Kingston Herald.

A CANADIAN JOURNAL, POLITICAL, AGRICULTURAL & COMMERCIAL.

VOL. XXV. KINGSTON, CANADA, TUESDAY, AUGUST 20, 1844. No. 19.

Variety.

A Scotch Schoolmaster.—The village schoolmaster belongs to a race of men whom the curious traveller must not neglect in any country. They stand on the outermost bounds of the educated classes, and are of that portion of society who think, compare, and reason, and are in the most intimate connexion with the main population of the land. They have their knowledge at first hand from foresters, gamekeepers, shepherds, farmers, &c., and, from nature, of land, animals, plants, and climate. We consequently find among village schoolmasters a glorious treasure of knowledge of human nature, especially a detailed and minute acquaintance with their own locality, and the habits of their fellow villagers and neighbours, such as one does not meet with often among the clergy, moving as they do in a much higher and farther removed sphere.—The ethnographer and statistician can, therefore, if they set themselves rightly to work, collect immense stores of matter from the little treasury of the schoolmaster. My teaching friend was in himself instructive; for I found him, as afterwards not a few of his colleagues, to be a very clever and well-informed man. His rooms were arranged in a cleanly, nay, even an elegant style, and when I compared it mentally with the dwellings of our village pedagogues in Germany, I found the latter far more lowly. I expressed to my friend my joyful astonishment on this head, and he told me that he was personally contented; but that, in general, great discontent prevailed among Scotch village schoolmasters,—especially on account of the small remuneration they received. I remarked to him that the same complaint prevailed among our German pedagogues, whose salaries were also very insignificant. "How much are they?" he asked.—"They vary," I replied, "some amounting to perhaps one hundred, or even one hundred and fifty dollars, others only fifty dollars, or even less than this.' "How many dollars are there in a pound!" he inquired. "Seven dollars make a pound." "And fifty dollars are about—" "Seven pounds?"—"What!" he exclaimed in horror, and jumped up from his seat, "seven pounds the salary of a schoolmaster!" "Yes, seven pounds," said I; "how much do you get then?" "I know none in Scotland who has less than from forty to fifty pounds. But the average income is from seventy to eighty pounds, and many amount to as much as one hundred and fifty." "What!" said I, startled as much as he had been, and, jumping up from my chair, so that we stood like two people in despair opposite each other, "one hundred and fifty pounds! that makes one thousand and fifty dollars! With such a revenue a baron in Germany would be content; and yet you grumble." "Yes he said, "it is true we complain. But then think how dear every thing is here. The best Jamaica coffee costs, roasted, 2s., and sugar 8d. a pound;—chocolate is still dearer, tea is not cheap, and then how dear good beef and pork are!" "Yes, indeed," said I, seating myself again; "that is true." But, I thought within myself, our schoolmasters are content if they have but bread in the house. The Scotch ministers complain, too, of the smallness of their salary; for the reformers, when they destroyed the abbeys and monasteries, let slip all the property and revenues connected with them, which fell into the hands of impropriators; and, afterwards, notwithstanding all their endeavours, they failed to receive any considerable amount of it. But there can be no doubt that none of our village clergymen would think that he had cause for murmuring if he had the income of even the worst paid of the Scotch ministers; the least affluent of them, that I could hear of, had one hundred and fifty pounds a-year, besides manse and glebe.—Feild's Travel's in Scotland.

Ambiguous Preaching.—On coming out from public worship, I asked Mr. P., a distinguished pious lawyer, how he liked the sermon of Dr. B. "I think, sir," said he, "that it lies under the third head." "How so?" said I. "A certain French preacher," he replied, "after a pompous introduction, said, 'I shall proceed, my hearers, to divide my subject into three parts.' "

"I shall tell you about that which I know you do not know.

"I shall tell you about that which you do know and which I do not know.

"And lastly, I shall tell you about that which neither you nor I know.

"Alas! how much preaching comes under the third head.

Won't Work Both Ways.—Stranger—Have you got any newspapers?

Editor—Certainly.

Stranger—You will give me one, I suppose,

Editor—Oh, yes sir, (handing him a paper.)—These are fine chickens in your basket; have you any more of them?

Stranger—Right smart chance of them at home.

Editor—That's a fine one; you will give me one, I suppose, sir; will you not?

