

voted the supplies for the year. The session was again closed, with strong censures of the Assembly by Lord Dalhousie.

In 1825 the temporary administration devolved upon Sir Francis Burton. He receded from the pretension made by Lord Dalhousie to break the estimate into two parts, of which one only was to be a charge upon the Government funds; but laid before them, in full detail, a statement of every service for which it would be necessary to provide. He then stated the probable amount of the King's revenue, and proposed to the House to supply the deficiency. Again the Assembly enlarged their pretensions. They proceeded to resolve that the funds of which the Government claimed the disposal could not be lawfully expended without their concurrence. They then reviewed the estimate; and, after making considerable reductions, voted it for one year. Thus the Assembly gained every point for which they had contended. There was no longer mention of chapters, or of a permanent grant, or of splitting the estimate into two parts, a Government and a popular part; or even of the Crown definitively settling to what purposes its own revenue should be applied. The Assembly had, in effect, acquired the control of all the revenues of the province on their own terms.

1825.
Sir Francis Burton's estimate.

1825.
The Assembly appropriate the King's revenue.

Lord Bathurst strongly disapproved these concessions, and addressed to Sir Francis Burton a very marked censure for his conduct.

Lord Dalhousie was despatched to resume his government, and reverted to his former plan of dividing the estimate for 1826 into two parts. While the House were in deliberation on the subject, Lord Bathurst's despatch to Sir F. Burton was communicated to them. The Assembly immediately addressed the King, protesting against the doctrine advanced by the Secretary of State, that one part of the revenue might be lawfully appropriated without their consent; and they passed a Bill, in which they asserted for themselves the right of appropriating the whole. Lord Dalhousie would not accept this Bill, but reserved it for the signification of the King's pleasure. The Assembly was then dissolved.

1826.
Petitions from the Assembly against Lord Dalhousie's pretensions.

In 1827 Lord Bathurst resigned his office, and was succeeded by Lord Goderich. In July of that year Lord Goderich apprized Lord Dalhousie of his general concurrence in his predecessor's claim to the appropriation of the Crown revenue without reference to the Assembly. But Lord Goderich directed that an offer should be made to the House, of resigning the King's revenue to their disposal, in consideration of a civil list of 36,000 *l.* per annum.

1827.
Lord Ripon's demand of a civil list of 36,000 *l.* in exchange for the King's revenue.

The Canadian Assembly met in the autumn of 1827, and presented Mr. Papineau to Lord Dalhousie as their Speaker; but his Lordship refused to accept him in that character. The consequence was, that in the winter of 1827-8 no session at all took place, and it was impossible to communicate to the House the proposal made by Lord Goderich for a civil list.

In 1828 Lord Goderich resigned the seals of this department, which were transferred to Mr. Huskisson. So general was now the discontent prevailing in the province, that no less than 87,000 people, or at least one-fifth of the entire population, signed petitions to the King and to both Houses of Parliament for the redress of their grievances. Three delegates were commissioned to be the bearers of them. Mr. Huskisson resolved to move the appointment of a Committee of the House of Commons to take these complaints into consideration; and in the session of 1828 such a Committee was accordingly appointed.

1828.
Petitions to Parliament.
House of Commons' Committee of 1828.

The great sources of discontent in the province were, the claims advanced by the Secretary of State, and by the Governors, to the appropriation of so large a part of the Canadian revenue; the illegal application of other parts of that revenue by the Duke of Richmond and Lord Dalhousie, in defiance of the Assembly; and the very heavy loss occasioned by Caldwell's default, which itself has been brought about by these dissensions. But various other causes of irritation had sprung up pending this financial discussion; and to these it is not necessary in this place to advert, except in general terms, because, as will appear in the accompanying Minute, No. 2, they have chiefly been obviated by the more recent measures of the King's Government. It should, however, be understood that the original petitioners were met by several counter-petitions. Parties in Canada had followed, to a great extent, the original division of the inhabitants into the French and English races. Some few of the leading opponents of the Provincial Government were indeed Englishmen by birth, and, on the other hand, some French names were to be found in the list of its adherents; but the opposition, which, under other circumstances, Lord Dalhousie's measures might have incurred from the English settlers, was silenced by the motives which separated the two races from each other. The electoral divisions of the country had thrown into the hands of the French almost the whole representation, while the English held a large proportion of all the places of honour and emolument. The one was possessed of a majority in the Assembly, and the other in the Legislative Council. The French held as seigneuries all the finer parts of the province, while the English settlers formed a distinct community in that region which is called the townships. The French were in possession of almost all collegiate and ecclesiastical endowments, while the English had possessed themselves of every lucrative branch of foreign commerce. From these contending parties the following complaints reached the House of Commons, and the Canadian Committee of 1828.

Sources of discontent.

Counter-petitions.

French and English parties.

Complaints of the two parties.

1. A series of Acts of Parliament had provided for the commutation of the feudal tenures in Lower Canada, with the consent of the lord, into free and common soccage tenure. The French complained of these English statutes, as calculated to embarrass all titles to property in the Province, while the English remonstrated against them as inadequate to the attainment of their professed design.

Complaints of the petitioners.

2. The English complained of the inequality of the representation of the people, and prayed