Kingston Herald.

CANADIAN JOURNAL, POLITICAL, AGRICULTURAL & COMMERCIAL.

VOL. XXV. KINGSTON, CANADA, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 1844. No. 23.

SEPTEMBER.

BY G. WILCOX.

The sultry summer past, September comes,
Soft twilight of the slow-declining year;—
All mildness, soothing loneliness and peace:
The fading season ere the falling come,
More sober than the buxom blooming May,
And therefore less the favorite of the world,
But dearest month of all to pensive minds.
'Tis now far spent; and the meridian sun,
Most sweetly smiling with attempered beams,
Sheds gently down a mild and grateful warmth
Beneath its yellow lustre, groves and woods,
Checkered by one night's frost with various hues;
While yet no wind has swept a leaf away,
Shine doubly rich. It were a sad delight
Down the smooth stream to glide, & see it tinged
Over each brink, with all the gorgeous hues,
The yellow, red, or purple of the trees,
Thick singly, or in tufts, or forests thick,
Along the shores; to see, perhaps, the side
Of some high mount reflected far below,
With its bright colors, intermixed with spots
Of darker green. Yes, it were sweetly sad
To wander in the open fields, and hear,
Ere at this hour, the noonday hardly past,
The lulling insects of the summer's night:
To hear, where lately buzzing swarms were heard,
A lonely bee long roving here and there,
To find a single flower, but all in vain;
Then, rising quick, and with a louder hum,
Widening circles round and round his head,
Sought by the listener flying clear away,
As to bid the fields a last adieu;
To hear, within the woodland's sunny side,
Full of music, nothing, save, perhaps,
The sound of nutshells, by the squirrel dropped
From some tall beech, fast falling thro' the leaves.

Variety.

From the New Monthly Magazine.

Abroad and at Home—or the TWO-FACED HUSBAND.

[There is too much truth in the picture here presented. There are too many such husbands in the world.]

Those people who at the club and elsewhere are acquainted with Mr. Wagstaff, declare he is the most generous and agreeable creature that ever turned out of the city. He arrives, his jolly face beaming with good humor. He has a good word for every body, and every man a good one for him. Some bachelor says, 'Wag, my boy, there is a white-bait party at Greenwich; can you be one?' He hesitates. 'I promised Mrs. Wagstaff to be home at dinner,' says he; 'but when he says *that*, you may be sure he will go. If you propose to him a game of billiards in the afternoon he will play till dinner, and make the most ludicrous jokes about his poor wife waiting till his return. If you ask him to smoke cigars he will do so till morning, and goes home with a story to Mrs. W., which the poor soul receives with desperate credulity. Once she used to sit up for him; but to continue the practice would have killed her. She goes to bed now and Wagstaff reels in when he pleases.

He is not ill-humored. Far from it. He never says an unkind word to the children, or to the cat, or to the boy who blacks his boots, or to his wife. She wishes he would. He comes down stairs exactly three minutes before office time.

He has his tea and his newspaper in bed. The eldest daughter brings the paper in, and his wife appears with the tea. He has a kind word for both, and scrubs the little girl's fresh face with his bristly beard, and laughs at the baby and professes a prodigious interest in her prattle, and in knowing whether Miss Wiggles the governess is satisfied with her; and before he finishes her answer, he is deep in the folios of the Times, and does not care a one farthing for what the little girl says. He has promised to take the child to Astley's any time these four days. She could hardly speak when he promised it. She is a fine tall lass, and can read and write now; and though it was so long ago, has never forgotten the promise about Astley's.

When he is away from home, Wagstaff talks of his family with great affection. In the early days when he is away, their mother, God bless her! is telling them what a good man their father is—how kind and generous—and how busy he is—what a pity! he is obliged to work so late and stay away from home! Poor creature! poor creature! Sure Heaven will pardon her little lies, if any lies are pardonable.—Whenever she says he will walk with her, Arabella dresses herself in the gown he likes, and puts on a bonnet, and is ready to the very minute, as they may be sure. How often is it that he is early to the minute! How many scores and scores of times has he left the heart-sick girl!—forgetting her in the least—but engaged elsewhere with a game of billiards or a jolly friend and cigar—and perhaps wishing rather to be at home all the time—but he is so good natured, and a capital fellow.

Whenever he keeps his appointment—Heaven help us! she brightens up as if it were Paradise coming to her. She looks with a triumphant air at the servant who opens the door, and round about at the neighbors' windows, as if she would have all the world know that she is walking with her husband. Every now and then he walks—(it is but twice or thrice a year, Wagstaff has his business on week days, never gets up till one of a Sunday)—every now and then as she walks with him, the delight-stricken creature gives a skip, and squeezes his arm and looks up in his face, she is so happy. And so she is too, for he is as good a fellow as ever lived—and he resolves to take her out the next Sunday—only he doesn't. Every one of these walks is noted down in the poor soul's calendar of home as saint's days. She talks of them quite fondly; and there is not one of her female friends whom she won't visit for days after, and to whom she will not be sure to find some pretext for recounting the wonderful talk.

