The Upper Canada Herald,

288

A POLITICAL, AGRICULTURAL AND COMMERCIAL JOURNAL.

{PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THOMAS H. BENTLEY, AT HIS OFFICE, STORE STREET, NEARLY OPPOSITE THE MANSION HOUSE.}

{TERMS—FIFTEEN SHILLINGS PER ANNUM, WHEN PAID IN ADVANCE—SEVENTEEN SHILLINGS AND SIX PENCE WHEN NOT SO PAID.}

VOLUME XIX.] [JOHN WAUDBY, Editor.] KINGSTON, UPPER CANADA, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1837. [T. H. BENTLEY, Printer & Proprietor.] [NUMBER 967.

W. B. WELLS, M. P. P.—MR. HUME, M. P.—AND THE CANADAS.

To the Editor of the Upper Canada Herald.

SIR,

Some time last year, a vain young man by the name of W. B. Wells, (who by some extraordinary freak in the whims of political good nature or moorbidness, has become a member of the House of Assembly,) went to London, and by his vanity and weakness contributed much to the amusement of a certain class of political loungers or politicians, some of whom he has since undertaken to imitate, to the no small amusement of those who know the man, and who know the men whom the man would personify.

This Mr. Wells would be great, must be great; & therefore, as the first ascending step in the ladder of greatness, he publishes a great pamphlet of two or three hundred pages—a hodge-podge of every thing but cool, connected, discriminating argument, —unnoticed except, I believe, by one radical print, which subsists to a considerable extent by charitable contributions, and which must therefore have had a strong sympathy for every one striving to creep up in the world.

Not yet discouraged, Mr. Wells resolves to show himself in the radical print itself—agreeing to purchase 50 or 100 copies at 4½d. sterling per copy, for the privilege of a couple of columns for that purpose. Mr. Wells' letter was signed "W. B. Wells, M. P. FOR Upper Canada"—not for the County of Grenville in Upper Canada—but "*for* Upper Canada." The pretext for this exhibition was, a series of Letters on the Affairs of the Canadas, by "*A Canadian*," which originally appeared in a leading Morning Journal, and which were afterwards, at the request and expense of Gentlemen connected with the Canadas, printed in the form of a pamphlet, and distributed amongst the Members of both Houses of Parliament—but from which the author thought proper to withhold his name, giving a reference by which any individual concerned might obtain access to him, should he feel himself injured, or desire further information on the subjects discussed. Mr. Wells appearing in the imposing character of "M. P. *for* Upper Canada, the anonymous writer of those letters thought proper to answer him. The papers containing the *answer and rejoinder of "A Canadian"* were not sent out to Canada; and have not been received until the present week. The effusions of Mr. Wells have appeared in the Canadian papers of his party, and have, I am told, been much boasted of by those prints and their supporters, as to the effect which they must have produced on the minds of public men in England. I herewith send you the replies of "A Canadian", by which you and the Canadian public may judge as to the reason of this party boasting.

I am authorised to say that the author of the letters signed "*A Canadian*" was in the British House of Commons during the three nights debate on Canadian affairs, and observed and noted at the time the following particulars: When Mr. HUME rose to speak the first night, there was such a general rush of members to the door, being determined not to listen to him, that all was confusion, and the debate had to be adjourned, until about six o'clock the next evening, when Mr. Hume claimed the floor as first speaker, because he had possession of it when the debate was adjourned. In the British House of Commons the members of the opposing political parties sit together, on opposite sides of the House. When Mr. Hume commenced his nearly three hour speech, there were about 150 or 200 members present. When he had spoken half an hour, "*A Canadian*," counted Mr. Hume's side of the house, and there were but *thirty-two* members. When he had spoken one hour another count was made, when there were found to be *twenty-eight*. After the expiration of another half hour, the twenty-eight were reduced to *twenty-two; sixteen* of whom were employed in conversation with each other—as were all (about the same number) of the members on the opposite side of the House. As soon as Mr. Hume drew towards the conclusion of his harangue, the House began to be filled with Members. It appeared that the exposures of Mr. Hume's conduct in Canadian affairs had so completely disgusted the members of the House of Commons, that they were determined not to endure the infliction of a speech from him.

"*A Canadian*" perceiving that Mr. Hume's speech was intended for the press and for the Canadas, and not for the House of Commons, immediately furnished Mr. GLADSTONE with the facts which were so admirably employed by that gentleman, to the delight of the House and to Mr. Hume's deep mortification.