Stranger—I brought these to market to sell; I would like to sell you a dozen at 75 cents. The above absolutely occurred in the State Sentinel office lately, and we doubt not it is a joke not soon to be forgotten.

Commodious Inn.— An inn, in Gravesend, in front a large board, upon which is painted the following announcement: —"Good accommodation for steam packets."

Steam.—"Talk of your northern steamers," said a Mississippi fireman the other day, "you haint had a boiler burst for five years.—You don't require no spunk to navigate them waters, any fool can do it. But it takes a man, stranger, to ride one of these ere aligator boats head on a sawyer, high pressure, the valve soddered down, and six hundred passengers on board."

Soft Question.—"How are you off for gin?" asked a wag of a man lately, whom he saw fall into a hogshead of the soft material.—"Very near out," replied the soapee, as he got his chin to the surface.

"Wife! why in the name of goodness did you make the washerwoman put starch in my dickey collar?"

"Why, my dear, I thought it an useless waste of the article, for I can get your *choler* up so easily without it."

The Astonished Dutchman.—An honest Dutchman came on a visit to a New York lodge, and was quietly smoking his pipe in view of the Mohawk valley, without knowing that a road ran through it. The night was dark, and the appearance of rain, which absorbed the Dutchman's conjectures, when suddenly a train of cars rumbled by, leaving a long train of sparks in the rear. Suddenly dropping his pipe, the astonished citizen exclaimed—"Vell, if New York State ish not der tyfel for improvements! Dey hang lanterns to dere thunder clouds dat people may see them and get out of the way.

A case of absence of mind in New Hampshire has created a great deal of talk on Change. This was a young lady, who intended to broil a beef steak, but instead of doing so, hauled her lover over the coals for paying too much attention to another girl.

The way at present adopted in New Orleans for a young girl to "crown the bliss" of an old man whom she marries for money, is to give him a new wig.

"Half Right."—When Lord Morpeth was in this country, a few years since, he chanced to be at a dinner table in company with Mr. Frelinghuysen. He filled his glass, and asked Mr. F. to allow him the pleasure of taking wine with him, who politely declined the honor, remarking that he had abandoned its use. "You are more than half right," replied Lord M. His lordship afterwards commenced pouring water into his glass with wine, drinking about half and half. "I see my lord," said Mr. F., "that you are *just* half right."

Price of Kisses.—As to the marketable value of a kiss, it fluctuates considerably. Sheridan, we are informed, gave a guinea for one;—some people only get a box on the ear. We ourselves (says Punch) were once kissed in a dream, and that cost us a pair of gloves. A nursery rhyme informs us that

There was an old man in a velvet coat—
He kissed a maid and gave her a groat;

from which evidence we gather that the highest price is £1 1s., and lowest 4d.

Responsible Government

DEFENDED AGAINST THE ATTACKS OF THE

REV. EGERTON RYERSON.

LETTER VII.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

Sir,—Mr. Ryerson's fourth number is a remarkable document,—remarkable because it places the whole defence of his Excellency, and the whole contest between him and the late Counsellors, upon one issue in principle; one which may be easily understood, and in which, if Mr. Ryerson fails, his celebrated defence withers like the gourd of Jonah. This state paper must, therefore, be considered with care, with attention, and patience.

Mr. Ryerson may, as he says, have engaged in this contest without solicitation; but I cannot believe that it was without the approval of the Governor General; or without explanations from his Excellency, or from sources which his Excellency was at liberty to place at his disposal; and, as Mr. Ryerson must be considered as his Excellency's adopted, though not solicited champion, we may consider his Excellency, in some degree, bound by Mr. Ryerson's admissions.

Now, with regard to the stipulation, what does Mr. Ryerson say? The following are his own words:—

"It should be remarked that Sir Charles does not call this demand a "stipulation," in the legal, or, if you please, parliamentary sense of that term; but in a moral sense, as an *understanding* between man and man,"—a sense by which he had defined the preceding argument. He says, "such stipulation," "such a surrender of the Royal Prerogative."

Here, at least, Sir, is a plain and distinct disavowal of the attempt to fasten upon the late Counsellors the imputation, that they demanded a stipulation—except in a moral sense, unless a stipulation by paraphrase.

