

L. Kilburne, manufacturer, Stanstead Plain.
E. Drolet, carriage-maker, Sorel.
Thos. Brady, dry goods, Montreal.
T. Quinn, fruits, Montreal.
I. L. Bangs & Co., roofers, Montreal.
G. A. Perry, grain, Coteau Landing.
F. X. Wilson, general store, Isle Bizard.
W. H. Monsell, grocer, Isle Bizard.
Theo. Sanson, trader, Levis.
Savage, Lyman & Co., jewellers, Montreal.
Frévoit & Frères, general store, St. Polycarpe.

PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA.

James Fraser & Sons, Pictou.
R. H. Smith, Truro.
M. J. Murphy, Halifax.
W. H. Trauley, Windsor.

PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

Norman Corey, Gaagetown.
Carson Flood, St. John.
F. Jones, St. John.
Smith & Barnes, Moncton.
O. Brown, Moncton.
Geo. Taylor, Moncton.

ASSIGNMENTS.

PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.

John Taylor, Brantford.
Jos. A. Kemp, Hastings.
R. McDonald, Baltimore.
D. J. Graham & W. Graham, London.
Geo. Gale, mill, Smith's Falls.
E. & J. Paterson, boots and shoes, Toronto.
Jas. Fagan, Cellingwood.
N. Crawford & Co., Teeswater.
Jos. A. Penard, dry goods, Ottawa.

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

E. Renaud, St. Chaire.
A. Louiselle, carriage maker, Waterloo.
N. & A. Filion, carriage makers, St. Jacques le Mineur.

PROVINCE OF NOVA SCOTIA.

Jno. Halstead, Yarmouth.
H. A. J. Whitman & Co., Halifax.
Wm. Elliott & Son, grocers, Dartmouth.

PROVINCE OF NEW BRUNSWICK.

McDonald & Campbell, St. John.
Le Baron L. Moores, Woodstock.

Correspondence.

THE LONDON FREE PRESS AND SIR FRANCIS HINCKS.

To the Editor of THE JOURNAL OF COMMERCE.

SIR,—The London *Free Press* has thought proper to make an offensive personal attack on me without having had the courtesy to send me a copy of it. Owing to its reproduction in the *Toronto Mail* I had an opportunity of seeing this attack, and shall, with your permission, reply to it over my own signature, although I may remark that writers who, when unable to grapple with the arguments of their opponents, endeavour to damage them by attributing to them corrupt or improper motives, are hardly deserving of serious notice. It might have occurred to the *Free Press* that, even on the assumption that my motives were as corrupt, and my violation of party fidelity as flagrant, as he alleges them to be, the merits of the public questions on which his opinion differs from mine would not be in the least affected thereby. I might very fairly retort on the *Free Press* that writers who resort to such a mode of conducting a controversy expose themselves to the imputation of having judged others by their own rule of conduct. On this head I will only add that I trust that no one with whom I may differ in opinion on any subject on which I may write will be able to charge me truthfully with attacking his motives.

The personal attacks on me are two-fold: 1st. The corrupt motive by which I am actuated;

2nd. The violation of my party allegiance. On the first charge there is a threat of an enquiry by a Committee of Parliament, to which I have a very simple reply, viz.: that I court the fullest enquiry into my conduct with reference to the City and District Savings Bank, an institution with which I became connected after my withdrawal from public life. It is insinuated rather than directly asserted that my motive in becoming what the *Free Press* terms the "Defender General of the Mackenzie Government" is to be ascribed either to gratitude for favours conferred on the City and District Savings Bank or to fear less favours should have been withdrawn. It might have occurred to my assailant that similar motives might with equal justice be supposed to influence others. Surely the worthy President of the Institution and some of the other directors are as liable as I am to the imputation of corrupt motives, and yet several of them are known to be identified with the party of which the *Free Press* is an organ. I shall not be drawn into a discussion, which is wholly irrelevant, of the affairs of the City and District Savings Bank, but shall confine myself to what is personal to myself. It is not true that I retired from public life to assume any other occupations, although had I done so it would not have been creditable to me, nor would any one have had a right to meddle with my private affairs. The *Free Press* admits that I had "well earned" the right to withdraw from politics when I did, but he seems to be of opinion, on what ground I am unable to conceive, that, by joining Sir John Macdonald's Government, at his request, I bound myself to life servitude; that, in point of fact, after I had ceased to have any influence whatever over the policy of the party with which I had acted, I was nevertheless bound to sustain it, and thus sacrifice my independence during the remainder of my life. But unreasonable as such a demand would be, it is really moderate when compared with the servitude claimed from me. I am expected not only to support Sir John Macdonald's own policy, which I have not been charged with attacking, but I am likewise to surrender my judgment to the Quebec Ex-ministers. I have invariably acknowledged that those who were fettered by party ties to the Quebec Ex-ministers were placed in a very embarrassing position, but I own that it was satisfactory to me that I was free from any party obligation to that Ministry, and that I was not restrained by any such motive from expressing my opinions on a grave constitutional question.