Another specimen of Mr. Hume's candour and honour occurred during the debate. He is known to have written out to Canada some years since, a "baneful domination" letter, in which he most shamefully calumniated and abused a particular individual. Mr. Hume employed one hour and ten minutes of his speech to vindicate himself from the "baneful domination" part of that letter. At the beginning he said he would read the *whole* letter; but coming to that part where the name of the individual occurred whom he had assailed, he stopped short, and after a pause, observed—"This is a personal affair, perhaps I had better not go into it now;" and read no further;—in the *Constitutional* newspaper—patronized by him and Mr. Roebuck—Mr. Hume had the *whole* letter published, as if it had been read entire; whereas if it had been read, Lord Sandon and other members were prepared to defend the calumniated individual against the attacks which it contained. Such an act is beneath comment.

Situated as "A Canadian" was—and peculiarly situated as were the affairs of the Canadas—he felt that duty to his country left him no alternative, but to employ the press, the pen, and personal intercourse, in order to maintain the established institutions of these Provinces, in connexion with important salutary reforms and improvements, which he did all in his power to promote.

PHILO CANADIAN.

From the London Constitutional, 20th February, 1837.

THE CANADAS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL.

SIR,—A copy of the *Constitutional* newspaper of Monday, the 13th ult. has been put into my hands, in which a person signing himself "W. B. Wells, M. P. for Upper Canada," has violently assailed the author of a pamphlet entitled *Affairs of the Canadas*. As you have allowed your columns to be the medium, not merely of strictures upon the pamphlet, but of attacks upon the character of an individual publicly named as the author, I trust, as a friend and advocate of equal justice to all, you will allow the author of the pamphlet in question sufficient space to answer to the charges thus preferred.

Mr. Wells has not chosen to grapple with one of my general arguments, he has rather contented himself—as better adapted to his taste, and qualifications, and cause—to deal in general assertions, and personal attacks; and to nibble at isolated facts and circumstances which have no material bearing upon the general question. Whether my unprepending pamphlet is a tissue of misrepresentation throughout, I readily leave to the decision of every attentive reader of it. I have no concern as to the result of a comparison of its reasoning and internal evidence of truth, with the general assertions of Mr. Wells, even though he really were that he vainly pretends to be, "M. P. for Upper Canada." As my general arguments remain unrefuted and even untouched, I have only to notice the several statements made by this gentleman.

1. And first, as to the election for the county of Grenville, in Upper Canada. My statement that "two anti-constitutional candidates were noted into the assembly, in consequence of which the constitutional candidates had protested," Mr. Wells asserts to be false. Yet he admits there was a riot at the election, which terminated in the return of anti-constitutionalists; and his friend, Mr. W. L. Mackenzie, in his paper of the 9th of July, says;—"The Tory candidates entered their protest and retired." I said not with whom or what party the riot originated, I knew that was a matter of dispute. I simply stated the fact, and the result of it. My object was to show the absurdity of Dr. Charles Duncombe's charge against his Excellency Sir F. B. Head as the instigator of the riot. Whether my argument was true or false, my facts are proved by Mr. Wells's own admission and authority, which he ought not to controvert.

2. In regard to the county of Leeds. The argument in my pamphlet was, that such riots had occurred at elections in that county previous to Sir F. Head's arrival in Upper Canada, as induced the provincial legislature to pass a special act to prevent their recurrence; and therefore that Sir F. Head could not be justly charged *prima facia* with instigating election riots in that county. This is admitted by Mr. Wells; which is all that was necessary to my argument. Whether riots had occurred at elections in Leeds during the last ten years, or only three, was immaterial, though I am prepared, if necessary, to prove the former statement, [with one single exception for ten years] even from debates in the House of Assembly.

3. In contradiction to what I have stated in my pamphlet, Mr. Wells asserts, "At the last election but one (in 1834) the majority of the successful candidates were supported on the express grounds that they were to seek an amendment in the constitution, by causing the legislative council to be made elective." Where is Mr. Wells's proof of this statement? I declare it to be unfounded, and defy Mr. Wells to adduce a single proceeding of the House of Assembly, or any petition, or address, or resolution, signed or sanctioned by any considerable portion of the people of Upper Canada before 1835, in which an elective legislative council is directly or indirectly recommended. I cannot of course prove a negative; but in illustration of the perfect fabulousness of Mr. Wells's statement, I quote the words of Mr. Perry, the acknowledged leader of the majority of the late Assembly, who, in his place in the house the 30th of January, 1835, said, "He (Mr. Perry) would stake his existence, that where one of the people of Upper Canada desired a change in the constitution, twenty would be found against it." And "Dr. Charles Duncombe," of whom so honourable mention is made by Mr. Wells, proposed a resolution on the same day, not only condemning Mr. Hume as an enemy to the interest of the Canadas, but declaring "the strong and tried attachment of the inhabitants of Upper Canada to their sovereign and the constitution under which they had the happiness to live."

