INTERESTING DIALOGUE.

DON'T FAIL TO READ IT.

The following dialogue is copied from the Mills' Point Herald. It is suited to every meridian, and by the substitution of Mechanic, Merchant, Lawyer, Doctor, &c., is adapted to all the various classes in the community:—

Farmer.—Good morning, Mr. Editor! I wish you'd give me a paper, I want to see the news.

Editor.—With pleasure; there is one just from the press. What have you in that basket?

Farmer.—I have some fresh butter, eggs, and about a gallon of raspberries, which I have brought to market.

Editor.—Well, neighbor Snobs, I am glad that I am out of butter; please give me a *pound* or *two*, if you can spare it.

Farmer.—You can have it all at a bit a pound.

Editor.—Very true, but I *gave* you a newspaper at your request; turn about is fair play you know; now I want you to *give* me some butter.

Farmer.—But I have brought that butter to sell.

Editor.—We too publish our paper to sell; by our labors we live, and if you Farmers will not support us, we cannot buy your marketing. We cannot afford to give *papers* away.

Farmer.—But I asked for only a paper, and that is not much you know; you will not miss that.

Editor.—I asked you only for a pound or two of butter, and that is not much, you know.

Farmer.—Yes, that's all very true; but if I should give you my butter, every body else would want to get it on the same terms, and I couldn't sell any more to any person.

Editor.—Exactly, Farmer Snobs, now I have brought you to the very point, I wish you to understand: it is true, one newspaper is of but trifling value, but let an Editor get into the habit of giving his papers to Tom, Dick, and Harry, whenever called on, who will be fool enough to pay for what others get gratis?—besides it is morally wrong to make paying subscribers pay for the papers thus wasted upon persons who refuse to contribute one cent to the sustainment of the public press. We therefore feel it our duty to inform you neighbour Snobs, that we do no *give* papers away—if our paper is not worth buying it is not reading.

From the Eastport Sentinel, 29th Nov.

Melancholy Shipwreck & Loss of Eighteen Lives!—The British barque Caroline, Crawford, master, belonging to Greenock, Scotland, bound from Grenada to St. John, New Brunswick, in ballast, was cast away at Cranberry Point, (Prospect Harbour,) near Goldsboro', on Tuesday night, the 21st ult., and all on board, except four, were lost. There were twenty-two persons on board, and amongst those who perished were all the officers of the ship. Of those saved, one jumped to the shore from the jib-boom when the barque first struck; the others were drifted ashore on a part of the deck. So violent was the storm that all the masts went by the board in a few minutes after she struck, and the hull was not long in going to pieces. Those who have been there say that a more perfect wreck was never seen, pieces of the vessel being strewed all along the shore.

A good deal of doubt exists as to the cause of the disaster. It appears from the statements of the crew, that they made Brier Island on Saturday, and that the Captain then kept the vessel off and on until Monday afternoon, when the men becoming dissatisfied, went to the Captain in a body and demanded of him what he intended to do with the ship, and requesting, with that coolness for which seamen are so remarkable, that he would not run her ashore, but that if he did so, he would do it in the day-time, and give them a chance for their lives. The Captain seems, from their statement, not to have taken much notice of this, other than to tell them that he would bring them safely to St. John. From the log-slate, however, it appears that this appeal must have been more violent than the sailors represent, as it is there recorded that they threatened to take the command of the ship from the Captain. On Tuesday afternoon they made what must have been Mount Desert Rock, though they did not know it, and in the evening they found themselves among breakers, and attempted to wear the ship, but failed, and went ashore. After attempting, without success, to save themselves in the yawl-boat, which was dashed in pieces as soon as it struck the water, all the sailors except the four saved, clung together near the bow, and by one wave were swept away. The Captain was swept away from the quarter deck, and the mate did not come out of the cabin. If this disaster was, as there seems to be too much reason to believe, caused by the intoxication of the Captain, it ought to be known as a warning.

We are at length put in possession of authentic accounts of the loss of the vessels on the north shore, from letters received yesterday morning.

Extract of a letter from Capt. Fawcett:

"The Josephine was driven ashore on the west side of Betsiametis Point, on the 21st ult., in a heavy snow storm; she lays on a sandy beach, and I think she may be got off. The cargo will probably be all saved in a damaged state—she has eight feet water in her hold."

"The bark Neptune is ashore on a reef of rocks, about 8 miles from the bark Josephine, and will, it is feared, be a total wreck—nothing saved."

