of the administration was brought to bear in its favour, it was lost. Their next attempt was more successful. They opened negotiations with one of the liberal members of the committee, with a view to his appointment to office, and succeeded in inducing him to accept three offices in his own district, and to abandon his seat. The vote of that member decided the contest against Mr. Hincks and in favour of Mr. Riddell, and before the scrutiny had terminated he actually accepted office, and left the committee. I feel assured, my Lord, that you will find some difficulty in crediting these statements. Enquire, I beg of you, into their

truth. The individual last alluded to is Mr. Roblin, then member for the county of Prince Edward, and the offices which he received while serving on the Oxford Committee were the Collectorship of Customs at Picton, the Agency for Crown Lands and the Registrarship of the County. He, of course, vacated his seat in Parliament; and, to the deep mortification of the Ministers, a Reformer was elected in his place. I will not trespass on your Lordship's time by referring to the contested elections for Middlesex and West Halton, neither of which were decided on the merits, and the petitioners in both cases obliged to give up the contest after vain efforts to obtain justice. I will content myself by assuring your Lordship that the present parliamentary majority has been obtained by the grossest fraud, and that the House of Assembly does not represent the public opinion of the country.

I have called your Lordship's attention to the treatment which the opposition has received from the Ministers and their supporters in the matter of the contested elections; let me now state the circumstances under which Mr. Inspector General Cayley obtained a seat in Parliament. When that gentleman accepted office he was comparatively speaking unknown never having taken any part in public affairs. It was necessary for him to obtain a seat in Parliament, and Ministerial influence was insufficient to procure one by legitimate means. After fruitless efforts in other quarters, the member for the county of Huron (Dr. Dunlop) was literally purchased with an office created for the occasion and the duties of which he is wholly incapable of performing. Dr. Dunlop made no secret of the terms of the contract and frankly informed his constituents that his necessities compelled him to accede to them. The influence of the Government in a new and thinly peopled county was sufficient to secure Mr. Cayley's election. I put it to your Lordship whether such trafficking with the patronage of the Crown would be tolerated in England.

Your Lordship has doubtless been assured that Lord Metcalfe was eminently successful in his Government of Canada and that he left behind him an administration strong in public confidence. Your Lordship may have heard of the "Caron correspondence" which was brought to light during last Session. You ought most certainly to peruse it. From it you will learn that previous to the departure of Lord Metcalfe, Mr. Draper the leading member of the administration opened a negotiation with Mr. Caron an avowed member of the opposition party, the object of which was to reconstruct the administration in such a manner as to obtain for it a larger amount of parliamentary support. Mr. Caron did not pretend to be the leader of the opposition, and he was authorized by Mr. Draper to consult with his friends. He accordingly opened a correspondence with Mr. LaFontaine the acknowledged leader of the opposition, and urged him to consent to an arrangement under which Mr. Morin another opposition leader would be brought into power with other friends, while Mr. LaFontaine to whom personal objections were entertained by Lord Metcalfe was to be provided for on the bench or otherwise. In the course of this correspondence Mr. Draper fully admitted the weakness of the administration as then constructed. Mr. LaFontaine refused to be a party to any such arrangement as was proposed but suggested the constitutional mode of