4. Mr. Wells's next statement is as absurd as the one noticed last is untrue. He says the people of Upper Canada have contended for the amendment of the constitution, because they sought to "divert the enormous grant therein made for the support of a Protestant clergy." Far more unfortunate than "ignorant of history," must Mr. Wells be to have suppressed and perverted the well-known fact, that those persons who have taken the most conspicuous part on the popular side of the Clergy Reserve question, have uniformly contended that their proposition did not involve a change in the constitution of the province; that it did not affect the constitutional powers of any branch of the government; that though the Constitutional Act made the provision in question, yet that very Act contained a clause also providing for the "varying or repealing" of that provision at the discretion of the provincial legislature, under certain forms, by and with the consent of his Majesty in Council. In confirmation of this remark, I have the authority of even a royal despatch on this very question of the Clergy Reserves. It was transmitted to the House of Assembly by Sir John Colborne, on the 25th of January, 1832, and concludes in the following words:—"His Majesty therefore invites the House of Assembly of Upper Canada, to consider how the powers given to the provincial legislature by the Constitutional Act, to vary or repeal this part of its provisions, can be called into exercise most advantageously for the spiritual and temporal interests of his Majesty's faithful subjects in this province."

5. The next item in Mr. Wells's bill of charges against me I must give at length in his own words. Alluding to the author of the pamphlet Mr. Wells proceeds:—"He further says, 'In Upper Canada the appointment to the offices of magistrates, &c., have, for several years been impartial, even upon the confession of the majority of the Radical journals;' and afterwards he (the author of the pamphlet) adduces one Radical member as a magistrate, and another as a militia officer, and states, 'were it necessary I could mention many similar examples.' Astonishing condescension on the part of the oligarchy!"

Now, will the British reader believe it, that the two quotations which Mr. Wells professes to take from my pamphlet, as having been written by me to illustrate the same subject, occur fifty-two pages apart, and in letters addressed to different individuals, written two months' distance of time from each other, as the dates will show, and on totally different subjects! Bad, indeed, must be the cause which requires such violations of justice, and truth, and honour, to support it; and unenviable is the heart that can descend to employ them. The first quotation is taken from the tenth page of my pamphlet, where I was speaking of the gradual improvement in the administration of the Canadian government in pursuance of the recommendations of the committee of the House of Commons on the civil government of the Canadas, in 1828. Amongst other things, I mentioned the appointments to the offices of magistrates, &c., but adduced no examples, though I could from recollection, have named at least twenty. I simply mentioned the fact, and the admission of it by Radical journals. I will now add, that among the Radical journals which I had in my mind at the time I made that statement, was the *Grenville Gazette* (the Radical journal of the very county in which Mr. Wells professes to have been elected), in which Sir John Colborne's numerous additions to the magistracy, in 1834, were lauded as impartial and praiseworthy in the highest degree.

Mr. Wells's second quotation is taken from the 62d page of my pamphlet, from a letter which I addressed to the noble Secretary of State for the Colonies, and, throughout which, I have not mentioned the subject of impartial appointments to the offices of magistrates, &c. I was repelling the charges preferred by "Dr. Charles Duncombe," in his petition to the British House of Commons against Sir Francis Head respecting magistrates, militia officers, &c., taking a part in the elections. I argued—1. That they were not excluded from the elective franchise by law. 2. That they took part in such contests in England. 3. That magistrates and militia officers interfered at the elections against Sir F. Head, as well as for him. In illustration, I stated that Mr. Perry, who introduced the resolution into the Assembly to stop the supplies, and Mr. Roblin, who made an elaborate speech in support of it, were both magistrates and militia officers (not that one was a magistrate, and the other a militia officer,) and that "were it necessary, I could mention many similar examples" of magistrates and militia officers taking a part, during the late elections, on the anti-constitutional as well as the constitutional side. Now, though Mr. Wells can pervert my words, I am persuaded he dare not explicitly deny this statement.

6. As to no efforts having been employed on the part of the government to redress grievances complained of, I need only refer for a refutation of Mr. Wells's charge on this point, to the speech of his friend "Dr. Charles Duncombe," delivered in the House of Assembly, the 30th of January, 1835, and quoted at considerable length in my seventh letter on the *Affairs of the Canadas*.

7. In respect to Orangeism, Mr. Wells's assertion weighs nothing against my facts, which were, that the Roman Catholics generally, with the Bishop at their head,) who even published an address to his adherents, in behalf of the constitution and Sir F. Head,) supported constitutional candidates during the late elections, which could not have been the case if Orange Lodges, and processions, and outrages had been encouraged by Sir F. Head, in the manner represented by "Dr. Charles Duncombe."

