

CANADA.

city all were agreed, yet they had presented the humiliating spectacle of an assembly remaining there from 10 o'clock in the morning unable to agree for a single moment, at a time when agreement was most important. If the honourable member would take out his motion those portions which were already to be found on the journals of the House, and which condemned all that the majority had done, he would vote for the amendment. He agreed with the proposition to express the regret which the House must feel at the insult which had been offered to the Chief Magistrate and through him to the majesty of the law.

The vote was then taken on the amendment.

*Yeas*:—Messrs. Badgley, Boulton of Toronto, Christie, Galt, Gagy, Sir Allan N. MacNab, Malloch, McConnell, Robinson, Seymour, Sherwood of Brockville, Sherwood of Toronto, Smith of Frontenac, and Stevenson.—14.

*Nays*:—Messrs. Attorney-General Baldwin, Beaubien, Bell, Solicitor-General Blake, Boulton of Norfolk, Boutillier, Cameron of Kent, Cartier, Cauchon, Chabot, Chauveau, Davignon, De Witt, Solicitor-General Drummond, Duchesnay, Damas, Fergusson, Fournier, Fourquin, Hincks, Holmes, La Terrière, Lemieux, Marquis, McFarland, Merritt, Nelson, Notman, Papineau, Polette, Price, Smith of Wentworth, Taché, Thompson, Viger, Watts, and Wetenhall.—37.

The question being then put upon the main motion, the House divided thereon, and it was carried in the affirmative.

*Yeas*:—Messrs. Attorney-General Baldwin, Beaubien, Bell, Solicitor-General Blake, Boulton of Norfolk, Boutillier, Cameron of Kent, Cartier, Cauchon, Chabot, Chauveau, Davignon, De Witt, Solicitor-General Drummond, Duchesnay, Dumas, Fergusson, Fournier, Fourquin, Hincks, Holmes, La Terrière, Lemieux, Marquis, McFarland, Merritt, Nelson, Notman, Polette, Price, Smith of Wentworth, Taché, Thompson, Viger, Watts, and Wetenhall.—36.

*Nays*:—Messrs. Badgley, Boulton of Toronto, Cayley, Christie, Galt, Gagy, Sir Allan N. MacNab, Malloch, McConnell, Papineau, Robinson, Seymour, Sherwood of Brockville, Sherwood of Toronto, Smith of Frontenac, and Stevenson.—16.

The House then adjourned.

Enclosure 5.

Enclosure 5.

EXTRACT from the "PILOT and JOURNAL of COMMERCE," dated Montreal, April 30, 1849.

*The Late Riots.*

Now that peace and tranquillity have been, it may be hoped, quite restored, it may be proper that the public, both here and in England, should be put in possession of all the facts connected with a very disgraceful riot which is calculated to injure the credit of the province, to destroy the prospect of obtaining English capital to construct our railways, and to increase that irritation of feeling, which all good subjects of Her Majesty ought to have been anxious to allay. We shall endeavour to treat the entire subject with calmness and moderation. We have no desire to inflame and irritate the angry passions of men capable of committing such outrages as those which have disgraced this city. We do not even deem it necessary at present to defend the course taken by the Administration with regard to the Indemnity Bill. We are far more anxious to maintain the great cause of constitutional government, and to defend the honoured representative of our beloved Sovereign, who has been most shamefully vilified for carrying into effect the wishes of the two Houses of the Canadian Parliament. All Canadian politicians profess their adhesion to the principles of constitutional government, and those principles, we need scarcely inform our readers, require the Sovereign, and, of course, the representative of the Sovereign, to assent to all Bills which have been sanctioned by the two Houses of Parliament. Let us not be misunderstood. In England, as in Canada, the Crown can exercise the Royal prerogative of refusing to assent to a Bill, but in practice this course is never resorted to, for the simple reason, that if the Crown has determined to withhold its assent, the time for announcing such determination would naturally be *before*, and *not after*, the passing of the Bill. Why, for instance, should the whole country have been inflamed and distracted with this Indemnity Bill, and the time of Parliament wasted, if all was to come to naught by the refusal of the Governor's assent? It would obviously have been an absurdity on the part of the Administration to introduce such a measure, and to undergo all the censure of their opponents, if they had not the means of carrying it into effect. One argument alone can be used against the foregoing view of the case, viz., that the question was an *Imperial one*. How can such a proposition be maintained for a moment? The Bill proposes an appropriation of the money of the Canadian people for a Canadian object. Why should the people of England interfere, unless to support a minority against a majority? But, it is said, public opinion is against the measure. The answer to this is, that in the city of Montreal, where the greatest excitement prevails, the present members were returned by large majorities, and we defy our opponents to give the names of fifty of their supporters who disapprove of their votes on this particular measure. The truth is, that both in Lower and Upper Canada, the opposition to the Bill has been a factious one on the part of the minority.

The Bill was carried by a majority of the members of British origin, which entirely disproves the assertion that the question has any connection with national distinctions. The administration has a majority from Upper Canada as well as from Lower Canada, and in the former province there is not a single French Canadian representative. The Bill not being an imperial question in any way, the Governor-General having been called upon very suddenly to sanction the Customs Bill in consequence of the arrival of two vessels at Quebec, proceeded to the Par-