

of Canadian judges and advocates; by the fact that the Canadians feared that a strict interpretation of the Royal Proclamation (No. VII) was imminent. The provision of Canadian jurors had, however, removed many misunderstandings. Further changes in the judicature are advised. Recommendations are given: to follow in civil cases French custom, and in criminal cases English criminal law.

- XV. Ordinance of 1766 . . . . . 68  
This amends and amplifies No. IX.
- XVI. Masères's Considerations on the Expediency of an Act of Parliament for the Province of Quebec, 1766 . . . . . 69  
Parliament and not the king must settle Canadian questions. The whole legal system needs careful consideration. A house of assembly is not now expedient—reasons are given; but if it is to be established, parliament and not the king must be responsible.
- XVII. Commission to Chief Justice William Hey, 1766 . . . . . 72
- XVIII. Remonstrance of the Members of Council to Carleton, October 13, 1766 . . . . . 74  
Five members of the council blame the governor for his methods in consulting only a part of the council and in connexion with appointments to the council.
- XIX. Carleton's reply to No. XVIII, October, 1766 . . . . . 75  
The governor curtly dismisses the complaint. He will take advice when and where he can best get it, and will act on his own best judgement.
- XX. Carleton to Shelburne, November 25, 1767 . . . . . 75  
Discusses the future of Quebec.
- XXI. Carleton to Shelburne, December 24, 1767 . . . . . 76  
Complains of the legal system erected by No. IX. Its continuance will produce discontent.
- XXII. Hillsborough to Carleton, March 6, 1768 . . . . . 76  
Hillsborough gives his interpretation of the Royal Proclamation of 1763 (No. VII). With regard to property, there was no intention of overturning the laws and customs of Canada. Remedial instructions are promised.
- XXIII. Carleton to Shelburne, January 20, 1768 . . . . . 77  
Discusses a possible house of assembly.
- XXIV. Carleton's Report to Hillsborough, 1769 . . . . . 78  
Carleton recommends the continuance of English criminal law and the revival of the whole body of French civil law in use before the conquest.
- XXV. Masères's Criticism of No. XXIV, 1769 . . . . . 78  
Disapproves of the revival of the whole body of French civil law. Elaborate reasons are given. He recommends a code of laws for Quebec in which French and English civil and criminal laws should be judiciously included after careful selection. If inexpedient, let English criminal law continue, and let the French law relating to tenures, &c., be revived.
- XXVI. Carleton to Hillsborough, March 28, 1770 . . . . . 82  
Discusses legal reforms.
- XXVII. Case of the British Merchants Trading to Quebec, 1774 . . . . . 83  
A detailed elaboration of the principles underlying No. XI. Petitioners rely on documents to prove their case. They fear the revoca-