What a pity it is, Sir, that his Excellency, in writing his despatches, did not explain that they were all to be interpreted in this manner; the late Counsellors would not then have been condemned in the Imperial Parliament for demanding a direct stipulation—a stipulation in writing, a stipulation under hand and seal: so then, after all, there was no stipulation asked for; it was only an understanding between man and man; and it was only required by the late Counsellors to be understood, that they should be really consulted; and his Excellency really did mean to say, that such an understanding would be a surrender of the Prerogative of the Crown; "because it could not be imagined that taking advice, without regarding it, was the process contemplated."

I showed in my last letter that, by subscribing to the resolutions of 1841, his Excellency voluntarily entered into a stipulation,—a stipulation in writing; not merely in a moral, but what Mr. Ryerson calls a Parliamentary sense. I showed that therefore his Excellency's objection was not to a stipulation or understanding in any sense, but to the substantial proposition claimed to be understood; namely, *that patronage and appointments to office* fell within the term "local affairs," which were to be managed with the assistance, counsel, and information of the officers forming the Provincial Administration.

The Doctor, however, in his fourth letter, shifts the ground of defence of the Governor General altogether; for he does not make any distinction between appointments and patronage, and other local affairs; but he asserts, that the "assistance, counsel, and information" are substantially obtained by requiring, or ordering the Provincial Secretary to put the seal of the Province to commissions appointing individuals to office.

Mr. Ryerson's statement of his proposition is given in these words—"While there is a responsible Minister who keeps the seals of state—while every commission must be stamped with that seal, and consequently endorsed by that minister—there is Responsible Government, whatever may be the opinions of the Sovereign as to its excellence or folly."

"I have, heretofore," says Mr. Ryerson, "proved that it was impossible for the Governor General to make appointments in violation of the principle of Responsible Government, as long as he had a responsible Provincial Secretary, and as long as that Secretary was the keeper of the public seal of the Province."

"I have also," says Mr. Ryerson, "adduced his Excellency's denial, that he ever deviated from that principle, and now, (considering each part of his statement separately,) in reference to that particular of his statement, in which he says, that the late Counsellors "demanded of the Governor General, that he should make no appointment, and no offer of an appointment, without previously taking the advice of the Council." "The Governor General replied that he would make no such stipulation." They allege to the House of Assembly, that the Governor General has denied them the right of consultation, and the House, on that statement, (denied, be it remembered, by his Excellency,) adopts a resolution of confidence in them, on the question of their right to be consulted on appointments to office. This is their whole case. Let the fallaciousness be now exposed—the statement of his Excellency established, and his conduct justified."

I have quoted thus, at length, from Mr. Ryerson's defence, to avoid all uncertainty or mistake as to his principles.

And, in the first place, I most fully and freely admit, that the passing an instrument under the Great Seal makes the Provincial Secretary, and every Executive Counsellor, who continues in office afterwards, responsible for the appointment, if the object of sealing the instrument be an appointment to office.

I admit, also, that while the public know this, they have a right to hold the Ministers responsible, whether the Ministers are consulted or not, the Ministers being bound by their acquiescence just as fully as by actual recommendation.

In one sense it is the same thing, therefore, to the public, to whom the responsibility is incurred, whether the Counsellors are in reality consulted or not—whether they know the grounds of the appointments or not—whether they know the different names of the different candidates or not—whether they know more eligible candidates or not: for the responsibility incurred is all the same.

But is it all the same to the Ministers who incur the responsibility, whether they know these things, or whether they are kept in ignorance of them?

Mr. Ryerson calls the affixing the seal an *endorsation* by the Minister; this is a very good illustration, for it expresses, in one word, approval and the incurrence of personal liability.

Now, suppose one merchant undertook to endorse notes for another, for their mutual advantage, *on being advised with*, upon the occasion for drawing the notes, or upon the prudence of the business or speculation in the course of which they are drawn.

Suppose, that after this consultation and advice being had in several instances, and after several endorsations, at length two or three notes are inclosed, without any explanation, except the words "for endorsation."

Well, Sir, the endorsing merchant as Mr. Ryerson explains in his third letter, speaking of the Provincial Secretary, has four courses before him.

First, he may endorse the notes.

Secondly, he may refuse to endorse them.

Or, thirdly, he may ask explanation.