Extract of a letter from Capt. Hamilton, of the bark Mersey:—

"The bark Falcon, Capt. Day, went ashore the same night as the Mersey did, on the 22d ult. Capt. Day reports that he picked up a trunk containing ladies apparel, supposed to belong to the ship Bernard, Capt. Dumble. The shore was strewed with masts, deals, &c., which there is no doubt, formed part of her cargo. It may now be considered certain that she has gone to pieces and every soul on board perished."

The following is a statement of the cargoes of the above mentioned vessels:—

Bark Mersey, Capt. Hamilton, for Liverpool: [illegible] at Montreal [illegible] bbls flour, 4 half do do, 101 do pot ash, 74 do pearl do, [illegible] half do [illegible] 1 half do [illegible] 1 do [illegible] 211 do [illegible] [illegible] staves, for lining, 33 deals, 144 box bark work, 2400 W. O. W. I. staves, 1 keg butter, 2 1 do books, 1 do, jars preserves. Laden boxes [illegible] 9 bbls pot ash, 71 do pearl at Quebec, four 100 barrels and 428 ash, [illegible] 101 kegs butter—by G. B. Burrels, Sye.

Bark Josephine, Fawcett, for Glasgow—211 pearl ash, 217 do pot ash, 4438 do flour, 14 casks honey, 22 bbls apples, 7, 3, 9, 10, West India staves, 2, 2, 3, 18 pipe do—by G. B. Symes.

Bark Falcon, Day, for Bridgewater—32 pieces oak, 9 do elm, 2 do maple, 5 do red pine, 489 do white do, 1 do scantling, 567 standard deals, 138 cords lathwood—by S. Macaulay.

Bark Neptune, Reid, for Aberdeen—15 pieces oak, 15 do elm, 8 do ash, 243 do red pine, 108 do white pine, 393 standard deals, 1, 8, 9, 12 do staves, 2 bbls apples by Pemberton, Brothers.—[Quebec Mercury.

From the Toronto Banner.

THE MINISTERIAL CRISIS.

The most valuable principles of the British Constitution are so deeply involved in the crisis which has occurred between the Governor General and his Councillors, that we deem it a duty to express our views on the important points at issue. We assure our readers that these views have not been rashly or inconsiderately adopted. We recently observed with great satisfaction, an article in a leading London Tory newspaper, which spoke of the Reform Bill, of 1832, in terms of much approbation, and contrasted it favorably with the state of the representation, in 1831. When the Reformers of the three kingdoms were toiling and struggling to get that great measure brought about, the paper in question was stigmatizing it in the most severe terms. But great is truth, and in this case it has obtained a complete triumph. In like manner, Responsible Government in Canada was desired and obtained, by a portion of the people, and now the justice and necessity of it is admitted on all hands. It is on the working of this question that the breach has taken place between the present Governor and his Councillors, and both parties are eager to acknowledge its existence and supremacy. No cry is raised against it excepting the feeble and dying wail of the organ of prelacy and intolerance, which would willingly abolish the Parliament of Canada altogether. But there is hardly an echo to repeat, or sympathize with that cry, through the wide extent of Canada.

While the forces are mustering, and the trumpets are sounding to the contest about to commence, we hear nothing but the most guarded expression of a desire to rule, in a very *moderate* and *constitutional* manner. The sound seems to say, "if you will only let us have a change of men, we shall let you have both the theory and the practice much in your own way." Have we not reason to fear that this is only done to catch the *spondyle volante*, and that, when restored to power, the old propensities of their nature will break out with all their original vigor.

Before going farther, it is essentially necessary to enquire what Responsible Government actually means in Canada. All men know that in Britain it means that there is no act of the Government, for which the Ministers of the Crown are not Responsible. The Sovereign is sheltered by that system, from all personal blame, and is said to be incapable "of doing wrong," i. e.—All public acts are presumed to be done by the Ministers, and not by the Monarch. This is both the theory and the practice of the British Constitution, and it has been found by experience to be admirably adapted to maintain the prerogative of the Sovereign, and the rights of the other branches of the Legislature, and of the people. If a Minister is accused of malversation in office, the House of Commons, which is the grand inquest of the nation, can impeach him before the House of Peers. The cases of Lord Melville at home, and Warren Hastings abroad, are illustrations of the working of that part of the British Constitution. The latter case shows that in Colonies the system of responsibility is only carried into operation by an appeal to the mother country. The whole power of the Executive being lodged in the Governor of a colony, he is held responsible only to those in whose name, and by whose authority he acts. Such a government within the colony has an aspect of being entirely arbitrary, and so it is, excepting by the control under which he acts from the Home Government, and the free discussions of the British Parliament. Whatever inconvenience may arise from such a state of things, it is inseparable from the state of a newly peopled country, or one whose population is not in a fit state to enjoy British institutions.

