

REVIEW OF MR. REESOR'S PLATFORM.

DAVID REESOR

The Markham Organ Grinder Plays

JUMP JIM CROW!!

WITH VARIATIONS.

"I wheel about and turn about,
And do just so,
And every time I wheel about
I jump Jim Crow."

Having got up a requisition for himself (!) and adroitly pulled the wires so as to secure the Grit nomination as a candidate for King's Division, it is but justice to the independent electors that they should know the views advocated by him for the past two years, through the editorial columns of his organ, the *Markham Economist*. The following varieties are his own written sentiments, from time to time, as well as of his "faithful correspondent," whose opinions he has at all times endorsed. After carefully reading them, let the electors judge if such a man is to be exalted to the position of Legislative Councillor for King's Division: if he is, then is humbug at a premium, for on reading his paper down to January the 3rd, 1860, it will be seen that he advocates DISSOLUTION, PURE and SIMPLE, whilst in his address he goes in for some Joint Authority. In his paper he urges the total abolition of Separate Schools, and in his address he merely advocates their restriction. In his paper he advocates Representation by Population as the cure for all our evils, in his address he says nothing about it. In his paper he also advocates a Written Constitution, Elective Governors, ANNEXATION and REBELLION, which is not done in his address. Electors read the following! Compare and judge for yourselves!

TO THE ELECTORS OF KING'S DIVISION.—Gentlemen—In a few weeks you will be called upon to elect a Member to represent your Division in the Legislative Council for a period of eight years. Having received the nomination of the Reform Convention, held at Toronto, on the 25th June last, I appear before you as a candidate. The fact of my name being presented to you by so respectable a body, representing, as I must presume it did, the Reform Electors of every Municipality of the Division, is of itself a guarantee of the soundness of my political principles. It may be well, however, that I should state for general information, in the form of a printed address, the views I entertain in regard to the great questions of the day, as well as the principles I intend to advocate, should the majority of the Electors ratify the polls the choice of the Convention.

In the first place, I must acknowledge that I have no confidence in the present Coalition Administration, and not only disapprove of its general policy, but of opinion that a change in the Constitutional relations of Upper and Lower Canada is absolutely necessary to protect the rights and interests of the people of this section of the Province, and restore to them the blessings of good Government. The extent and the particulars of that change can only be properly and finally determined after full discussion, by some properly constituted body, charged with that special duty. But I believe the principle upon which the change ought to be based is, to allow the people of each section of the Province to manage their own local affairs in their own way, leaving matters of joint or common interest only to joint or common control.

In the meantime—until these changes can be accomplished—I desire to see the principles that I have just mentioned, and so far as possible practically applied both in the Legislature and Executive Administration of the country. Notwithstanding the discouragements with which Reformers have been met at every turn in their advocacy of sound, practical measures, for the benefit of the country, they have certainly some evidence of approaching success, when political aspirants, who are known to be strong supporters of the present Ministry, and in the confidence of these, who are usually opposed to such Reformers, are, by the force of public opinion, obliged to advocate them.

It is true a very liberal platform may be adopted without the candidate, who stands upon it, having the least desire of its being carried out; yet its promulgation is evidence of the direction and force of public opinion. But it is idle to expect many great Reforms, while the Government is in the hands of a large majority of the representatives of Lower Canada, and a Ministerial minority from Upper Canada.

It is not possible to specify in this address every reform which the country may require, or which, during the next eight years, is likely to engage the attention of the Legislature; but in addition to such measures as have uniformly received the support of the Liberal Party, and which every Government candidate has to acknowledge to be good, I shall have much pleasure in advocating the following:—

The reduction of the number of public officers now swarming in every department of the Government—a reduction in the enormous sum now annually expended in the equipment of the ports of entry, and the system of management, as well as the cost of collecting the customs revenue to something near the rate which was paid when the Coalition Government acceded to office. Then the revenue collected was \$3,226,754, and the cost only \$175,163, or about 4 per cent. The public accounts, submitted in 1859, show that the amount collected for the previous year was only \$3,500,517, while the cost of collection amounted to \$358,153, or about 10 per cent.