Or, fourthly, he may very justly remonstrate against notes being sent to him for endorsement, without his being consulted. Or he may say, I shall not quarrel about these notes, and therefore I endorse them, your honor and credit being already pledged; but I demand that you will agree to draw no more notes without taking my advice. If is true he may say, so long as our connexion lasts I am bound to endorse your paper, and, provided you give me an opportunity of advising with you, I cannot refuse the endorsation; but if you draw notes without consulting me, or without letting me know why you draw them, or if you promise to draw them so that our mutual character is pledged, before I know any thing of it, it will be contrary to our agreement, and I must put an end to our connexion in business.

If the merchant endorses the notes, of course he becomes responsible, and the Bank where the notes are discounted holds the endorser liable, whether he was consulted or not—there is responsibility: and if a commission be sealed by a responsible Minister—there is Responsible Government.

But is it nothing to the person who is made responsible, whether the business of the person for whom he becomes responsible, is known to, or hidden from him; or whether he is consulted or not upon the propriety of drawing the notes?

Suppose he refuses to endorse the notes.

Then, Sir, he injures the credit of the party with whom he is in connexion, perhaps the credit of both; and perhaps the notes, after all, may be proper notes, and the speculation a very good one.

Then, suppose he asks explanation:

Well, Sir, such was not the agreement; and the explanation thus asked for may be too late, purchases may have been made, mercantile honor pledged, and a refusal to endorse would be the destruction of public confidence; the question would not then merely be upon the goodness of the speculation, or the legitimacy of the business, but it would resolve itself into this,—shall I bring ruin upon our mutual credit, shall I show the Bank, which we look to for discounts, that no confidence exists between us, by a refusal to endorse notes already drawn?

Suppose he remonstrates, does he do any thing but what he has a right to do; and if he supposes or hopes that the omission to consult was unintentional, or arising from a misunderstanding of the agreement, does he do any thing in remonstrating but what he ought to do?

Plain and applicable as this analogy is, I can make it still stronger, without violence to the circumstances to which I compare it.

We all know that Banks discount on the credit of the probable results of business, as well as upon the credit of possessed capital of drawers and endorsers, and a Bank may discount to enable a party to carry on business, on the assurance that the person who carries it on consults with his endorser, when they would not discount were they to know it was carried on without consultation.

The people of Canada are in the situation of this Bank; they give support to the Government provided it be conducted with the "assistance, counsel, and information" of officers in whom they have confidence.

But the case may be made still stronger, for the people have admitted that the Governor is not responsible to them at all; and, therefore, they are in the situation of the Bank, when the drawer of the notes is not responsible, and where the credit given is altogether on the ability and discretion of the endorser.

Now, this being the case, let us suppose the endorsing merchant to remonstrate as follows:

"By sending me these notes already drawn, without any consultation, you not only unfairly ask me to become liable for transactions of which I know nothing, but you ask me to deceive the Bank by my endorsation, which, if I make it, they will receive as evidence of my having been a consulted and approving party.

It is not easy to frame a proper answer to this remonstrance; but his Excellency has given the answer he would make under the circumstances, which answer may be thus stated, in an explanation to the Board of Directors:—

"Mr. A. B. came to my counting-house on Friday last, and demanded that I should agree to draw no notes for his endorsation without previously consulting him; and I answered, that I would make no such stipulation; that it would be a surrender of my prerogative, or privilege of drawing notes, when and how I pleased—a degradation which no merchant ought to submit to, for it cannot be imagined that taking advice without regarding it was the process contemplated."

I think, Sir, it would be in vain for the irresponsible merchant to try to persuade the Bank, after this, that he was really and truly favorable to the arrangement originally entered into; and it would be equally in vain for him to appeal to the number of notes he had drawn upon the counsel and advice of his endorser, or to the number he had forborne to draw, from the great consideration he had yielded to his endorser's opinion.

The only excuse he could give, would be the hurry of business; and that the transactions were such as led him to believe there would be no difference of opinion.

And so, Sir, the only available excuse which a Governor could give for acting without the advice of his Council would be, the hurry of business; or his belief that the appointments he made would meet the approbation of his sworn advisers.

But, on the contrary, even by his own account, he gave no such excuse; but he declared that to agree, or, to use Mr. Ryerson's words, to come to an understanding, in a moral sense, that he would in future consult his Council, would be a surrender of prerogative—a degradation of his office: he did not allege that he had acted without advice, because he thought concurrence with his acts probable; but, on the contrary, he avowed an antagonism in the principle upon which appointments should be made, which rendered disagreement not only probable, but certain and inevitable.

