

THE SENTINEL.

AND NEW BRUNSWICK GENERAL ADVERTISER.

VOL. III

FREDERICTON, SATURDAY, MAY 9, 1840.

No. 19.

THE SENTINEL.
PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING
By **Edmund Ward.**
Office.—Phoenix or Tank House—Fredericton.
AND CONTAINS,
The Decisions of the Executive, and Notices of
Sales of Crown Lands.
During the sitting of the Legislature THE SENTINEL is published twice each week, and in it
are inserted
The Debates of the House of Assembly.

TERMS.—15s. per annum, exclusive of Postage
Half in advance.

No Paper will be discontinued until all
arrearers are paid.

ADVERTISEMENTS not exceeding twelve
lines will be inserted for four shillings and sixpence
the first, and one shilling and sixpence for each
succeeding insertion. Larger in proportion.

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.
CENTRAL BANK OF NEW BRUNSWICK.—W.
J. Babel, Esq. President. Saml. W. Babbit, Esq.
Cashier. Discount Days, Tuesdays and Fridays.
—Bills or Notes offered for Discount must be left at
the Bank, enclosed and directed to the Cashier, be-
fore two o'clock on Mondays and Thursdays. Di-
rector next week, J. ROBINSON, Esq.

COMMERCIAL BANK OF NEW BRUNSWICK.—
Fredericton Branch. Archd. Scott, Esq. Cashier.
Discount days, —Mondays and Thursdays. Hours
of business from 10 to 3. Notes or Bills for dis-
count are to be left at the Bank, enclosed to the
Cashier before three o'clock on Saturdays and Wed-
nesdays.

BANK OF BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.—Fredericton
Branch.—Alfred Smithers, Esq. Manager.—
Discount days, Wednesdays and Saturdays. Hours
of business from 10 to 3. Notes and Bills for
Discount to be in before 3 o'clock on the days pre-
ceding the Discount Days. Director next week, J.
F. Taylor Esq.

SAVINGS' BANK. Trustee for next week, P.
FISHER.
CENTRAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.—B.
Volhaupter, Esq. Office open every day, at Mr.
Minchin's Brick House, opposite the Parade, (Sun-
days excepted,) from 11 to 2 o'clock. Committee
for the present Month, C. McPHERSON and C.
FISHER.

ALMS HOUSE AND WORK HOUSE.—Commis-
sioner, till Thursday next, L. A. WILMOT, Esq.

FROM LATE LONDON PAPERS.

The Tory re-action goes on merrily. The se-
venth election has just been decided, and a se-
venth election to the liberal party has been ac-
chieved.

A vacancy for the Inverness burghs having
occurred, the candidates were Mr. Fraser, a
highlander, who had all the kindly sympathies of
his countrymen in his favour, and against
whom nothing could be said, except that he was a
Tory, and Mr. Morrison, a London merchant,
who had no local influence whatever, and who
was only known to the people of Scotland as a
Reformer.

At the former election for the same place the
liberal candidate was returned by a majority of
nineteen. So great however has been the Tory
reaction in those parts, that Mr. Morrison has
been elected by a majority of Forty-six.

This success had been obtained in spite of the
utmost efforts of the Tory party, and in spite of
the attempts of the Tory papers to mystify the
electors, with respect to the intention of the Tories
upon the non-intrusion question—the question
which is now the all-absorbing topic among
Scotchmen, and upon which they are united as
one man.

The non-intrusion question is a quaint term,
employed to signify the right of the heads of
families in Scotland to interpose a veto upon the
appointment of any clergyman, whom they may
think unqualified to perform his spiritual duties
with advantage among them. In the vindication
of this right, which has been recently invaded
by a decision of their civil courts, they are so
enthusiastic, that we have heard Scotchmen
declare that they would rather turn out upon
the hill side, as their fathers did of yore, than
see this great privilege lost to them and their
children.

