

No. 1.

Sir F. B. Head to
Lord Glenelg.

Grievance Report was nothing but a revolutionary *ignis fatuus*, purposely created to deceive the British Government, and that, as I stated in my despatch, No. 24, dated 6th of April, "far from desiring to remove these grievances, the republican members deem them the fulcrum for subverting the Government, and for destroying the constitutional liberties of the Province."

The decided measures which your Lordship took promptly to correct the alleged grievances which were brought before you, have had the happy effect of breaking up the faction which, from want of firmness, has long been undermining the constitution of this Province. Its enemies are now unmasked, disarmed, and discomfited, and the inhabitants of this country are now indignantly exclaiming, as Cromwell said, "You, who are deputed here by the people to get their grievances redressed, are yourselves become their greatest grievance."

If the sentiments contained in these petitions from the House of Assembly, were really the sentiments of their constituents, this Province might justly be said to be in a state of revolt, whereas the fact is, as I stated it to your Lordship in my last despatch, No. 24, that a burst "of loyalty will very shortly resound from one end of the Province to the other, as a more honest, well-meaning peasantry cannot exist than His Majesty's subjects in this noble Province;" and, as a proof of this assertion, I refer your Lordship to the enclosed addresses I have already received.

Your Lordship cannot but remark, that for the first time in the history of this Province, the supplies have been stopped: that the whole country has been thus thrown into confusion: and that the period selected for this violence has been my arrival with your Lordship's instructions to correct all the grievances of the country. Had the object of those who have stated themselves reformers been reform, your Lordship's instructions would have been hailed with joy, instead of which they have been repudiated by the republicans, as the enemy of their hopes.

The case is fortunately so clear, that no one, even in England, can now fail to understand it.

"Why," it will be asked, "have the supplies in Upper Canada been stopped?" The answer is, because the complaints of the republicans were ordered to be corrected, and being thus driven off their grievance ground, they were forced by your Lordship to unveil the real object, which has been neither more nor less than to seize upon the power and patronage of the Crown.

"And how," it will be asked, "have they attempted to do this?" I reply, by demanding that the Executive Council be henceforward responsible to the people; or, in other words, to themselves, for the acts of the Lieutenant-governor.

And is this all? No: they further demand that the Legislative Council shall be elective, or, in other words, that it shall also be nominated by themselves. And if this does not betray their real object—if this does not prove to people in England the traitorous, democratic intentions of the half-dozen republicans who have been allowed to agitate this noble Province, facts are useless and argument is powerless.

If the duty of the Lieutenant-governor of this Province merely consisted only in his being one branch out of three of the Colonial Legislature, even in that case there would be no more reason why he should be governed by an Executive Council than that such a body should be created to govern the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council. But besides the Lieutenant-governor's station in the Provincial Legislature, he has to guard the lands and property of the Crown: in short, he is the only individual in the Colony competent to consider the interests of the British Empire, of which the Colony is but an atom.

The Executive Council are his privy council, to give him sworn advice when he wants it, and not to "encumber him with help" when he does not require it.

If I had been governed by my late council, the constitution of this Province would at this moment be subverted, for it will be evident to your Lordship that the unanimous demand they made upon me was contrary to law.

This doctrine was in 1834 clearly explained by Mr. Stanley, who, in reply to