8. Mr. Wells says, the "project of changing the constitution of the Canadas, did not originate with Mr. Hume and Mr. Roebuck in 1833," as I had asserted, and I think proved, "but with Mr. Fox, in 1791," and that but for my ignorance of history I would have known this. True, Mr. Fox opposed some clauses of a bill which, afterwards, in an amended form, became the constitution of the Canadas; but will Mr. Wells direct me to the "history" in which I can learn that Mr. Fox ever proposed, as he asserts, to "change the constitution of the Canadas." Possibly this gentleman, "M. P. for Upper Canada," may not have yet learned the difference between the constitution of a country, and a bill under the consideration of Parliament. I have given my reasons as to the origin of the project for changing the constitution of the Canadas; intelligent British readers will judge of their strength or weakness without asking permission from Mr. Wells.

9. For the fiftieth time does Mr. Wells repeat the stale and oft-refuted calumny against the Wesleyan Conference in Upper Canada, as having received for the benefit of its members, and been influenced by a grant of £900, from the government. I deny his statement in toto, and challenge him to the proof of it. On the contrary, I am prepared to prove the acknowedgment of the sum alluded to, in the published report of a religious society in London; that not one single farthing of it has ever been paid to or received by any Wesleyan minister in Upper Canada; that these facts have been proved before a committee of the Upper Canada House of Assembly, upon the testimony, and from the detailed accounts, of the representative and agent of the Missionary Society in London; that the sum in question was paid to the order and agent of the London Missionary Society referred to, in compliance with the instructions of the Earl of Ripon, when Secretary of State for the Colonies, and has been wholly and solely expended in the erection of school-houses, and support of teachers, amongst the aboriginal Indian tribes, the same as certain parliamentary grants to several missionary societies in England are expended in the instruction of the West Indian slaves. Mr. Wells should recollect that he cannot impose fiction and sophistry upon the British public with the same impunity and success that he has been wont to do upon the new settlers in the back woods of Canada.

10. Another topic, of which Mr. Wells has availed himself to deal largely in personal abuse, is the celebrated "Grievance Report," respecting which I contended in my pamphlet, that it had never been adopted by the Assembly up to the time of its being sent to England; and that it did not express the sentiments of the inhabitants of that province, as they would declare at any time on being appealed to. Now Mr. Wells himself says, that "owing to the lateness of the session [rather late period of the session] it (the Grievance Report) was ordered to be printed, but could not be adopted." This admission is the gist of the first part of my argument; and as to the second part, the people of Upper Canada have been appealed to, and have responded to that appeal by condemning the Grievance Report and its abettors by a majority of three to one—thus more than fulfiling my prediction. Whether or not my statement, that the Grievance Report was concealed from members of the opposite party until the day of prorogation, is "untrue," as Mr. Wells asserts, may be decided by the reader, from the following extract of the debates which took place on the morning of the prorogation—"Mr. M'Nabb [a gentleman well known to the cost of Mr. Wells and his coadjutors] said, since he understood it (the Grievance Report) had been adopted on a former night, when most of the members were absent, he had searched and enquired of the clerk for it, that he might look into it, but it was not to be found." "Mr. Mackenzie (the Chairman of the Committee) said he had taken the report home to have part of it copied to send to Lower Canada and to London, which was the cause of its being missing for some time."

11. In reply to Mr. Wells's attack upon the Wesleyan Conference in Canada, I will merely state, that that active and successful body of ministers, at their annual meeting held in June last, adopted unahimously an address to his Majesty, in which they waved all claim to any personal participation in the proceeds of the clergy reserves, and entreated that an early settlement of that long-litigated question might be made in accordance with the nearly unanimous wishes of the inhabitants of Upper Canada, as frequently expressed through their representatives and otherwise. And as late as September last, that address was presented by the Rev. Egerton Ryerson to his Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, to be laid at the foot of the Throne. I envy not the feelings or character of the calumniators of that most numerous class of Christian ministers in Canada, when confronted by such facts. Mr. Wells's petty display of pointless wit in the use of the word "Elder," betrays also his ignorance of the most familiar page of Canadian "history," as that term does not even occur in the formula, or discipline, or vocabulary of the Wesleyan Methodist church; much less does it designate any class of its ministers.