We envy the natives of this division of our
island their unanimity and their enthusiasm in
such a cause, and we envy them also the cer-
tainty they have of succeeding. Had such a
right as this been obtained by our laity, and
guarded with watchfulness and spirit, how much
heartburning, how much tyranny, how much
scandal to religion would it have saved, and
how different a Church of England should we
now have had?

The parliamentary reports are silent upon the
corn laws as if no such question agitated the
country. Six weeks has the House now been
sitting, often has it omitted to sit at all; weeks
of debate has it expended upon a trumpery ques-
tion of privilege, in which the country feels no
interest whatever, or if they do feel any inter-
est, it is somewhat equivalent to the indignation
which the master of a house would feel when
he found his house in confusion, and his study
without a fire, because his servants were quar-
reling with the servants of his next door neigh-
bour,—six weeks, we say, has the House thus
consumed, and yet the corn laws have never
been mentioned. This one topic of public in-
terest, this great question of questions, upon
which alone the public mind is concentrated, is
absolutely tabooed in the house of representa-
tives, and the Speaker would at once interrupt
the member who would venture to say a dozen
words upon it.

We are not ignorant that there is a notice of
motion upon this subject upon the books, or that
a grand corn law field-day is approaching. We
had one of these last session, and we may have
one for a hundred sessions to come, if this is
the only way in which the question is to be
treated in Parliament. These great debates,
these grand salvos of oratory, are worse than
useless. It is not thus that the Reform Bill
was agitated, nor was it thus that it was carried.

To repeal the corn laws we must have a par-
liamentary as well as an out-of-doors agitation.
And never was there an act of Parliament passed
so favourable to Toryism as is that simple ses-
sional order which now forbids all discussion
upon petitions. It shuts out all parliamentary
agitation; it in effect destroys all the efficacy
of the constitutional right of petitioning; it is an
injustice and an insult to the constituency, and
the present state of the House shows that it is
as unnecessary as it is noxious.

But for this unconstitutional order of the
House, not a night would have passed without
a full House and a corn law debate. A contin-
ual running fire would have been kept up, pe-
titions would have poured in in thousands, and
the debates of the House would have borne
some analogy to the feeling of the country.—
But what use is it now to get up petitions,
which are thrust under the table in silence, and
are cut up the next day to make tailors' mea-
sures?

What are the corn law delegates about?—
Surely they will not be satisfied that the sub-
ject should be disposed of by a single debate, or
that it should occupy a less portion of the con-
sideration of the House than a disputed railroad
bill, or Mr. Packington's beer bill. If the corn
laws are to be repealed, we must have fifty de-
bates and fifty motions every session; we must
agitate in Parliament; we must never let the
House relax one single night from the contem-
plation of the subject; we must also watch; we
also must harass; we also if necessary must ob-
struct; but we must be continually heard. It
was thus that the Test Acts were repealed, it
was thus that the Emancipation was carried, it
was thus that Reform was gained; and thus—
and thus only—shall we ever emancipate our
countrymen from the degradation and misery
which they hourly suffer from this atrocious
impot.

Every anti-corn law constituency should now
closely watch the conduct of its representative,
and teach every member that the first question
which he will be asked upon the hustings, will
be, "What have you personally done towards
the repeal of the bread tax?" It is in forward-
ing this great cause that the leisure moments of
our House of Commons should be passed, not in
thin attendances, early adjournments, and "no
house."