That *incipient state* has passed away in Canada, and the late Government, with a wisdom and foresight which will secure the approbation of the future historian of North America, introduced a principle into the management of public affairs which was, with the sanction of the Governor General, adopted by the Legislative Assembly, on 3rd September, 1841. We give these resolutions at length in another column. It is there expressly stated, "That the head of the Executive Government, being within the limits of his Government the representative of the Sovereign, he is responsible for the exercise of authority alone, but that nevertheless, the management of our local affairs can only be conducted by him, by and with the assistance, counsel, and information of subordinate officers of the Province." These Councillors are called "chief advisers of the representative of the Sovereign," and "a provincial administration under him." These resolutions have for above two years remained on the journals of the Provincial Assembly, incontrovertible and unchallenged, as the Magna Charta of the Canadas, and they are officially acknowledged by the present Governor General. They proclaim to the world that Canada is admitted to be capable of exercising the highest rights of British subjects, and these rights it would be both unjust and unwise to take away, without any act of forfeiture having occurred.

The resolutions in question trench not on the rights of the Crown. They preserve the inviolability of the Governor's person, as representative of his sovereign within the colony over which he presides. Exercising the high prerogative of the first branch of the Legislature, summoning, proroguing and dissolving Parliament, and his sanction being necessary to all acts of the Legislature, it is fit and proper that he should enjoy the immunity which attaches to the Royal office. That immunity, however, ceases in his relation to the Home Government. The temporary Sovereign of Canada is there regarded only as the confidential and responsible delegate of the Colonial Administration. To them he is as much responsible as every ambassador and consul representing the British Government.

But the existence of a Colonial Parliament without a responsibility being due to it by the officers of the Crown seems inconsistent with the spirit of the British Constitution. Although the relation in which the Governor General stands towards them from his exercise of the functions of sovereignty, forbids responsibility from that quarter, a remedy has been found in the creation of a council of advice and administration, which is supposed to enjoy the confidence of a majority of the Provincial Parliament.

It does not admit of a doubt that these resolutions are a fair exposition of the meaning of Responsible Government.

The question then arises, what party is to blame for this disruption? The legal right of the Governor to dismiss, or of the ministers to retire from office when they please, is unquestionable. But in the most important act which can affect the interests of a country, it has been customary to require whether the parties concerned have received a sound discretion in bringing about an event, which for a time, disturbs the harmony of the public mind, and often retards or defeats measures of great public utility.

Both parties acknowledge the existence of Responsible Government. Only one party gives a definition of it. The Governor General says, "it is an undefined question in regard to a colony." He states that it does not mean "That the Council is supreme and the Governor General a nullity." He does not state how far the Council ought to exercise any control over appointments or over the management of public affairs. Both parties admit that the power of appointment is at variance with the Governor General, and the power claimed by the Council is that of giving advice. It appears also from the Governor's statement, that the ministry wished that no appointments should be made "prejudicial to their interest." This his Excellency declined to agree to, as being at a period "that the patronage of the Crown should be entirely devoted to the Conservatives for the purpose of Parliamentary support."

We would deprecate any attempt to lower the dignity of the Crown within its legitimate extent. [illegible] but such is not the case. [illegible] appointments are not in the name of the Sovereign, and are all signed by the Royal hand, but in effect the appointments are generally made by ministers.—Would Sir Robert Peel or the Duke of Wellington retain their situations if they were deprived of appointments for which they are responsible to Parliament and the country? If this be the general rule in regard to the Sovereign, there can surely be no degradation in the Governor of a Province being advised by a Council which enjoys the confidence of the Legislature.