12. I notice lastly, the most unpleasant, and to the English reader the least interesting part of Mr. Wells's communication—his scurrilous and abusive attacks upon the character of an individual as a man and a Christian minister—a topic which had nothing to do with the great questions at issue, and which could only have been introduced in the manner it has been by a person not to be "dealt with except in a public way," and of whose partisanship honour can form no attribute. I appeal to any candid reader of my pamphlet—how widely soever he may differ from me in the opinions and reasonings I have advanced—whether I have not canvassed the public conduct and measures of public men according to the strictest proprieties of political discussion; and whether, after I had withheld my name from the public, but at the same time rendered it accessible to any person who might wish to satisfy himself, or make further inquiries, or seek redress if he felt himself injured, it is not a violation of the conventional usages of public life to drag an individual before the public with a view to assail him in the different social relations which he has been called to sustain in his own country, and even to represent him as having left his country to escape the accumulated pressure of popular odium? I very much mistake the taste and honour of Englishmen of all parties if Mr. Wells can gain credit or even respect in their estimation, by such an outrage upon British propriety.

Whether the "Rev. Egerton Ryerson" is or is not the author of the pamphlet on the *Affairs of the Canadas* affects not the questions therein argued, and is immaterial to the British public; but the moral and religious character of a Christian Minister is of some importance to himself and to the public of every country in which he may exercise his functions. If Mr. Wells's statements and insinuations are not a disgraceful fabrication, will he answer the following questions? How happens Mr. Ryerson to have been chosen annually, during the last six or eight years, by a ballot vote of his brethren to the highest offices in their gift? How happens he, at the time of leaving his native country in November, 1835, to have been a minister of the largest Wesleyan congregation in Upper Canada, and to have received the "unanimous and cordial" invitation of the heads of that congregation to become their pastor again as soon as he could accomplish his mission to England? How happens the then governor of Upper Canada (on several of whose measures Mr. Ryerson had publicly animadverted with great plainness and considerable severity) to have so far approved of his upright motives and honourable conduct, as to have transmitted to him, at a distance of nearly 200 miles, letters of introduction and commendation to persons of distinction in England? How happen the views advocated for years past by Mr. Ryerson to have been recently endorsed by three-fourths of the elective voice of Upper Canada, and his most conspicuous personal friends to have been elected to the Assembly by overwhelming majorities? But, Mr. Editor, the spleen of this party will be perfectly intelligible when it is known that its leaders have more than once attributed to the author of the pamphlet on the Canadas the chief instrumentality of their overthrow and accumulating political misfortunes.

As to Sir F. Head, with whom Mr. Wells has placed me in such honourable juxtaposition, I know nothing of him personally. I never saw him.—His Excellency arrived in Upper Canada after I left that province. My defence of him originated in a spontaneous sense of duty to a distinguished and calumniated individual, of whom I had heard honourable testimonies in this country from persons of various political creeds. In my pamphlet I have also kept aloof from English politics; and my animadversions on the conduct of certain English politicians have been confined entirely to their proceedings in Canadian affairs. That pamphlet was prepared without any pretensions as to style, at the request of Gentlemen who are interested in the mutual prosperity of Great Britain and the Canadas; and was respectfully dedicated to those for whose perusal it was principally intended.

I am, sir,
Your very obedient servant,
A CANADIAN.

20, Guildford-street, Russell-square,
Feb. 16, 1837.

From the same, 9th March, 1837.

SIR,—The *Constitutional* newspaper of the 6th instant was put into my hands about five minutes since. In that paper I observe a second letter from Mr. W. B. Wells, of Upper Canada, occupying a column and a half of your greatly enlarged publication. I will not intrude upon one-third of that space in reply. If a tedious repetition of ungenerous insinuations and ungentlemanly abuse is any answer to simple and unquestionable arguments, expressed in the fewest words possible, than has Mr. Wells refuted my reply to his attacks. But if he has anything in the shape of argument to produce, why has he burdened your columns and insulted your readers with a column and a half of insinuations and abuse, without scarcely an attempt to establish the main points at issue? Why does he act the part of an entangled scuttle-fish, blacken the water about him that he may escape unseen? Mr. Wells ought to have been more accurate in his estimate of the cost; he is now rather an object of commiseration than of rebuke. I will dismiss this point by addressing him in the words of the venerable Hooker—"To your railing I say nothing; to your arguments I say what follows."

1. As to the whole question of the elections in Upper Canada, the report of a select committee of the Upper Canada House of Assembly, which has appeared in some of the morning journals, so fully establishes to the very letter every statement I have made, and every opinion I have expressed on that subject, that it is superfluous for me to add another word. I leave Mr. Wells to refute the statements and evidence of that report if he can.

2. Whether the party in the two Canadas with which Mr. Wells is connected, demand independence from the mother-country or not, I leave to the debate in the House of Commons on Monday evening last on the affairs of Canada, to prove.—Did not the advocates of Mr. Wells's party contend that the Canadas ought to be made independent? And did not Lord John Russell and Sir George Grey maintain that the demands of that party were incompatible with the relations of a colony to the mother-country? And to that same debate I also appeal to prove whether the demands of that party originated with Mr. Fox or with Mr. Roebuck and Mr. Hume. When I find his Majesty's ministers, after the fullest investigation of the subject, endorsing every one of the statements, and arguments, and opinions advanced in my pamphlet, I feel that I can well bear Mr. Wells's puny attacks.