We are perhaps unfortunate or singular,
but we have no sympathy with the present
pursuits of Parliament. When we say Par-
liament, we mean the House of Commons.
The Lords are nonentities, and do nothing.
The long discussions on the privilege ques-
tion seemed to us, in the present condition
of the country, a miserable mockery of the
public feelings and public expectations. A-
gain, when so much is demanded of the
House of Commons, it has occupied two
nights with a debate on a Bill of Lord Stan-
ley's concerning the registration of voters in
Ireland, and is as intensely interested with
the subject as if the fate of the empire de-
pended on it. We have no sympathy with the
pursuits of the Commons. The Tory
journals complain of the Liberals because they
oppose the bill on the ground that it is
Lord Stanley's. If they were to do so we
should praise them. To snub that arrogant
changeling, who fancies himself a great
statesman because he is a great talker—"the
heir of all his mother's tongue," is the duty
of every reflecting moderate member. What-
ever such a Hotspur proposes should always
be looked on with suspicion. Of Catholic
Irishmen he is the open and declared enemy,
as he is the open and avowed servant of the
Anglican bigots. All the members for Ire-
land therefore, should rise against him when
he interferes with its concerns. He has mer-
ited the suspicion and the enmity of the
Irish, and common sense cautions them not
to trust their opponents. They do right,
therefore, in resisting Lord Stanley's Bill.

It is proposed by Lord Stanley's bill to re-
move from the registry the names of those
who by death, or removal, or other non-qua-
lification, ought not to remain on it; so that
the list of voters may be really a list of those
and of those alone having the right to vote at
an election. The opponents of the measure
object to this; they say, "we will not allow
the number of names on the register to be
diminished," "it would be almost a total dis-
franchisement," &c. Now we contend, that
this objection being reduced to plain English
can mean only this—"we do not like the
names of those who ought not to be on the
register to be removed from it, because that
would deprive those interested of the power
of bringing up fictitious voters to the poll,"
(this is what they call "disfranchisement")
Here then, we have the main argument a-
gainst the principle of the bill, and the rea-
son for it.—*Courier.*

FROM THE LONDON ATLAS MARCH 28.

Lord Stanley's Bill for repealing the Irish
Reform Act—for such, in effect it is—has been
read a second time in the House of Commons by
a majority of sixteen! Thus falls the favourite
figment of the finality of the Reform Act. Such
is the first practical commentary upon the often
repeated vows of allegiance to the present state
of the representation, which the Tories have
been so loudly ejaculating ever since they found
that they could use the English Reform Bill for
their own purposes.

When this Bill was introduced by Lord Stan-
ley, artful as was his account of it, and care-
fully as its object was attempted to be concealed,
it was yet so clear, that the public generally
marvelled at its audacity, and censured the attempt
as a gratuitous impertinence. To change a con-
stituency because it declares against a particu-
lar faction of the state, to abolish a system of
registry because it enables too many qualified
persons to register, to hem round the franchise
with continual contests, to fetter it year after
year with a long series of forms and notices,
which would employ all the acuteness of a spe-
cial pleader to be drawn so that no objection
could be taken to them; to harass, oppress,
and impoverish every one who insists to remain
upon the register against the will of his neigh-
bour; to make an elector hold his vote at the
expense of an intricate and yearly law-suit—
these were the objects of Lord Stanley and
his party—these must be the effects of his bill if
ever it should become law.

The bill itself is worthy of its object. It is
the most clumsy piece of embryo legislation that
has been lately laid before the House. It is
conched in the old and now obsolete verbiage,
in which the meaning of our Acts of Parliament
was accustomed to be concealed from the vul-
gar ken. It is inconsistent in its provisions,
vague and wordy in its enactments. There is
not a clause which would not admit of as many
doubts as it contains lines—but hold. Perhaps
the very faults which we are urging against it
are its chief excellencies in the eyes of its par-

ent. No one knows better than Lord Stanley
that there is a vast difference between the En-
glish and the Irish bench of judges, and that to-
pics of politics, which are excluded from West-
minster Hall, find ready admission in the Hall
of the four Courts. Toryism has already gained
much by the kind aid of the Irish judges acting
upon the election law; what might not be ex-
pected from them if the whole law of registration
were enveloped in a cloud of incongruities, and
they were left to pick what they pleased out of
them? Lord Stanley is a clever and acute tacti-
cian, and who so able to undermine the Re-
form Bill as he who laid its foundation?

It would be easy to show, from the language
of this Bill, and from collating its clauses, that
all we have said of its clumsiness, verbosity, and
ambiguity, is entirely true. Such an at-
tempt, however, would carry us far beyond the
limits of a newspaper article, and we shall be
satisfied if our notice of the fact should call the
attention of members to the details of this most
dangerous measure.