The re-imposition of tolls upon the canals and public works, which, contrary to the policy of all previous Governments, and in the face of a large and continuous deficit of the revenue, was, for some unexplained—certainly insufficient—reason, abolished during the last session of Parliament. To throw open for the benefit of a foreign commerce, even more than our own, canals which have cost the people of this country millions of dollars, and to maintain these canals at a heavy annual charge, after having voluntarily given up the revenues they yielded, is a policy as unutilitarian in theory as it is unprecedented in the history of this or any other country.

The restriction rather than the extension of the Separate Schools supported by the public money—a system dangerous alike to our religious and educational interests.

The assertion of our right to, and the establishing of our authority over, that immense tract of inhabitable territory, now unjustly claimed by the Hudson's Bay Company.

The immediate abolition of such admitted abuses as the Queen's Printer's monopoly, which annually swallows up many thousands of dollars of the people's money.

The more equitable apportionment of the public expenditures between the two sections of the Province.

democratic than ours, yet their governments are not free from improper influences, while the more democratic institutions of the neighboring Republic fail to secure purity in their public servants. Under all constitutional governments we must patiently suffer the punishment inflicted by dishonest rulers, until we are prepared, in a constitutional way, to replace them by better men."

Dissolution, Pure and Simple.

The *Economist* of July 29, 1858, says: "Among all the uncertainties of the ever-changing scenes of the political farce, now being played in Parliament, one thing can be depended on, the Hon. Member for Baldimand's annual motion for a 'Dissolution of the Union.' The debate on this periodic motion has brought home to the Lower Canadians a more rational sense of their true position, than anything that has occurred during the session. They were shown, and now feel, what the result will be, of dictating to Upper Canada a policy insulting and oppressive, and which, if persisted in, must lead to a dissolution of the union.

In anticipation of such a possible contingency, it may not be improper to consider the effect it would be likely to have on the material interests of the respective sections of the Province. Would a dissolution necessarily prove inimical to the interests of Upper Canada? We answer—it would not, but the reverse."

Who Has Sold Us?

The *Economist* of August 12, 1858, produces the following: "He has sold Upper Canada.' 'He has sacrificed his professions of the last four years.' 'He has belied every principle which he has advocated since he first entered Parliament.' Representation by Population and Separate Schools, are henceforth to be ignored by the Clear Grits.'—Such has been the cry of the whole corruptionists' press, in reference to Mr. Brown's connection with his late ministry. Apart of that press, two weeks ago, favored the Opposition; but their sincerity was tested when the wire-pullers of the McDonald Government raised the cry that Mr. Brown, in forming his Ministry, has sacrificed his principles. The cry was raised first by designing men, in order to ensure his defeat; it was duly echoed by the subservient portion of the press, before any reliable evidence was given as to its truth. Thus, he was belied, and thus condemned, by a corrupt house and its tools, upon a false issue, and before he could be heard in his own defence. But all this was to serve a purpose—to bring back the McDonald Ministry. Such tactics exhibit a feature in political warfare but little to the credit of those who participate in them.

"Now, 'who has sold us,' Mr. Brown and his colleagues, or the corruptionists? Read his address of Friday night, in the Royal Exchange. Is there any evidence there of the sacrifice of principle? Does it there appear that he has ignored the great questions of Separate Schools and Representation by Population?" The following are extracts from Mr. Brown's remarks in which he advocates Representation by Population and Destroying Separate Schools:—

"Mr. Dorion's first question to me was 'what are to be the principles of the Administration?' I said to him—'Mr. Dorion, you can understand that I can form no Administration in which the question of Representation by Population is not directly met. It is sufficient that I say to you that we found the strongest reason to believe that we could mature a measure acknowledging Population as the basis of Representation, that would be acceptable to both sections of the Province,—and this measure we pledged ourselves to lay before Parliament at its next assembling and to stand or fall by it as a government. The next question that came up was that of Education. Mr. Dorion asked, 'what do you propose upon that?'

I said, 'I want of course that the Common School system of Upper Canada shall be made entirely uniform, and that all the children, of whatever denomination, shall come into the same school-room, sit at the same desks, grow up hand in hand, and forget those sectarian animosities that now form the greatest obstacle in the way of our progress as a people.'