Thus have the main arguments of Mr. Wells's voluminous letter been disposed of; I will now advert to one or two particulars.

I demanded of him to prove what I denied, and what he had asserted, that a majority of the members of the Upper Canada Assembly, elected in 1834, were pledged to support the elective Legislative Council project. I denied that there had been the slightest expression of popular feeling in Upper Canada on the subject until after the election of that Assembly. Now what is Mr. Wells's proof? His only pretended proof is, that a majority of that Assembly voted in favour of an elective council within six months after its election! And even this statement is untrue, upon Mr. Wells's own showing; for in his first letter he says that the "Grievance Report," in which an elective council was first demanded, was "ordered to be printed (in 1835) but was not adopted." In his second letter, he says, that there was a majority of 29 to 15 against Mr. Perry on that question. But when? Not in 1835, as Mr. Wells would fain represent in direct contradiction to his own previous letter, but twelve months afterwards, on the 30th of January, 1836—the very fact stated by myself—and within three months of the dissolution of that Assembly, and for which they were rejected by the electors of Upper Canada. And how utterly dishonest and unworthy is Mr. Wells's attempt, at supposing that Dr. Charles Duncombe did not mean the constitution of the Canadas, when he declared in 1835, the "strong and tried attachment of the Canadian people to the constitution under which they have the happiness to live?"

In Mr. Wells's first letter, he stated, that I came to this country to escape popular odium; in his second letter he says, that "in my profession," I am "respected" in Canada! In his first letter he assailed the conduct of the Wesleyan Conference on the Clergy Reserve question; in his second letter he has not the candour to acknowledge the calumny, but admits that he has a high respect for the Wesleyan body.

Having now disposed of every material point in Mr. Wells's puerile rejoinder, except his abuse, I leave him to his reflections, and your columns to be occupied with more interesting and useful matter.

I am, Sir,
Your very obedient servant,
A CANADIAN.

20, Guildford-street, Russell-square,
March 8, 1837.

MONETARY.

THE CREDIT SYSTEM—AMERICAN AND EUROPEAN.—In a brief notice we published a day or two since, of the new work of Mr. Grund on the Americans, we referred with particular commendation to his chapter on Commerce and Credit. Mr. Grund is a gentleman who has improved great opportunities of observation to the best advantage. A native of Germany, he is familiar with the institutions of Europe; and he has derived from a residence of fifteen years in different parts of the United States, an intimate knowledge of their resources, capacities and character. This enables him to compare the relative positions and advantages of the two continents, and aids his naturally vigorous and sound judgment in forming correct opinions. From much of the political speculation in his last chapter, however, we entirely dissent; though the general defence of democratic institutions is able and philosophical. The mistake of the writer consists in not making the proper distinction between practice and professions—fact and theory. Having seen the Jackson party styled "democratic" in the newspapers, he has assumed that they sustain democratic principles, and pursue a democratic policy; but should he become more familiar with the real party divisions, and scrutinize more carefully the history of the last six or seven years, he would be convinced that the actual government has been that of an oligarchy—and an oligarchy of the most desperate and abandoned character.

Leaving these speculations out of the question, there is much valuable philosophy in these volumes—and especially in the chapter of which we shall give a summary analysis. The first circumstance noted by Mr. Grund in his comments on our commercial system is the fact that almost all the enterprising and successful merchants in New York, Boston and other sea ports have been the architects of their own fortune; and that in almost all instances good sense, good character, industry, and capacity for business have gone much further than mere capital with inferior personal qualifications. This can only be explained in his opinion, by reference to the singular facilities of credit, and the willingness of wealthy capitalists to invest their money in trade. "A young beginner with talents" he observes, "finds always a partner with money,—in many instances a silent one,—while the son of a rich man either studies a profession or receives less of that practical education which can alone render him fit for business. Being born with a fortune, he is, perhaps, less eager in its pursuit than one who commences poor; and is on that account less trusted than an enterprising merchant with a small capital."