reconstructing the administration in whole or in part by the instrumentality of some influential individual charged with the duty by the Governor. While the negotiation between Mr. Caron and Mr. Draper was in progress Lord Metcalfe resigned and Earl Cathcart was appointed his successor, since which time no change has been made in the administration, although it has never commanded that amount of public confidence which its own leader deems necessary. And at this moment, my Lord, what is the state of our affairs? It is notorious that for several weeks back the administration has been disorganized. Mr. Solicitor General Sherwood has resigned after, it is said, an ineffectual attempt to induce Mr. Draper to strengthen the Ministry in a constitutional manner. Mr. Viger President of the Council has also resigned. Mr. Papineau merely holds office until his successor be appointed. Mr. Daly the Provincial Secretary an inefficient and exceedingly unpopular member of the Government has effected an arrangement by which he expects to obtain the permanent office of Private or Civil Secretary the two offices having been united during the last Session. By this arrangement, should your Lordship unhappily sanction it, all future Governors will be deprived of the assistance of an efficient Private Secretary of their own choice although the Provincial Parliament made the liberal provision of £750 per annum for such an officer. Your Lordship will be surprised to hear that with one exception Mr. Draper has been unable to fill up the vacancies thus created. Several offers have been made, and rejected for one reason or another. One of the vacant offices was offered to a supporter of the administration, the member for the city of Kingston, so at least the public were assured by the demi official organ of the Government. Steps were taken to ascertain whether this gentleman could be re-elected, and the result being unfavourable, the appointment has not taken place; and it is now said that the offer has been refused. It has been repeatedly asserted in the Ministerial journals that Mr. Draper is endeavouring to prevail on certain influential French Canadian gentlemen to join his administration. Offers have I believe been made to gentlemen who are not in Parliament and who have never been engaged in political life, but your Lordship is too well acquainted with the working of party Government not to know that such negotiations as those which Earl Cathcart has sanctioned are only looked on with contempt. The avowed object of these negotiations is to obtain the support of an influential party in the country, and yet the recognized leaders of that party have never been consulted by Earl Cathcart. Your Lordship will scarcely believe that there are men here weak enough and ignorant enough to imagine that a tottering administration can be strengthened by the purchase of a few individuals. If your Lordship wishes to form an estimate of the strength of the present remnant of an administration, I would recommend you to read the public journals and especially those which have hitherto supported them. You will find in them almost universal condemnation. I am tempted to present you with a specimen.

[From the Montreal Times.]

"The last rumour that has reached us concerning the "Ministerial crisis," is to the effect, that the Presidency of the Executive Council has been offered to a high judicial functionary, with *carte blanche* as regards the re-construction of the Lower Canada portion of the Ministry.

We cannot vouch for the truth of this rumour, and give it for what it is worth: but we received it from a quarter which we have found well informed on such matters. It is not just to attach blame to any one without his being heard; but really the whole country is getting weary of the process of incubation by which Mr. Draper is hatching a Ministry. It is feared that he has been sitting on an addled egg, and that he will, after all, bring forth nothing. There may be reasons for this long delay which are unknown to the public; but for our own part, we cannot conceive what those reasons can be. It is evident that if the negotiations with the French leaders have proceeded to such lengths as it is reported they have, it would be both dangerous and difficult to go back. Such a step ought now to be the result of a strong necessity only. It is both safer and easier to go forward; and Mr. Draper ought not to hesitate in doing so. After having sacrificed so much, the Attorney Generalship ought not to be in the way of an arrangement, unless the Canadian Premier is one of those scrupulous gentlemen who "strain at a gnat and swallow a camel."

It is in vain my Lord that appeals have been made to Earl Cathcart to perform his duty and to insist on the formation of an administration of some kind. If Mr. Draper be unable to obtain such assistance as he himself deems necessary and notwithstanding persists in retaining office it is manifestly the duty of the Governor to dismiss him, and to seek other advice. But my Lord, the noble Earl to whom the Government of Canada has been entrusted seems to care little whether there is an administration or not.

The press, my Lord, may be considered as a fair index of public opinion, but I have other evidence to prove the weakness of the administration, if I may so designate the present provisional holders of office.

Mr. Henry Sherwood whose resignation I have already referred to is notoriously supported by several members of the House of Assembly; Sir Allan McNab the late Speaker was gazetted as Adjutant General of Militia but he returned his commission immediately on its receipt owing doubtless to some dissatisfaction with the conduct of the Government. Col. Gagy late Adjutant General of Lower Canada has published a letter in which he accuses Mr. Attorney General Smith of having endeavoured to deprive a gentleman of high standing in Lower Canada of a Colonelcy of Militia because he ventured to oppose his (Mr. Smith's) election; he states further that Mr. Smith demanded his (Col. Gagy's) dismissal from Lord Metcalfe because he would not place the Militia patronage at his disposal, that Lord Metcalfe sustained him against Mr. Smith but that the latter has harboured revenge against him, and since Lord Metcalfe's departure has succeeded in ejecting him from office. Such, my Lord, are the statements of Col. Gagy who has heretofore been an active supporter of the present administration.