"John Smith" in the *Economist* of October 21, 1858, says:—"Perhaps it may seem out of place in me to suggest means for a healthy political regeneration. I think myself one of that class of men, that never yet believed in either Responsible Government or a Legislative Union with Lower Canada. Whew, be easy. I hope you will sleep as calm as ever after this frank avowal."

No Federation.

The *Economist* of September 15, 1859, says:—"With a separation and an elective Governor for Upper Canada, the annual expense need not be one-third of what it is at present; while our revenues would be more than two-thirds of that raised by the provinces united. Nor are we yet satisfied that there would be any advantage in a federal union of all the British North American provinces, or even of Upper and Lower Canada.—Had we a federal union, our customs' revenue

would, of course, pass into the hands of the federal government, and our local or state government would have to be sustained by direct taxation.—What benefit would result from a federal union that could not be secured by the joint action of the local legislatures? While our connection lasts with the mother country we have no foreign ministers to maintain at the courts of other nations, and no fleet to enforce treaty stipulations with other countries, were we in a position to make them.

The "Globe" and the "Economist."

From the *York Herald*, of July 29, 1859.
"Our Clear Grit contemporary, the *Economist*, stated in his last issue, in conjunction with his faithful [and we hope he will add truthful!] correspondent:—'Our readers are all familiar with the many arguments so frequently and so forcibly urged by our Toronto Correspondent in favor of a dissolution of the union between Upper and Lower Canada. During the last four months, however, many other liberal papers have taken up the same side of this question, the *Globe* taking the lead, so that at the present moment there are few journalists in the Reform ranks who do not admit of the propriety of the people of Upper Canada taking a decided stand in favor of so desirable an object.'

"In the very same issue of the *Globe*, in which the above appeared, we find the following: 'Dissolution, though preferable to a continuance of the existing state of things, may not be the most desirable remedy; we do not think it is; but certainly the least weighty objection is that which springs from the selfish apprehensions of a class which has, for the most part, been studiously hostile to Upper Canada.' 'Certainly the two do not tally.—The *Economist* is in favor of a Dissolution; the *Globe* merely states that 'it is preferable to the present state of things but does not think it the most desirable remedy.' Therefore, we advise such, if they feel inclined to go ahead themselves, not to push their master into the slough quicker than he is inclined to go. The *Globe* thinks there are other remedies preferable,—and so do we."

Revolution, Unless Repeal is Given.

"John Smith," in the *Economist*, says:—"Get your speeches ready, boys: no league with Belial—war with corruption to the knife, and the knife to the hilt. What is your member doing? When does his preparations commence.—Mr. Hartman I would excuse, because he is in delicate health; I will give him a few days if he needs it. Mr. Wright's health is good: pull him out, let him take the stump. We go in to win. I'll tell you a secret—we want repealers elected to the next Municipal Councils. What think you, boys? The assessment roll is the test of voters; have that safe, keep that safe: Don't be caught napping, Canada! Let her try her utmost."

The Work Initiated.

From the *Economist* of Sept. 29, 1859.
"The agitation for a Dissolution of the Union is producing its legitimate fruits. Two years ago only some two or three country journals opened their columns for its discussion, and as many members of Parliament inclined to favor the movement. Every session of the Legislature, however, brought to light additional reasons why the agitation so initiated should be continued, until the people in Upper Canada generally became strongly impressed with the necessity of a radical change in the constitution of the country. Nor is the movement destined to receive a check in its development. The liberal members of Parliament, in obedience to the public voice, have felt the necessity of moving in the matter—and in this step, we are happy to learn, there has been great unanimity. On Friday last there was a meeting at the Rosin House, at which the Upper Canada Opposition was well represented. So strong was the feeling in favor of a Dissolution of the Union taken hold of the public mind, that new strength has been added to the Parliamentary Opposition.

A Written Constitution Advocated.

From the *Economist* of November 24, 1859.
"But there are other improvements which we have not yet adopted, although of still more importance. We mean the application of such checks as will define the duties and limit the power of the Executive and of Parliament in the expenditure of public money without the consent of the people. Our system of Government is too extravagant and expensive for the age and wealth of the Province. To save this waste of money we require A WRITTEN CONSTITUTION, and the heads of departments independent of Parliament. 'But,' vociferate these Celestials, 'that would be Republicanism. Some of the States have Written Constitutions, and to adopt so much of the American system of Government would be disloyalty and treason.'"