Mr. Grund then comments on the purely personal character of credit in the United States. This advantage is enjoyed in England to a greater extent than in France—but in the rest of Europe credit is based altogether on *possessions*, and is consequently with a few exceptions beyond the grasp of mere intelligence, honesty and industry. To the poor German or Frenchman, the acquisition of property is a slow and tedious process; his facility of credit corresponding merely to the property that he can pledge for its redemption. But in this country the case is very different. Credit rests on a moral basis. Not merely goods and lands—but capacity, integrity, talent, aptitude for business, enterprise, industry, also furnish satisfactory pledges. A man's character is as good a guarantee as his merchandize; in some instances it is the preferable security. A man of small property then, with a good character, and favorably known in his business relations, enjoys a *better* credit than the man of mere wealth destitute of business capacities.—"Thus the amount of floating capital in the United States," says Mr. Grund, "is not merely based on the gross value of real and personal estate; but also on the moral qualifications of the merchants, and the resources of the country which it is the genius of the people to develope. The figures on 'Change denote not merely money and merchandize; but represent also the intelligence, enterprize, economy and probity of the people; they are the index to the *mind* as well as to the property of the merchants."

The advantages of this system, Mr. Grund regards as incalculable, in giving facilities of trade to persons who could not otherwise enjoy them, and in their strong moral influence on the people.—Where credit rests solely on property, the spirit of enterprise is entirely stifled, or confined to a very small class. It induces those who possess fortunes to be intent only on their increase; and induces a disposition of meanness and avarice, in the place of liberal activity and well directed enterprise. To this Mr. Grund attributes the different relative positions of the American and the Continental merchants. In Germany the pursuits of trade are generally regarded in the spirit with which the administration press in this country considers them.—They are deemed to be vulgar and sordid; because it is the tendency of trade, as it is there conducted, to narrow and degrade the mind. The business of the American merchant liberalizes his intellect, expands and invigorates it. Knowledge, experience, character, supply the deficiency of capital; and moral advantages raise their possessor to an equality with the more wealthy and prosperous. "The rich are obliged to employ the talents of the poor in order to increase their wealth; and the latter may in turn hope to become opulent and independent. Commerce, in this manner, is not monopolized by a few wealthy families, but becomes the natural occupation of the whole people, in which all who have talent and industry, have an equal chance of success."

In conclusion, Mr. Grund notices the objection which has been made to the American System of Credits. His comments on this subject we copy in full:

"Now, granting that there occur more failures in the United States than in any country of the same population in Europe, it does not follow that, considering the amount of business, and the number of those who engage in it, there is more injury sustained from bankruptcies than either in France or England; on the contrary, it is more than probable that the profits, realized in any kind of trade, bear a better proportion to the losses sustained by insolvent debtors than in any other country in the world.

"To judge correctly of the frequency of failures in America, we must not only consider the vastness of speculation based on a comparatively small capital; but also the fact that in the United States there exists as yet no bankrupt law to exclude persons of whatever employment or trade of the advantages enjoyed by merchants. Mercantile speculations are not confined to any one class; the tradesman, the mechanic, the agriculturist, the lawyer, the physician, and even the schoolmaster have their share in them; and, considering the abilities of all these persons, we shall find the number of those who actually avail themselves of the benefit of the "act for insolvent debtors," not only small, but incapable of affecting the community. If the facilities of credit were less, the number of failures would, undoubtedly, be less also; but in the same ratio would also diminish the facilities of trade, and the profits arising from an active and liberal commerce. The nation would be deprived of one of its principal sources of prosperity, and thousands of enterprising individuals prevented from participating in an extensive business. Those who are against the credit system of the United States, ought, for the same reason, to oppose navigation, on account of the frequency of shipwrecks."

[N. Y. Courier & Enquirer.]

FOREIGN ITEMS.

We do not know how it may strike others, but to us the following passage seems eloquent. It is from an electioneering speech by Lord Francis Egerton, at a conservative dinner.

He saw the sovereign take her station at that table where many years since the young Sixth Edward, who gave us our liturgy, also took his stand. He heard her with a voice which resembled sorrow over mastered for a great occasion, and with a firm confidence in an overruling providence, read that speech which confirmed her attachment to and pledged her to the established church—that oath he firmly believed she never would break—cheers. It was for them to determine, whether she should yet be surrounded by those who would lead her insensibly to the verge of its infringement. For him there was one affecting scene—it was when an individual then present knelt to kiss that sovereign's hand, when the simple braid of those tresses which sat beneath England's crown was brought into juxta position with the hoary locks of Wellington—(cheers)—with those veteran locks devoted to her service; there Britannia's genius, which had suffered many a scar, seemed bound to her feet, ready to protect her in the hour of danger. It seemed as if the right arm of England was near her, ready to smite or to save. They had heard of a strange scene in a foreign country, when a young fair sovereign was pressed by the banded powers of Europe and by the nobles in her kingdom of Hungary, the people rose on behalf of the sovereign; and we, like them, will raise the cry of "Moriamor, pro regi nostra Alexandrina Victoria!