But another case, my Lord, has caused no little stir in the commercial world. Your Lordship is aware that by an act of last session the 3s. frontier duty on wheat was to be repealed whenever the new Corn law act should come into operation in England. In the month of May an application was made to the Government by certain merchants to be permitted to import wheat on the understanding that the duty would be refunded in case the bill became law. This application was refused on the ground that Government had not the power to accede to the request.

But, my Lord, in the month of June a special application was made to the Government to permit two cargoes of wheat, the property of a mercantile house, with the partners in which Mr. Atty. General Smith is nearly connected by marriage, to be ground in bond without payment of duty, in contravention of the existing law. This application, my Lord, was granted, but others praying the same indulgence were refused. The names of the parties have been given; the facts are notorious, and no defence of the act has yet been made on behalf of the Government. I have, perhaps, dwelt too much, my Lord, on what I conceive to be the errors or crimes of the present Canadian administration. I again repeat that I do not invoke any aid from your Lordship to the political party to which I am myself attached. I merely claim for it fair play, and that, I maintain, it has not had from Lord Metcalfe. The people of Canada may fairly claim the appointment of a Governor General whose own feelings are in accordance with those of your Lordship, and who will give effect to the Earl of Durham's recommendations. That Governor should have his own confidential Secretary to assist him in his Imperial correspondence, but who should abstain from all interference with the local affairs of the Province. The royal instructions should be materially changed, and Colonial Office interference should be discountenanced by your Lordship. The new Governor should insist on the administration being completed by the gentleman now at the head of it, or, in case of his inability to do so, by some other political leader. There is surely nothing unreasonable in all this; nothing inconsistent with your Lordship's frequently expressed opinions. But, my Lord, the new Governor should go one step further; he should order an immediate dissolution of Parliament. Your Lordship cannot approve of the electoral frauds practised in 1844, and will not countenance them. Let Mr. Draper, by all means, have the benefit of a dissolution while he is Minister; let him make what pledges he likes regarding University Bills, Interior Roads, Patronage, or other questions of interest; but, my Lord, let him do so as Mr. Draper; let not the Governor General's name be identified with these frauds upon the people. If, after a dissolution, Mr. Draper should have a majority, your Lordship may rest assured that the liberal party will not utter a single complaint, and that your Lordship will hear no more of Canadian grievances.

Although I fear I have already trespassed too long on your Lordship's valuable time, there is a subject of deep importance to the Canadian people, which I cannot forbear alluding to,—I mean the question of Free Trade. It is very evident from the tenor of your Lordship's speech that you labour under some misapprehension with regard to the state of feeling in Canada on this subject. You seem to consider that the majority in favour of the Canadian Government proposition of last session to allow American wheat to be ground in bond for exportation free of duty, were in favour of free trade and the minority opposed to it. If so, your Lordship is in error. Practically, there is not much difference of opinion in Canada regarding Free Trade. Here, doubtless, as elsewhere, there are Protectionists and Free Traders; but with regard to the repeal of the English Corn Laws, there was no member of the Legislature, no public Journal, and no body of men, not even the Free Trade Association of this city, that advocated it.—