Advocates the Double Majority Question.

From the *Economist* of December 8, 1859.
"Our present system requires the government to be sustained by a majority of the whole house, and does any one believe, as unprincipled as John A. McDonald may be, that he would have stood up in his place in Parliament and boldly defend Fellowes to keep him in his seat as he did do, were it not for his vote in order to make sure of that majority? If, on the other hand, the Attorney General for Upper Canada was elected by a direct vote of the people of this section of the Province, he would not be tempted to defend the worst of criminals—the man who unblushingly defrauds the electors of their rights. The changes in the constitution, now demanded by almost the whole people of Upper Canada, has in view the removal of this as well as many other sources of corruption so rife in our present system of Responsible Government. Then let the movement for this change be sustained.

Annexation or the Union Repealed.

THE CONVENTION OR ANNEXATION
From the *Economist* of October 20, 1859.
"The people of Upper Canada are loyal, and do not desire annexation to the United States. But some of the most loyal have declared that if they cannot be separated from Lower Canada they will go for annexation. It would be well, therefore, for those who oppose a dissolution of the union, to consider well the responsibility of such a position before. Scarcely one man in a hundred in Upper Canada is in favor of the union."

Our own Correspondent disagrees with the Convention.

STILL FOR DISSOLUTION, PURE AND SIMPLE.

From the *Economist* January 3rd, 1860.
"John Smith" says:—"The Convention was an event that I confess somewhat disappointed me; although I am fully alive to the propriety of the Reform cause being organized, I confess that after looking at it with spectacles for several weeks, I feel greatly disappointed. Early one hundred men assembled in this city—many of them men of considerable talent—but what did they accomplish? Just two objects—they shewed to the people they professed to represent, a disinclination to grapple with the principles of Reform, or, if they prefer the other horn of the dilemma, an incompetency to bring the elements that comprise the party into proper shape, and an alacrity in giving the cry for dissolution of the union its quietus, with what success time will show."

"A Financial Committee should have been appointed at the convention; the confused accounts of the Province placed in proper shape; the multifarious peculations and chiselings of the executive dragged to day light; the degrading, enervated, soul-debasing servitude inflicted by the accused legislative union made public. With a Canadian black-book, a text-book on our pitiful and miserable humiliation, to lay before the constituencies, we should soon have a movement, a cry for justice that all the misgovernment and doings of our rulers would be unable to resist. A demand for no more International and Colonial Banks; no more selling bank charters to a horde of swindlers and not-shavers; no more rag money without security to the bill-holders; no more immunities to swindlers, but penitentiary for all of that stamp. But the reason, I suppose, was that your financial Reformers in the Assembly, from the dull, prosy Mr. Brown to the eloquent, soul-stirring, animated and animated member for East York, voted for them bogus bank charters. Reform with a vengeance! Our convention did not toe that mark; they should have done it, but did not. But murder will out; shall it come or shall it be strangled? No, out it must come. Whisper, and for your own sake and for my sake, reports say the reason that debatable theme was not conjured up, was a fear that it would wake a storm of disapprobation at the repeal of the usury laws. Men that read—and Reformers are men of mind—were told that if the usury laws were abrogated money would be plentiful at five and six per cent. A mammoth scheme of Federation is to be squinted at, binding Upper Canada in a yoke intolerable to be borne. Lower Canada, at present, is to us an intolerable nuisance, and an addition to our bonds is to be the panacea for all our woes. All humbug; nothing but repeal, pure and simple, can save us. Has Canada the men to strike off her fetters at once? No, indeed; we have them not. When we are once awakened, we may hope for success; the constituencies are asleep. Rotten responsible government that has not one feature of responsible government in it, unless it mean responsibility in another world—a government steeped in corruption to the core, is a more fitting name for it."

I have the honor to be,
Gentlemen,
Your very obedient servant,
DAVID REESOR.

No Constitutional Change Needed.

The *Economist* of June 24, 1853, says: "Talk of constitutional changes to cure the evils that arise, simply from the bad administration of a good system of government, and what do you accomplish? Nothing. In England their constitution is less de-