The Queen is compelled to take exercise by stealth; her carrage is daily surrounded, and the way she proposes to drive lined with curious idlers until it has become necessary to practice deception on the crowd. Surely the Queen of England might claim the respect due to her sex and situation; feeling is independent of rank, and the thoughtless only can forget that while her uncle's body lies unburied, the niece cannot receive pleasure from noisy and unmeaning shouts of congratulation. What would be thought of such indelicacy towards a youthful female in any other rank of life?—

[Atlas.]

ROYAL AMATEURS.—Her Majesty, besides being a good performer on the pianoforte, sings remarkably well; her voice is a mezzo soprano of very sweet quality. The Duchess of Kent is a good musician, and plays the pianoforte scientifically. Most of the sons and daughters of George III. were accomplished musicians. His late Majesty King George IV. was an excellent performer on the violoncello and he possessed a very fine bass voice. The Duke of Cambridge plays the violin in a very superior manner, and the Princess Augusta has composed many pretty vocal pieces. Queen Adelaide is an excellent judge of music, and is remarkably fond of sacred compositions, particularly full choruses. During the festival in Westminster Abbey she was frequently moved "even to tears" when the sublime choruses of Handel were performed.

[Musical World.]

THE NEW PALACE.—Four superb new lamps, surmounted by the Crown were yesterday affixed over the two private entrances of this Palace.—The ornamental gates, enriched with mosaic gold, have been also affixed to the marble entrance.—They are considered to be the largest and most splendid in Europe, not excepting even the great gates of the Ducal Palace at Venice, hitherto esteemed the most remarkable for their size. The cost per contract of the new gates, including the circular railings fixed on each side of the arch, has been £10,200; so that the whole expense of this entrance alone, archway, statue, and railing has amounted to considerable more than £70,000.

THE NEW THRONE.—The New Throne, upon which her majesty will receive several addresses this day, was yesterday fixed in the palace. It is a most magnificent piece of furniture. The platform upon which the gorgeous chair is placed, is sixteen feet long by ten, and raised three steps from the floor. It is covered with crimson velvet pile carpeting, over which a canopy is suspended eighteen feet in height, decorated with the rose, thistle and shamrock, interwoven with foliage, and surmounted by a beautifully carved crown and cushion. The drapery is composed of the richest crimson velvet, of English manufacture, lined with lutestring of the same tone. The tester is composed of velvet panelleo, with a broad oak leaf, and acorn gold lace trimming, with a massive gold rope. Similar decorations are used in forming the drapery of the inside valance. The valance on the outside is of a different design, and is trimmed with two rows of gold lace, and finished with a deep gold fringe. The curtains which are exceedingly full, are furnished in a similar manner, and are looped up with a gold rope and tassels, the whole forming one of the most beautiful structures imaginable. The chair, which was not finished until a late hour last night, is covered with crimson velvet, and is richly carved and gilt, and embroidered with rows of deep gold lace. The footstool corresponds in colour and magnificence with the decorations above and around the throne.

ALTERATION IN THE ROYAL ARMS.—The Royal Arms of England will vary very much from those borne by Her Majesty's five predecessors. The Sovereign being a female, they will be borne on a lozenge instead of a shield, and the imperial crest of a lion surmounting the Crown will be discontinued, as will also the escutcheon of pretence bearing the arms of Hanover surmounted by the crown of that kingdom. The Arms will in future consist of the four grand quarters only—namely, England in the first and fourth, and Ireland and Scotland in the second and third quarters.

CURIOUS HISTORY OF AN OLD TRUNK.—Some years ago an old woman became an inmate of Moulton work house, near this town, bringing with her the whole of her worldly goods, consisting of an old bedstead and a trunk. She died in the work house, and the parish officers applied to her nearest of kin to ascertain whether they would undertake the expenses incident to her interment, and inherit the old bedstead and trunk, or leave the last offices to the parish, who would then claim the property, such as it was, to meet the expenses. The relatives declined all interference, and the old lady was buried at the cost of the parish. When the Brixworth union was formed, the guardians rented, *pro tempore*, the Moulton work house, taking the property at a valuation. Among this property was the old bedstead and the trunk. The Brixworth union now having a building of their own, have abandoned the work house at Moulton, and last week a sale by public auction took place of the old furniture, including the bedstead and trunk. Here these two venerable articles parted company. Of the purchaser of the bedstead we have no record, but the trunk was knocked down for 2s. Two persons claiming the purchase, it was again put up and knocked down at 2s 9d to the

Public Record Office Reference C.O. 47/58

COPYRIGHT OF PHOTOGRAPH RESERVED TO PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE. FOR PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE, APPLY TO PUBLIC ARCHIVES, OTTAWA.