The declaration "that office ought, in every instance, to be given to the men best qualified to render efficient service to the State," is honorable to Sir Charles Metcalfe; but we see no reason for believing that such was not also the view of his Ministers; and as such appointments would be the most popular, it is natural to suppose they would be the very ones which the ministers would make. The Governor General says that they wished that no appointments should be made prejudicial *to their influence*; and we are informed that His Excellency declined to agree to that request. The Council in this case were maintaining the interests and power of the Government, while the Governor was opposing it; for we can make no distinction between His Excellency and his Council in their administrative capacity. If indeed the Council had demanded that every appointment should be made to promote party purposes, we would have said that it was carrying out the principle to an unjustifiable extent. Such is not the case in Britain. Promotions and appointments in the army and navy are generally given entirely independent of political party,—and we have a recent instance of a Bishopric now vacant, where it is generally believed her Majesty has interfered to place in the situation a person she conceives to have earned that distinction from his attachment to the principles of the Reformation.

But it is a well known fact that most appointments for the Bar and the Bench, and other Civil Departments, with occasional exceptions, are given to those who support the party in power. This practice has prevailed in the best periods of the British history, and is strictly in accordance with the constitutional necessity of preserving a majority in the popular branch of the Legislature. We do not therefore think it an objection to the ministers, that they have desired to strengthen their party by public appointments, provided they have done so in prudence and moderation, and all cases aimed at having efficient men placed in office.

We are not a little surprised at one part of the Governor General's statement, viz., *that* where he draws a line of distinction between himself and his ministers, and talks of "abstaining from the appointments of their opponents to office." Now we cannot conceive how the theory of the constitution can separate between his Excellency and his advisers. What would Sir Robert Peel think if her Majesty was to say, "I have often abstained from conferring appointments on your opponents," and objecting to the patronage of the Crown being conferred "for the purchase of Parliamentary support?" by *purchase*, we presume, is only meant the indirect influence which such appointments may convey to the administration. He would unquestionably say, that it was with sincere regret he had heard that her Majesty was not disposed to give him that support which all his predecessors had enjoyed, and he would make his bow and retire from office. We cannot see how less confidence should be bestowed by a Governor General in Canada than by the Sovereign of the British Empire. If the Canadian Executive Council does not fill so high a station in the world as the Cabinet Council of London, there is also a vast difference between the dignity of their Heads. For one is the Sovereign of a hundred and thirty millions of people, the other is that Sovereign's temporary Delegate in one sense, but in another, only First Minister of State, who will at all times best consult his own dignity, his Sovereign's, and the welfare of the Colony, by regarding the Council as his proper advisers for settling every public question, and giving them, while in office, his entire confidence. These officers are of his own appointment, and subject to his removal. They are subjects of the same Sovereign and servants of the same Crown, and if a portion of the influence of office is yielded to them, it is on the same ground that it is conferred on the Governor General, to enable the public business to be carried on, and to promote the welfare of the people of Canada.

The refusal to sign the Secret Societies' Bill, after his Excellency had agreed to allow it to come into the House, would alone have amply justified the ministers in their resignation. The Governor General says that he told them it was "an unwise and arbitrary measure," but why were they allowed to proceed so far with what he regarded in such a light? The purport of that Bill is to put down all societies bound by oath of secrecy, and wholly secret sights in their communications. All persons in public employment are obliged to sign a declaration by first June next, that they are not members of such societies. Mason Lodges are exempted from the operation of the Bill. We believe this Bill is similar to a measure adopted by the British Parliament in regard to Ireland, with the happiest effects. We have been much misinformed if such a Bill is not wanted in Canada. The riots which have disgraced this Province at elections and other public occasions, are stated to have been chiefly promoted by men connected with such institutions, and the safety and peace of the community call for such an enactment.

We can never sufficiently deplore the rupture which has occurred in the Government. We believe to no party, and cannot be suspected of having any sinister motives in thus speaking. We believe that such are true friends to the British connexion who wish the inhabitants of Canada to enjoy every privilege of British subjects. We may be thought by some to be deviating from our usual course on this occasion. But he must have studied the aspect of the times to little purpose, who has not observed that there is a party in this country, which would take away the right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, and that it is only the utmost watchfulness and jealousy over our civil and religious rights which can prevent the dreaded event from being accomplished.

We ask every Presbyterian to look back for a few years on the situation in which he was placed, in company with all who differed from the ruling power in the Church, and exhort him, as he regards his welfare and that of his children, not to allow himself to be deceived, but to stand fast for the full enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, which the British Constitution, when duly exercised, is so well calculated to afford.

From the Toronto Banner.

THE PRESENT CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS.