The hypocrisy of Lord Stanley was more of-
fensive even than his object. He tells us that
this is a remedial and not a party measure. Not
a party measure! what then is it? Is a mea-
sure to disfranchise one-half of the electors of
Ireland an indifferent measure, upon which
Whigs and Tories are agreed? Not a party
measure! Why, then, were the Tory benches
so thronged?—why was the House so numerous?
—why then, were the cheers so deafening when
the result of the division was announced?—why
then, was the great economical leader of the to-
ries, the illustrious Sibthorpe, so loud in his tri-
umphant buffoonery, and so earnest in his hope
that after this division Lord John Russell would
"lumber the country no longer"? Not a party
measure! Why, then, was Lord Stanley
obliged to tell us that this question detained him
from the bed of a parent, helpless from recent
paralysis? And why was his brother-in-law,
Mr. Bootle Wilbraham, hurried from the death-
bed of his mother? Surely a family under
such complicated afflictions might have been
forgotten if they had forgotten, for a space, the
evils of Irish registration! We should be sorry
to suppose of Lord Stanley that the immaterial
question of a month's, more or less, existence of
a grievance which has already endured eight
years, if a grievance it be, could draw him
from duties so sacred as these. We do not sup-
pose any thing of the sort. It was the demand
of faction; the summons of his party; the stern
discipline which, in factions as in warlike con-
test, admits of no excuse; it was these which
called him to London and kept him here when
he should have been elsewhere. We are not
inclined to speak harshly of him for this, but
we do strongly condemn the bold contempt of truth
with which he exclaimed, while the Tory
whipper in was languid from his labour, "This
is no party question."

The majority upon this Bill is unpardonable,
and it should at once seal the fate of the present
Parliament. We have no hesitation in saying
that from a House of Commons which would
suffer such a bill as this to be read a second time
in their House, the country has nothing what-
ever to expect of a beneficial kind, but has every
thing to dread. In the custody of such a
House the liberties of neither Britons nor Irish-
men are safe.

Mr. Hume's motion, having for its object to
suspend the payment of the King of Hanover's
pension was negatived by the House of Com-
mons on Friday night, by a majority of thirteen
the numbers being 75 to 62.

This decision and the debate which preceded
it, exhibit in glowing colours the character of
the new Tory mania for economy. If we were
to search throughout the whole list of the items
of public expenditure for the most unpopular
article of the whole, we should put our finger
without hesitation upon the quarterly payment
of £5,250 to the King of Hanover. If we were
asked, which, of all these pensions, had been
the least deserved, we should keep our finger
still upon the same spot; if it were demanded
to point out the item which was the least war-
ranted by public principle or public policy,
which pension was most dishonest towards the
nation that pays, and most dishonorable to the
person who receives, we should still have no
further to seek—the pension of the King of
Hanover would still be our answer, and the re-
sponse would be echoed by every man of every
party among the middle classes of our country-
men.

The fact of an independent sovereign receiv-
ing a pension from a foreign country, cannot ad-
mit of even a colourable defence. The only
precedent which we remember is that of Charles
II. who is well known to have received a large
annual stipend from Louis XIV. Charles how-
ever, received this pension as the price of ser-
vices to Louis, and of treason to his people.
It has stamped his memory with an im-
mortality of infamy. We know no case in
which a pension was ever before granted to a
reigning monarch without some return being
expected by the people who paid it, and we do
not conceive that the destruction of the consti-
tution of Hanover, and the establishment of a
despotism, is precisely what the British people
would be inclined to purchase by a large annual
payment. In the employment of their foreign
pension we admit that the cases of Charles II.
and Ernest of Hanover are identical—they both
employed the foreign gold to enslave their
own subjects. How a constitutional Sovereign,
a liberal government, and a people jealous of
freedom can reconcile to themselves the acting
part of the plotting despot of Old France, and
paying their money for a similar purpose, is
a matter which it is for them to consider.