In the present case, it is not one, but many are made responsible; and as Mr. Ryerson speaks of one responsible Minister, I say, without fear of contradiction, that any one member of Council who, without the knowledge of his colleagues, would give advice on a matter upon which difference of opinion was apprehended, would be acting unfairly and treacherously towards them.

And thus, Sir, though for the despatch of business, in matters where there is no antagonism, either real or apprehended, Governors may make appointments, and individual members of Council may give advice without consultation in Council, yet, when antagonism is avowed, and difference of opinion known to exist, then circumstances demand consultation, and agreement or disagreement before the act proposed be consummated.

But as Mr. Ryerson's argument in the supposed case of the notes would be, that the endorsing merchant had no reason to complain, because, whether consulted or not, he would still be liable, so the Executive Counsellors, who see acts for which they are accountable done without their advice, have no reason to complain; for, whether consulted or not, they are still responsible.

This, Sir, is such absolute nonsense, that it seems almost an insult to the people of Canada to suppose that any of them could read Mr. Ryerson's letter without seeing the absurdity of the conclusion to which he would lead them. I am far from imagining that his Excellency would promulgate Mr. Ryerson's doctrine as his own. But his Excellency is not answerable for Mr. Ryerson's absurdities; and what matters it to him by what arguments the "humble classes" may be led to give him their support, or by what means the chaos of contradictory opinions, upon which his Excellency rests, may for the moment be reconciled. His Excellency has spread his marriage-table, and he is driven to seek for guests in the highways and hedges, amongst the maimed, the halt, and the blind. To the Tories is offered a crutch, which he calls prerogative; to the Liberals Doctor Ryerson's spectacles, through which to see his Excellency's Responsible Government. But, alas! not one of the guests has got the wedding garment of public confidence, and they devour their meal with wailing and gnashing of teeth.

I had almost forgotten to allude to Mr. Ryerson's adducing "his Excellency's denial that he ever deviated from that principle," meaning the principle of Responsible Government. But, Sir, read Mr. Ryerson's argument, and what is the denial worth? Mr. Ryerson's principle of Responsible Government is fulfilled, by the fact that there is a Secretary, who keeps the Provincial Seal; and, therefore, his Excellency's denial of having violated the principle is neither more or less than a denial that he clandestinely or forcibly affixed the Provincial Seal himself. This is the only way, according to the Doctor, in which his Excellency could have violated the principle of Responsible Government; and no one, I am sure, thinks his Excellency has any occasion to resort to such a violation, while he has the good fortune to possess his present obedient, though truly and seriously very worthy Secretary.

In like manner, when his Excellency professes to subscribe to the resolutions of 1841, see what this means according to the Ryersonian reading. You will find, Sir, that it only means that his Excellency means to have a Provincial Secretary; and when you ask whether the country has been governed for eight months past according to the principles of Responsible Government? Yes, exclaims the Doctor, and he points to Mr. Secretary Daly. There, you unbeliever, there is Responsible Government; that comely gentleman riding past is Responsible Government,—the Governor General parted with Mr. Baldwin, but he did not part with Mr. Secretary Daly, and *he* is Responsible Government—*he* keeps the Seal.

This glorious and unanswerable defence of the Governor General, which offers Mr. Baldwin's one idea embodied in the form of Mr. Daly, for the worship of the followers of the undefined principles—this Ryersonian incarnation of Responsible Government, reminds me forcibly of the patent stove which cooks the largest dinner with only the fuel contained in a lucifer match. Well may the Doctor say that Responsible Government does not depend upon the Governor General's opinion, for its perfection depends upon Mr. Daly's strong box, which keeps the Seal out of the reach of the Governor. Wonderful, Doctor Faustus! Ungrateful Canadians!! Happy Governor General!!!

It is a great pity that this great discovery was not communicated at an earlier period to the Governor General. It would then not have been utterly opposed to his own notions of his own prerogative, and so staringly out of place in his defence. It is also to be regretted that it was not made known to the Imperial authorities, for then they would not have advanced opposite principles in the late debate, and the Doctor might have been called home, and made "Responsible Government" for the Empire, in his own person. Far be it from me, Sir, to deprive the Governor General of the Doctor's defence; I acknowledge it as a stroke of genius worthy of its author.

