

note to me of 19th May, viz.: that you had the "*pleasure*" to inform me that the third reading of the Canada Bill had been deferred. From this, I had some hope that the prayer of my Petition, presented by you, would still be attended to, but the Bill was read the third time, and passed without a word being reported on the subject. May I frankly ask how you could express *pleasure* which could only be big with *pain* to me? I have again and again reflected on this, and a liberal explanation may set the matter at rest.

Your obedient servant,

ROBERT GOURLAY.

*Joseph Hume, Esq.*

No. 19.

*Bryanstone-square, June 11, 1825.*

Sir,

As you have, as stated in your letter of this day, been under some doubt what I could mean by an expression in my note to you of the 19th May, "that I had pleasure to inform you that the third reading of the Canada Bill had been deferred," I think it necessary to state, that I had understood from you that you intended to send, before the third reading, some particulars respecting the Bill, if you had time, and as the deferring the third reading of the Bill would, as I thought, afford you time to do what you wished to do, I considered that you would be pleased in having the opportunity, and therefore expressed my own satisfaction, or *pleasure*, that such was the case.

I trust this explanation will relieve you from the surprise you are in respecting the phrase.

The Bill for permitting henceforth the importation of corn from Canada, at duty of five shillings per quarter, which passed the House of Commons, was limited to one year by the Lords, which being an interference with a money clause, was the reason for the Commons rejecting the Bill: but another Bill has been introduced, which shall be sent to you on Monday.

I am

Your obedient servant,

JOSEPH HUME.

*Mr. Robert Gourlay.*