If the dissolution of Sir Charles Metcalfe's first ministry had been merely a change of the men who carry through the public business, the people of Canada would naturally take a lively interest in such an event. Every such change involves an alteration to some extent in the policy of the Government. But the change which has occurred is far deeper in its character. It involves an point of fact, the denial of that great principle of "Responsible Government," which was solemnly and deliberately incorporated with the political frame-work of the colony. It has been expressly stated in the ministerial manifesto, and has not been denied, that the Governor expressly holds "that affairs might be more satisfactorily managed by and through the Governor himself, without any necessity of consulting among the Members of the Executive Council, an obligation on their part to defend or support the acts of the Governor."

The distinguished individual who now holds the reins of Government, and whose fame had gone before him and prepared the colony to receive him with the utmost favor, has unquestionably a right to form his opinion on the fitness the constitution of Canada, but he has no right to alter that constitution without the consent of the contracting parties.

The resolutions of 1841, cannot be interfered with in such a manner. No case has been made out, or even alleged to exist, which can warrant their abolition. Those resolutions received the sanction not only of the Legislature but of the Governor General. Even the present Governor General admits their validity, while the statement now given, and his official acts of hostility to such admission.

While we deny the power of the Governor General to make the alteration, let us examine how the new system would operate if carried into effect.

The existence of a Council is still contemplated by His Excellency, but the official responsibility is to cease. It is doubtful, whether it is even necessary that the Council should be members of the Legislature, as when their ministerial character ceases, they will be no more than in a circle as their respective departments. If the Members of the Executive Council are not to be Members of the Legislature, a most happy approach will be made to the system of the neighbouring Republic. In vain will the frank explanations and official communications, which is the peculiar glory of the British Parliament to receive through the responsible ministers of the Crown, or Members of the Legislature, be exchanged for the Council and on the Executive in public [illegible] Each minister of the Executive Council will be in his own department the sole responsible adviser of the Governor, and will be the sole recipient of his instructions. Upon him alone the whole vials of party indignation are poured. Although he has ministers it is known they are merely his agents, and they never share the blame of a singular unpopular act of administration.

But supposing that it is deemed necessary that the heads or first clerks of departments should be members of the Legislature under the new regime, the measures are not to be theirs, but the Governor's. There is not a man among them but will be justly liable to the suspicion of not speaking his own sentiments and of being only the representative of the opinions of another, who is sheltered by his reflected prerogative from all legal responsibility in the colony.

With that dignity or firmness can this first Clerk of a Department rise in his place to propose a measure in the Assembly? How unlike his former self, when every eye was on him who had respect which is usually awarded to him who fills a high and responsible public office in the British Government? Will men be found in Canada to fill situations so degraded, or will constituencies be found to return to Parliament those who are not amenable for a single act of their administration? Supposing them to be returned and in their places, and not bound to support an obnoxious measure, we may have the edifying spectacle of the Inspector-General sturdily attacking the measures of the Surveyor-General, while the Secretary of Canada West opens a battery of great guns on the Secretary of Canada East, which is smartly returned by his hon. colleague in the very best Canadian French. We wonder where such a scheme of Government not has originated. If the Abbe Sieyes were alive he would readily yield the palm of originality to this bold innovator on all the rules of political justice and evidence. What a dignified scene would it be to hear an irresponsible minister declaring that he was instructed by the Governor General to introduce such and such a Bill, or if his official knowledge of what is required by the public interest should give him a holiness to bring in a Bill on his own account, how satisfactory would it be, after his Bill had passed both houses to have it vetoed by the Governor General.

When Canning made the first Tory movement to just and popular principles of Government, and when that sagacious statesman was deserted by all his ultra associates, a handful and fifty Whig members, headed by George Tierney, suddenly left the opposition benches, and to their immortal honor, placed themselves on the Treasury bench behind the Prime Minister supported his measures so far as they were of a liberal character and gave him an overwhelming majority. It was on that memorable occasion that Tierney remarked—"We are his Majesty's opposition. The Tories are in office, but the Whigs are in power. We have only to withdraw our support and out go the ministers." What then arose from an adventitious circumstance, and which is memorable from the illustration it gave of English statesmen sacrificing every personal or party feeling from regard to their country's welfare, may not occur again in a century. In popular assemblies party combinations are essentially necessary for developing public opinion. The conscientious and enlightened judgment of individuals connected with such parties, the Press and the public eye, will prevent them from attaining any dangerous height.