In fact, Sir, I would not take away any defence from His Excellency; for he needs them all, come from what quarter they may. As to facts, His Excellency may have them as stated by the late Counsellors, as paraphrased by himself, and as perverted by Mr. Ryerson. If they do not all, or any, satisfy the Canadian people, it is not my fault. And as to principles, His Excellency is welcome to the principles of the Woodstock *Monarch*, of the Toronto *Herald*, of the Montreal *Courier*, of Ogle R. Gowan, and of Egerton Ryerson. It is true, not one of them is in agreement with the other, and none of them with the Governor General himself; but what of that, I am willing that His Excellency may have the benefit of all the principles, however contradictory; and if they, and none of them, satisfy the Canadian people, how can I help it? It surely is no harm to point out a discrepancy now and then, and my present object is to ascertain whether or not the Doctor agrees with the Home authorities.

I take it, that Mr. Ryerson admits responsibility of Provincial Advisers for all the acts of the Government; and, notwithstanding his hocus-pocus conjuration about the Secretary and the Seal, and his assertion, that if a Seal be added to a Secretary, the sum is inviolable Responsible Government; notwithstand this startling puzzle, he still maintains, at least, a typical and figurative responsibility,—still poor Mr. Daly is responsible for all: "*Stat nominis umbra*," he stands the shadow of a name; and the shade of a name may be something, as well as the "shade of a virus." Still this portentous ghost of Responsible Government shakes its gory locks in the face of His Excellency's prerogative, and declares that all his acts are, and must be, advised: and as "taking advice, without regarding it, cannot be the process contemplated," poor prerogative is surrendered, and his Excellency is a "tool" of a hobgoblin, if not of a Council.

But let us see whether the authorities of the Empire admit this responsibility—this constitutional necessity for even supposed advice and responsibility, upon every possible occasion.

Lord Stanley, in the debate of 30th May last, admits this principle of Responsible Government to exist in England not merely as a shadow, but as a practical reality; but he draws a distinction with respect to a Colony, opposed not only to the Responsible Government of the Toronto League, but opposed still more directly to Mr. Ryerson's theory. His words are, "The constitution of Canada might be formed on the model of the constitution. Observe what was the nature of the British constitution, and what were the functions of the Sovereign.

"The basis of the British constitution was, that the Sovereign was personally *irresponsible* for every act of the Government,—that the responsibility rested with the confidential advisers of the Sovereign, who were responsible to the Parliament and the people for the advice they gave."

"But—(his Lordship said afterwards)—because the Crown was not responsible for the acts of Government, the Crown practically exercised no political power; and it was obvious that the exercise of political power without responsibility would not be more dangerous to the liberty of the country, than the exercise of *responsibility without power* would be an *absurdity* and a *contradiction*." "He said, therefore, that no Minister in this country would have or allow such a proposition to Sir Charles Metcalfe as had been made to Sir Charles Metcalfe; the theory was well understood, and the practice followed. The Sovereign, in deference to the opinion of the Advisers of the Crown, made the appointment on the recommendation of the Minister; and every Minister, in making a recommendation to the Crown, *so far as higher and more important* considerations would permit, paid, and was bound to pay, deference to the *personal* convenience,—wishes, and feeling of the Sovereign; and, on the other hand, although the Sovereign had the power to reject the appointment recommended by the Minister, it was usual to sacrifice all personal consideration to the public advantage."

This, Sir, is his Lordship's definition of Responsible Government in England. But, does he extend it to Canada? No, Sir; for he adds these words, too plain to be misunderstood, and too important to be overlooked, by any one;—

"*But* (adds Lord Stanley) the case of a Colony was *totally* different from that of this country."

His Lordship, after describing the state of a Colony in wanting an aristocracy, and possessing a Governor without personal influence, proceeds as follows:

"Place the Governor, and the Legislature so constituted, in the position of a Minister (being himself responsible, and compelled to act, in every respect, with Parliament) stripped of all real power and authority, liable to act under the control of the leading politicians and parties of the day, and what would they institute in Canana? That which, but for the influence of the Crown and the peerage, and (with) the necessity of the Prime Minister of this country possessing the confidence of the House of Commons, would be the result here of a republican Government, a Governor placed in absolute dependence on the House of Commons."