It is too clear to admit of controversy that
this pension was granted to a prince of the blood
who had nothing of his own, in order that he
might maintain that station among us to which
his birth entitled him. It was never granted in
order that the same person, when he became a
foreign prince, might use it to wage war against
us, or might enjoy it to oppress his people. But
it would be useless to argue so clear a point—
the subject no more admits of adverse argu-
ment than does a correct mathematical demon-
stration.

Here, then, was a profligate expenditure of
public money, which not only the dictates of
economy, but the higher dictates of honour, hu-
manity and freedom required should be at once
put an end to. Yet the same men who are
so stern and severe economists, whenever provi-
sion for the Consort of their Queen is mentioned,
and who are loud in denunciation of any in-
crease in the public allowance to an English
royal duke, rise as one man to defend and to
vote for the subsidizing a foreign King.

We put the merits and demerits of the King
of Hanover as Duke of Cumberland, entirely

out of the question. We need no aid from such
topics in order to hold out these hypocritical To-
ry economists to the contempt of all honest men.

The conduct of the King of Hanover in this
matter serves to illustrate an old truth, that ty-
rants are always among the meanest as well as
the most haughty of mankind.

From the *New York Morning Chronicle.*

GREAT BRITAIN—AMERICA—RUSSIA
CHINA—ETC.

At a time when rumour with her hundred
tongues cries war from one end of the world
to the other, we are naturally anxious to
learn what may be the upshot of this general
clamour—who are to suffer—who are to be
benefitted, and so forth. Providence in mercy
to mankind, has drawn a veil over the fu-
ture. Were it not so we should be the most
miserable of beings. The cry of war is now
loud on our North Eastern frontier, and the
brave, fiery citizens of Maine, "in arms and
eager for the fray"—that is, eager to go to
loggerheads with their neighbours, the
British, about a portion of territory, the pos-
session of which, as regards Maine, is of
trifling advantage to her to what it is to Great
Britain.

The obstacles as regards the settlement of
this long disputed line of territory, are un-
questionably on the side of Maine—Great
Britain having for many years past expressed
her willingness and desire to accede to any-
thing like an equitable adjustment of her
claim—a claim which, under certain condi-
tions, the Federal Government of Maine, very
wisely we must say, does all in her
power to frustrate, on the principle of self-
interest. This is precisely the situation in
which we at present stand with Great Britain
on the everlasting, belligerent, sickening
theme, the North Eastern Boundary question
—the political incubus of the two countries.
This important question, however is not to
be settled otherwise than by the cool delib-
eration of the two powers nationally inter-
ested on the subject. Therefore, the good folks
of Maine and New Brunswick would do well
to shake hands together in brotherly amity,
and patiently await the result of the decision
of their respective governments; a decision
which we sincerely trust will be such as to
bind more strongly together the union of
commerce and friendly feeling existing be-
tween the two countries, and alike necessary
for the prosperity and happiness of both.

It is amusing to hear your would-be-politi-
cians talk about England and her resources.
That England is in a ruined state, at her last
gasp. As if for sooth the seeds of dissoluti-
on were sown in the formation of States as
they are in that of the human body. Were
it so, then are we in a rapid consumption,
and fast approaching dissolution. That Eng-
land cannot find money to go to war—that
Russia waits but an opportunity to pour her
myriads into England, and drive all her sub-
jects before her "like a flock of wild geese."
That such is the rebellious state of the work-
ing classes, Great Britain dare not impress
further taxes on her people. That in the e-
vent of a war with America, a rebellion
would most assuredly break out in England,
and that Russia would attack the English
territory in India. That a war with China
would so divide the forces of England and
cramp her resources, that she could not pro-
vide a sufficient force, &c. to carry on a war
in America. That Great Britain dare not go
to war with America; and a great deal more
to the same tune.