The *Free Press* refers to my connection with Sir John Macdonald's Government during something over three years from the fall of 1869 to the beginning of January, 1873, in such terms as to convey the idea that a great favour was conferred on me by "rehabilitating" me into Canadian public life. Considering circumstances, this is simply absurd. A seat in the Canadian Cabinet could hardly be deemed an object of ambition to me, and it most assuredly in my peculiar circumstances was of no pecuniary benefit, inasmuch as half my salary was deducted from my Imperial pension, and as I had to stand as a Minister of the Crown, three elections, two of which were contested; moreover two of those elections took place after I had communicated my determination to withdraw from public life, a determination arrived at after two years' trial, and without any reference whatever to political considerations. It is anything but agreeable to me to be compelled to refer to personal matters, and it is far from my intention to cast a reflection of any kind on the leader of the Government of which I was a member, or on any one of my colleagues, for all of whom I continue to entertain the same respect and esteem that I felt while I was their colleague. I merely wish to enter my protest against the assumption that what is termed my "rehabilitation" by my having accepted an office which I neither desired nor thought of until offered, has in any way debared me from expressing my honest opinions on public affairs, in case they happen to differ with those of colleagues with whom I acted nearly six years ago.

But for the personal attack in the *Free Press* I should not have deemed his article deserving of notice, for there is not the shadow of an argument in reply to what I have urged in support of my views on the three public questions to which he has referred. He, however, intimates that, "in view of late events," it is probable that "my pen will no longer be wielded in defence of those whom he terms my "late principals," and I am therefore bound to convince him that I have not in the least modified the opinions which I formerly expressed.

I can discover no reason whatever in the *Free Press* why I should not have defended Mr. Cartwright's loan other than a dishonest and disgraceful one. I am plainly told that I should have been governed in writing for the press on a question of importance to the interests of Canada by a feeling of revenge against Mr. Cartwright and the Government of which he was a member. Mr. Cartwright disapproved of my appointment as Minister of Finance, and Mr. Mackenzie and his followers assailed my policy, and, therefore, according to the logical writer in the *Free Press* I should have joined those who not only assailed Mr. Cartwright but who attributed the most improper motives to the agents who, during the last fifty years, have represented Canada in the London money market.

On the Quebec constitutional question I am told that my instincts, training and professions were known to have been constitutional and liberal, and yet that I have defended "the perpetrators of a *coup d'état*," "the flagrant usurpation" of the Lieutenant-Governor. My reason for so doing, according to the *Free Press*, was a corrupt motive; but, strangely enough, he himself implies that, as these perpetrators had been "bitter opponents," I ought on that account to have condemned them when I thought them right. Fortunately I can meet all charges of tergiversation on the Quebec case and all allegations that Responsible Government, as understood by Lafontaine and Baldwin, was violated by Lieutenant Governor Letellier by evidence of the most conclusive kind. In 1844, when the controversy caused by the resignation of the Government under Lord Metcalfe was at its height, it was charged by Mr. Gibbon Wakefield that the Ministry had acted in certain matters without consulting the Governor as they ought to have done. The cases cited by Mr. Wakefield when compared with an important railway bill and a new tax will appear simply ludicrous, but an extract from a letter of mine to the *London Morning Chronicle* will enable my assailants to judge whether I held the same opinions in 1844 that I have expressed in 1878. I shall quote an extract from that part of my letter which noticed a statement of Mr. Wakefield that Lord Metcalfe had told him in conversation that he (the Governor) had not heard of a certain negotiation between Mr. Wakefield and the Ministry about the appointment of a Committee of Enquiry, and that he, Mr. Wakefield, had replied, "This is not responsible government, according to my notions."

"Such is Mr. Wakefield's own account of this affair, which he says he knows was one of the causes why the ex-Ministers got into the "bad graces" of Sir C. Metcalfe. From Mr. Wakefield's account it would appear that Sir C. Metcalfe allowed him to make statements prejudicial to his ministers, which he believed and allowed to influence him to their prejudice without even seeking for explanations on the subject from the accused parties. Had His Excellency adopted the usual course, and enquired into the matter; it could have been cleared up at once and without difficulty. I have already stated that this land scheme of Messrs. Buller and Wakefield met with no countenance from the Canadian public or from the ex-Ministers, and that an Opposition member at Mr. Wakefield's request had taken the matter up and given notice of a committee. I presume you will agree with me that the ex-Ministers were not bound to consult the Governor with regard to schemes of Mr. Wakefield which they had no intention of recommending. The negotiation consisted in Mr. Wakefield having applied to