Then again, Lord Stanley says, "It was inconsistent with monarchical Government that the Governor, *who was responsible*, should be stripped of all authority and power, and be *reduced* to that degree of political power which was vested *in the constitutional Sovereign of the country*."

Let us now pause, to inquire whether these sentiments of Lord Stanley are inconsistent with Mr. Ryerson's notions of Responsible Government.

Mr. Ryerson declares the impossibility of the Governor's acting contrary to the principles of Responsible Government, the Secretary who keeps the Seal being responsible.

Lord Stanley admits the responsibility of the Prime Minister in England; but in a Colony, he says, the case is wholly different.

Lord Stanley declares responsibility without power to be a contradiction and an absurdity.

Lord Stanley says, that the Crown, practically, exercised no political power, because the Crown is not responsible.

Lord Stanley states, that the Governor, *who is responsible*, cannot be *reduced* to that degree of political power which is vested in the constitutional Sovereign of the country.

Now, if responsibility without power be a contradiction and an absurdity, and if the Governor must have the power, the Secretary having the responsibility, a Council through him having the responsibility must be a contradiction and an absurdity.

And if Mr. Ryerson's doctrine be contradictory and absurd, according to Lord Stanley's argument, I should like to know what reason Mr. Ryerson has to boast of *his* being supported by the authorities of the Empire.

Mr. Ryerson may say, with truth, that Lord Stanley does not agree with me, or with the Reform Association. But, Sir, I did not profess to hold the same opinions with Lord Stanley, neither did I prognosticate that his Lordship would agree with my opinions.

But I have a right to take Lord Stanley's justification of Sir Charles Metcalfe's doctrines, Mr. Ryerson's defence; and I cannot do his Excellency the injustice to believe that he has acted upon contradictory and absurd principles—so declared by Lord Stanley; and as Lord Stanley's opinions are directly contrary to Responsible Government, so far as regards appointments to office, I have a right to say that Sir Charles Metcalfe has mistaken his own opinions, when he declared them to be in favour of Responsible Government. When he said he was in favour of that principle, he could not, unless he meant to exclude appointments to office, have considered to what the principle led him, or into what contradictions he was betraying himself.

Mr. Cartwright, if he ever said what was attributed to him, that "Responsible Government was a humbug," has reason to boast of having the authorities of the Empire at his back; but not so Mr. Ryerson; for the latter, by arguing in favour of Responsible Government, and its extension to official appointments, shadowy and unreal as he would make it, even by his own definition, has placed himself in opposition to the strength of the Empire; and until he recant, he stands, by his own confession, a disaffected man.

Now, I do not pretend to agree with his Lordship; but I do not despair of seeing his Lordship convinced that he is wrong,—wrong in his estimate of the loyalty of the people of Canada—wrong in his notions of their want of trustworthiness and discretion—and wrong in his opinions that this country can be best governed by a constitution without the *life* of a constitution.—The breath of that life has been breathed upon Canada once, and she will retain it; and neither Lord Stanley, nor Sir Charles Metcalfe, nor Mr. Ryerson, shall persuade the Reformers of Canada that they are disaffected, because they desire a *living* British constitution for their country, or because they will not bow down before its lifeless image. We see no republicanism, or excuse for wishing for republicanism: our desire is, long and faithful allegiance to a British Sovereign, and enduring connexion with England.—But we cannot teach our children the British constitution, and tell them, that, as colonists, they are shut out from it forever, because a Secretary of State has pronounced that the *life* of the British constitution cannot be given to a Colony.