What Great Britain dare do has been pretty
well proved, we think, in India, Spain,
France, Belgium, &c. within the last fifty
years. What she can do and may do, time
will show. She is a restless power, and
must be doing something. The flag that
has braved the battle and the breeze for a
thousand years, may be tattered and torn,
but so long as a shred shall remain, her mil-
lions of brave sons will rally round it.

It is not our intention to enter *seriatim* into
all the above premises; we shall confine our-
selves at present, to Great Britain and her
resources, with which to wage war, should
she think proper so to do, with all the world.
Next to the honor of our own country, we
are the most jealous of that of Old England;
so intimately is the welfare of the one con-
nected with the other. Our limits compel us
to stop here. We shall resume this subject
in a future number.

DRESS THE MIND.

On a Sunday morning before going to
church what a dressing there is among all
classes, and what a stir to appear gay and
pleasing! It is quite sufficient for the great
purposes of our existence to wash the out-
side of the platter? Curly curls may be arranged,
fine tortoise shell combs fixed, sparkling
earrings hung, splendid garments displayed,
and yet perhaps the gay fair one's mind may
be poisoned with conceit, troubled with ri-
valry and kept on the torture by ignorance
and vanity. Windsor soap does not wash
the stains of the heart; Cologne water can-
not throw a fragrance over an impure mind;
nor will all the rubies of Golconda dazzle
the recording angel into a forgetfulness of
filling up the leaves of the book of retribu-
tion.

Works for the Farmers.—One of the most
encouraging "signs of the times" to us—out
of politics—is the increased attention which
is paid, all around us, to the agricultural in-
terest—a great national as well as individual
policy, in regard to the importance and dig-
nity of which, our convictions are so lively
that our readers will still probably have to
"put up" occasionally, hereafter, as they
have done heretofore, with our allusions to
the subject, and our attempts to make it in
some degree available to their entertainment
and edification alike.

Meanwhile we shall probably be doing
some of them a service by pointing out the
merits of publications, with which they are
not already familiar. Mr. Skinner's "Ameri-
can Farmer" still continues among the best
of the weeklies, and should be looked up, at

least by those who want to know all the sci-
ence and practice of the Baltimore latitude.
Judge Buel's "Cultivator," at Albany, (at \$1
a year) is also continued by his son, and may
be deemed indispensable to a northern far-
mer—to which list we shall only add, for the
present, the "Visiter," published at Concord,
N. H. by Governor Hill.

DIFFICULTIES IN NOVA SCOTIA.

From the *Toronto Christian Guardian.*

From the intelligence under the head of No-
va Scotia, it will be seen that the Lieutenant
Governor and his Executive Council, supported
by the Legislative Council, are in direct colli-
sion with the House of Assembly in that Pro-
vince. Our readers have, from time to time,
been informed of the affairs of Nova Scotia. The
loyalty of the Assembly of that Province is a
bove suspicion; amongst the leading reformers
there or in New Brunswick there are no Mac-
kenzie or Hinckes to deal in outrageous per-
sonal invective and abuse, or to urge the extremes
of suicidal violence; the majority of the mem-
bers of the Assemblies of both the Lower Pro-
vinces—especially the leaders—appear to be
men of great coolness and moderation, but of
great intelligence, inflexible firmness, and per-
severing energy.

Sir John Harvey acts harmoniously with the
Assembly of New Brunswick; and without any
reference to the theory, practically illustrates
the declaration of the Governor General, in his
Message to our House of Assembly on the ques-
tion of "Responsible Government"—"The Gov-
ernor General has received Her Majesty's
commands to administer the Government of these
Provinces in accordance with the well-under-
stood wishes and interests of the people, and to
pay to their feelings, as expressed through their
Representatives, the deference that is justly due
to them." The leading members of the House
of Assembly of New Brunswick have been ap-
pointed to public situations under the Crown,
and the difficulties which formerly agitated that
Province have been removed; the former party
distinctions and hostilities have been *annihilated*,
and peace and harmony prevail throughout
that Province, together with a state of unpre-
cedented prosperity.