But the system of the present Governor-General would create combinations in the House of Assembly far more curious than was seen on that remarkable occasion. Let us enter the House of Assembly under the new arrangement. We search in vain for an opposition ministerial bench. If the same ministers were in power, we cast our eye on Mr. Baldwin or Mr. Hincks, expecting a speech in favor of some doubtful measure of administration, but we need not be the least surprised to hear these hon. gentlemen, under the new principle which does not require "the Executive Council to support the acts of the Governor," boldly attack the measures of their own officers. It would give a pleasant variety to life. At their desks they would be zealously employed in carrying through the Governor's measures, and in the Parliament in demolishing them. They would doubtless know all the weak points of the Government, and would be most available men in opposition. On the other hand, we should probably see the gallant Knight of Hamilton, throwing down his glove, and proclaiming that he was the Governor's *opposition*, prepared to *support* every measure which would come from that high and influential quarter.

How long would such a Government exist? It could not survive a single session of the Legislature. But there is an objection to the new scheme, to which we have more alluded, and to which we would earnestly press on the consideration of the friends of the British Government. The overturn of Responsible Government could be a heavy blow to the high office of Governor General, and the permanency of British connexion. So long as a Responsible Minister exists, the Governor General, entrenched behind his prerogative, is rarely heard of in connection with political measures. He makes his public appearances, holds his levee, and is approached with all the respect attached to the Representative of Great Britain. But let Ministerial Responsibility cease, and although he may still be sheltered from all legal attack within the Colony, every man feels that his relation to the Governor General is entirely changed. He is no longer seen through the character of first branch of the Legislature, and the dispenser of mercy, but becomes the mark for every disappointed placeman, or dissatisfied citizen. The Governor-General says, he does not wish to be the head of a party,—by such a course he becomes so in reality. With his own hands he has pulled down the constitutional screen which protects his high office, and brought himself to the level of a mere Minister of the Crown. Let the public prints be examined for the last two years, and it will appear that the official character of the Governor General has every day been less and less attached. There were no want of complaints, but they fell chiefly on the ministers. Go back before that era, and every opposition paper rang with charges and complaints against the Governor and the British Government. The question then was not, whether the ministers had done right or wrong, but whether the Home Government had not forfeited the affections of the Colony. Do the advisers of His Excellency wish to see this state of things revived? They cannot be the friends of British connexion, or if any of the name, they must miserably mistake the mode of promoting that interest.

The great supporters of the present movement always assume that there is a colonial connection necessary interiority on the part of the colonists. We utterly deny this position. Colonists are *citizens* and are entitled to every right of a British subject, and be as in the most favorable political condition which the world affords. They are loyal and contented, and he will generally be discontented, and ready to fall into the hands of the turbulent and designing.

It is true that a Colony, in its early state, requires the help of its parent, but that state of infancy, and must be treated accordingly by [illegible] ought to continue up [illegible] the female relation. But get a younger from [illegible] age. But the parent, [illegible] comes in other life the [illegible] see of the progeny. We tell us why a colony [illegible] age than the inhabitants [illegible] right when absolute [illegible] dismissed in most cases, [illegible] other things, so long as you [illegible] We ask, why? It is a [illegible] tution to say so. Loyalty, ambition, or commerce country, and they [illegible] they are reciprocally [illegible] These duties can be pol[illegible] It would be a dear pu[illegible] cent pecuniary or prest[illegible] country, at the expense [illegible] of British subjects. [illegible] Parliament of Great B[illegible] they must be, if the p[illegible] will throw away the [illegible] its and attachment of [illegible] policy of the present [illegible] had gained them much [illegible] spot in the Empire wh[illegible] popular. Must that [illegible] discontent in every g[illegible] Empire not enough to [illegible] be extended to Ca[illegible]

But the evil is not cau[illegible] of these Provinces be[illegible] their rights—the [illegible] they must prevail. A[illegible] tional the public will [illegible] ing of the appointment [illegible] public opinion.

Happy would many [illegible] gens of the United St[illegible] of government for the [illegible] the deepest despond[illegible] of suffrage, which the [illegible] wilfulness and impatience [illegible] council, many in the [illegible] their eyes to the true [illegible] They have found with [illegible] talk about Canada [illegible] loyal and contented [illegible] discontented, and ready [illegible] turbulent and designing [illegible]

[illegible] of the most intelligent citizens [illegible] to exchange their form [illegible] British Constitution. Such [illegible] by the effect of numerous [illegible] of the most [illegible] public men that can be [illegible] entry are beginning to open [illegible] of their government [illegible] government, that the Sovereign [illegible] [illegible] and independent [illegible] [illegible] Colonies [illegible] [illegible] Colonies [illegible] [illegible] Colonies