I am fully aware how very nearly Lord Stanley, in his definition of Responsible Government, approaches to all that the Colonists could desire; he admits that a Responsible Government was conceded even by Sir Charles Metcalfe; and he says, that the principle had been fully recognized both in England and in Canada; but that principle is not Mr. Ryerson's principle of responsibility, and advice of Counsellors, or of Secretaries, for appointments to office, whether merely supposed from the forms of the constitution, or real and substantial. On the contrary, Lord Stanley, while he expresses more than a doubt "whether Responsible Government was or was not likely to be conducive to the prosperity and welfare of Canada, whether it was most likely to enlist in the ranks of the Government the greatest number of men of talent, honor, integrity, and station,"—while he leaves it to be understood that, in his opinion, these qualities are not to be found amongst those in whom the people have confidence, still admits that Responsible Government was conceded, as he understands, to the following effect, "that the administration of Canada was to be carried on by Head of Departments enjoying the confidence of the people of Canada,—enjoying the confidence of the Legislature of Canada, for the due exercise of the functions of these departments; *and more*, that the Governor, in preparing and introducing legislative measures to the Colonial Parliament, was to be guided by the advice of those whom he had called to his Councils, that he was to introduce legislative measures upon their advice, and upon the advice of the local authorities throughout the *Kingdom* (I suppose the colony is meant,) taking the responsibility of their conduct through the Colonial Legislature." Here, Sir, is a definition,—a stipulation, which, if accepted and used with moderation, ought, so far as regards all the affairs to which it extends, satisfy the most patriotic colonist, and which may be interpreted into more of concession and independence than the Colonists ever asked or desired; for it appears (so far as the conduct of the departments, and the framing and introduction of measures) to make the Governor General the passive instrument which I, for one, do not desire to see him, and which I hope the Governor of this Colony never will become, and which he never need become, so long as he has the power of placing his Council and Parliament before the people of this country to answer for measures either bad in themselves, or bad because they are contrary to the British institutions, or contrary (to use a strong expression) even to the prejudices of the British nation.—But, Sir, while Lord Stanley thus appears to take away responsibility from the Governor-General, and while he says, that "without power there cannot be responsibility," he asks the significant question, "Well, for what was he (the Governor) to be responsible, if it were not on those two heads—for the proper distribution of rewards and honours in the power of the Crown to bestow, and for the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown with respect to certain acts of the Legislature?" Now, Sir, as Lord Stanley conceives that within these two heads of reservation from Responsible Government is contained the "life" of the British constitution, which cannot be conceded to a colony, what becomes of Mr. Ryerson's Responsible Government, which makes the *keeper of the Provincial Seal* so responsible for appointments, that it is "*impossible*" for the Governor General to violate the principle so long as "he has a Provincial Secretary."

I think, Sir, Lord Stanley has made it very plain, that the only question which can ever arise in this Colony on the subject of Responsible Government may be stated thus,—"are the advisers of the Crown in Canada to advise upon appointments, or are they not." No one in Canada has ever dreamed of denying the right of the Governor General, upon his own responsibility, of reserving bills for the expression of the Royal pleasure thereon; and for any such reservation, so long as the Provincial Administration have the confidence of Parliament; and so long, therefore, as no bill can pass both Houses in which they are not concurring, they cannot be held responsible, if they do not make themselves so, by their own declarations. Therefore, the only question at issue is simple, tangible, and defined: How much is it to be regretted that Sir Charles Metcalfe did not say so directly, instead of vaguely alleging that he subscribed to the resolutions of 1841; and instead of mystifying the Counsellors, and the public, with charges of treason and disaffection against the late Counsellors; and, above all, instead of permitting the poor Doctor to come out as a stage player, in the tragedy of "Leonidas," tilting with anomalies and stipulations, and poisoning himself with the "shade of a virus."

I propose, Sir, in my next letter, to lay before your readers my notion of what Responsible Government, according to the Resolutions of 1841, really means; to explain what legitimate party Government is,—to show that it is real justice to all parties; and that it is the interest of all parties to see it established. In doing so, I shall write no treason, or sedition, or say any thing which the most exclusively loyal man in Canada may not subscribe to; without any danger of falling foul of one of the Doctor's anomalies.

LEGION.

An unfortunate man, supposed to be a soldier, while in a state of intoxication fell from the steam boat City of Toronto at our wharf last night, and was drowned before assistance could be rendered, notwithstanding two sailors of the boat sprang promptly into the lake to save him, but he had sunk, poor fellow, like a stone. His body was afterwards recovered, and now lies at the North American Hotel. An inquest has since been held upon it—verdict, accidental death.—Cobourg Star.

More Incendiarism.—The fire which destroyed Mr. Stevenson's dwelling house, store and barn, had scarcely ceased to burn, e're the torch of the incendiary was applied to a distillery owned by him and Dr. Pruyn. The alarm of fire was given about 12 o'clock on Tuesday night last, and in spite of the prompt attendance

Public Record Office Reference C.O. 47/60

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