Her Majesty's Government recommended the
adoption of the same policy in Nova Scotia.—
The House of Assembly had made representa-
tions to Her Majesty's Government on various
matters, and sent home a delegation. The Leg-
islative Council did the same. Among other
representations the House of Assembly com-
plained of the bigoted and exclusive character
of the Executive Council. Referring to the
Executive Council, the Secretary of State for
the Colonies, in a despatch to Sir C. Campbell,
Lieutenant Governor of Nova Scotia, dated Au-
gust 21st, 1839, says—"I feel strongly how
desirable it is that it should be composed in a
manner, to command the co-operation of the popu-
lar branch of the constitution, and although I do
not desire to fetter your discretion upon this sub-
ject, yet I shall be glad to learn that you shall
have thought it expedient to offer, as the occa-
sion for so doing may present itself, seats in it
to some of the leading members in the House
of Assembly."

A proper regard on the part of the Lieutenant
Governor of Nova Scotia to the timely and con-
ciliatory advice of Her Majesty's Colonial Sec-
retary of State, would have anticipated and pre-
vented the further discussion of any theoretical
questions in the Province of Nova Scotia; but
Sir C. Campbell appears to have determined to
be the head of a high church *dique*, instead of
the impartial Governor of the province. He
pushes the undefined prerogative of the Crown
to the verge of absolute despotism. The conse-
quence of such a course of proceeding is well
stated in Lord John Russell's despatch on "re-
sponsible government." His Lordship says—
"The Sovereign using the prerogative of the
Crown to the utmost extent, and the House of
Commons exerting its power of the purse, to
carry all its resolutions into immediate effect,
would produce confusion in the country in less
than a twelvemonth." It was thus that James
the Second exercised the prerogative of the
Crown, and the British nation took it away from
him, and placed a new family upon the Throne.
The House of Assembly of Nova Scotia in the
session of 1839, did adopt resolutions [before the
publication in the colonies of Lord Durham's re-
port] embodying its complaints and wishes; and
appointed its delegation to England, but it did
not—like the late House of Assembly of Upper
Canada—"exert its power of the purse." It
voted the supplies for the administration of the
civil government; and even placed at the dis-
posal of the Lieutenant Governor one hundred
thousand pounds to meet any exigency which
might arise out of the aggressions of the State of
Maine.

But the Lieutenant Governor has it seems, in
conjunction with his *dique*, preferred taking his
stand upon the prerogative of the Crown, to
"paying to the feelings of the people, as ex-
pressed through their representatives, the defer-
ence that is justly due to them"—a people
and representatives who had, a few months pre-
viously pledged their treasure and their lives
for the maintenance of British supremacy and
British honor. Lord John Russell says—"The
Queen's Government are earnestly intent on giv-
ing to the talent and character of leading per-
sons in the colonies, advantages similar to those
which talent and character employed in the pub-
lic service, obtain in the United Kingdom."—
But Sir C. Campbell, it appears, has no relish
for such doctrine; he has preferred doing what
Lord John Russell deprecates—"thwarting every
legitimate proposition of the Assembly."—
In support of what the Queen's Government
have admitted to be just, and politic, and wise
in administering the government of the colonies,
the House of Assembly of Nova Scotia have in-
sisted upon Lord Durham's theory, in which
their opponents will, of course, hope to gain an
advantage;—but such an advantage can be but
temporary at least, and the gain of it will doubt-
less prove an ultimate loss.

Sir C. Campbell has not only not offered seats
in the Executive Council to leading persons in
the Assembly; but he has actually called Mr.
A. Stewart to the Executive Council—a man
who was formerly even an extreme reformer in
the Assembly, but who changed his politics on
being appointed to the Legislative Council—one
of the most odious men in all Nova Scotia to the
House of Assembly—a man who is now actually
in England, and therefore cannot be elected
to assist the Governor, but to annoy and insult
one of the most confederately intelligent, patriot-
ic and loyal Houses of Assembly in British North
America.