Some were disposed to submit with a good grace to what they saw was inevitable, while others were inclined to send strong addresses and petitions on the subject. This, my Lord, is the real state of the case. A petition in favour of the repeal of the Corn Laws would not, in all probability, have received a signature in Canada. But then, my Lord, those who have predicted that we would all turn rebels because the Corn Law was repealed, are greatly mistaken. There is very little despondency in Canada on the subject. The present holders of bread stuffs will suffer severely because the purchases last winter were made at a time when the delusive cry of "famine" was in every mouth. When the present stocks are worked off all will be right, and the merchants will have the advantage of a steadier market in future. The question on which the division took place in our House of Assembly was the repeal of the frontier duty of 3s., which was thought by the minority, which opposed it, to be a very incomplete measure by itself. You have given the people of England Free Trade, my Lord, and we ask you to give it to us. We demand the repeal of all differential duties in favour of British manufactures, which are imposed by Imperial acts, and the free navigation of the St. Lawrence for vessels of all nations. In no other way, my Lord, can the commerce of the St. Lawrence be sustained. The freight of a barrel of flour from Montreal to Liverpool has been 6s. 3d. during the present season, while at New York it has been only 3s. If the press can be considered as an index of public opinion, all parties in Canada are in favor of the removal of these restrictions on our trade. And, my Lord, while I do not allow myself to anticipate any opposition to our demands from a Free Trade Cabinet, I can scarcely believe that even the parties for whose benefit the present restrictions have been imposed, will endeavour to maintain them. Surely, my Lord, the British manufacturers, the Free Traders of Manchester, and the other manufacturing towns will not claim protection for their cottons, their woollens, and their hardware. If they do, let the fact be proclaimed; let the agriculturalists of Canada be given clearly to understand that though their wheat and flour is to be placed on the same footing as foreign in the English markets, they are nevertheless to be subjected to protective duties in favor of British manufactures. The case of the ship-owner is a much clearer one. He, my Lord, must compete with foreign shipping under the Free Trade system. Our products must be sent to the English markets either by the St. Lawrence or by New York, and as the English ship-owner must compete with the foreigner at the latter port, he may as well do so in the St. Lawrence. But, my Lord, even if the British ship-owners should demand the continuance of their monopoly, will a Free Trade Cabinet lend them any countenance? We Canadians trust not; we entertain a confident hope that our reasonable demands will be acceded to, in which case your Lordship need not apprehend any complaints from Canada on commercial subjects. There is, however, one monster grievance which I have left untouched, and regarding which I can assure your Lordship there is no difference of opinion among political parties—I mean the Post Office. I shall not take up your Lordship's time with any lengthened notice of this subject, especially as the remedy is a very simple one. Place the Post Office under Provincial controul. Let its head

be a member of our Administration. Charge us with the packet postage as you do the United States, and all will work well. Why, my Lord, seek to maintain Imperial controul over this department? No good reason can be given for doing so.

I am well aware that all the Post Office subordinates in London will rise in arms against any proposal to give up the controul of their Canadian branch. But my Lord, have not the same parties opposed every measure of Post Office reform in England? I must confess that when I consider the immense influence of the Post Office department I scarcely venture to entertain any hopes of a speedy settlement of that question. The Post Office authorities however will most assuredly have to yield at last. I have now my Lord completed the task which I imposed on myself, and although my letter may be thought tedious, I do not think that your Lordship will find in it any unreasonable demands on your own time or on that of your Colleagues. Had I not great confidence both in the wisdom and justice of your Lordship I should scarcely have made the present appeal. Your Lordship may believe me when I assure you that you would hear much more from Canada at this time were it not that the people generally have long since lost all confidence in English party politicians. This is perhaps an ungracious expression, but your Lordship may rely on its being a true one. For my own part I regret the existence of such distrust, and I still more regret that there has been so much cause for it in times past.

While appealing to your Lordship for justice, I would remind my Canadian fellow subjects of your Lordship's valuable services in the cause of Colonial Reform, and which form the best guarantee that we can have that you will concede all our reasonable demands. It will, I feel assured, be a proud satisfaction for your Lordship to reflect hereafter that you were the first British statesman to give practical effect to the recommendations of your deeply lamented relative, the late Earl of Durham. Most assuredly your Lordship's predecessors have either not comprehended the Earl of Durham's report or have not thought proper to adopt it. I cannot my Lord conclude this letter in a more appropriate manner than by quoting the concluding words of that imperishable document.

"For these reasons I pray your Majesty's earnest attention to this report. It is the last act arising out of the loyal and conscientious discharge of the high duties imposed upon me by the Commission with which your Majesty was graciously pleased to entrust me. I humbly hope that your Majesty will receive it favourably, and believe that it has been dictated by the most devoted feeling of loyalty and attachment to your Majesty's person and throne, by the strongest sense of public duty, and by an earnest desire to perpetuate and strengthen the connection between this Empire and the North American Colonies which would then form one of the brightest ornaments in your Majesty's Imperial Crown."

I have the honour to be, my Lord,
Your Lordship's
Most obedient servant,

A CANADIAN.