Adieu, adieu, ladies—all the time I was describing that affair at Durognon's, those odious French officers, and their chatter, and their ogling, and their champagne, I was thinking of Arabella far away in the distance and alone. I declare upon my honor, she was never out of my thoughts for a single minute. She was the moral of the Parvenue—the simple, white-robed, spotless, dove-eyed angel of a wife—thinking about her husband—and he among the tawdry, good-for-nothings yonder! Fizz! there goes the first champagne cork, Mr. Wagstaff is making a tender speech to Madame Virginie.

At that moment Arabella is up stairs in the nursery, where the same moon is shining in, and singing her youngest boy to bed.

Fizz! there goes the second cork. Virginie laughs—Fitzsimons roars with laughter—Wagstaff is hob-nobs with the old lady, who gives a nod and a nod. They are taking away the fish and putting down the *entrees*.

At that moment Arabella has her second child between her knees, (the little one is asleep with its thumb in its mouth, and the elder is beginning to rub her eyes over her favorite fairy tale, though she has read it many scores of times.) Arabella has the child between her knees, and just as Wag is clinking his glass with the old lady in London, his wife at Bognor says something to the child, who says after her,

"*God bless my dear papa!*" and presently he is in bed too, and sleeps as soundly as his little sister.

And so it is that these pure blessings are sent—yearning after that fellow over his cups. Suppose they reach him! Why, the spotless things must blush and go out again from the company in which they find him. The drinking goes on, the jokes and fun get faster and faster. Arabella by this time has seen the eldest child asleep in her crib, and is looking out at the moon in silence, as the children breathe round her a soft chorus of slumber. Her mother is down stairs alone, reading 'Blair's sermons,'—a high-shouldered, hook-nosed, lean, moral woman. She wonders her daughter don't come down to tea—there is her cup quite cold, with the cream stagnant on the surface, and her work-basket by its side, with a pair of man's slippers nearly done, and one lazy scrawl from her husband, four lines only, and ten days old. But Arabella keeps away, thinking, thinking, and preferring to be alone. The girl has a sweet, soft heart, and little sympathy with the mother's coarse, rigid, strong-minded nature. The only time they quarrel is, when the old lady calls her son-in-law a brute; then the young one fires up and defends her own like a little Amazon.

What is this secret of love? How does it spring? How is it that no neglect can kill it? In truth, its origin and endurance are alike utterly absurd and unreasonable. What secret power was it that made this delicate minded young creature; who had been bred up upon the purest doctrines of the sainted Mrs. Chapone; who had never thought about love; who, simple soul, had been utterly absorbed in her little daily duties, her piano forte practice, her French lesson, her use of the globes, her canary bird, and her Magnall's questions—what, I say, is it that makes this delicate girl all of a sudden expand into a passion of love for a young sugar baker, simply because she meets him three times riding a grey mare on Clapham common, and afterward (the sly rogue!) on half a dozen occasions at her aunt's at tea? What is it that makes her feel that a young sugar baker is the fatal man with whom her existence is bound up; go through fire and water to marry him; love him in spite of neglect and indifference; adore him so absurdly that a half-hour's kindness from him more than balances a month's brutality? O, mystery of woman's heart!

Wagstaff, so splendid with his dinners, and so generous on himself, is not so generous at home. He pays the bills with only a few oaths; but somehow he leaves his wife without money. He will give it to any body rather than to her; a fact of which he himself is, very likely, unaware at this minute, or of the timidity of his wife in asking for it. In order to avoid this asking, the poor girl goes through unheard of economies, and performs the most curious tricks of avarice. She dresses herself for nothing, and she dresses her children out of her own frocks. Certain dimities, caps, pinafores, and other fallals, have gone through the family; and Arabella, though she sees ever such a pretty thing in a shop window, will pass on with a sigh; whereas her Lancelot is a perfect devourer of waistcoats, and never sets his eyes on a flaring velvet that strikes his fancy but you will be sure to behold him the next week swaggering about in the garment in Pall Mall. Women are ever practising these petty denials, about which the lords of the creation never think.

I will tell you what I once saw Arabella doing. She is a woman of very high breeding, and no inconsiderable share of family pride; well, one day on going to Wagstaff's house, who had invited a party of us to Blackwall, about a bet he had lost, I was, in the master's absence, ushered into the drawing room, which is furnished very fine, and there sat the lady of the house at her work table, with her child prattling at her knee.

I could not understand what made Mrs. Wagstaff blush so—look so entirely guilty of something or other—fidget, answer a travers, and receive an old friend in this strange and inhospitable way.

She, the descendant of the Smiths of Smithfield, of the Browns of Brown Hall, the proud daughter of the aristocracy, *was making a pair of trousers for her eldest son.* She huddled them away hastily under a pillow—but bah! we have keen eyes—and from under that pillow the buttons peeped out, and with those buttons, the secret—they were white ducks—Wagstaff's white ducks—his wife was making them into white ducklings for little Fred.

The sight affected me. I should like to have cried, only it is unmanly; and to cry about a pair of little breeches!—I should like to have seized hold of Mrs. Wagstaff and hugged her to my heart; but she would have screamed, and rung for John to show me down stairs; so I disguised my feelings by treading on the tail of her spaniel dog, whose squealing caused a diversion.

But I shall never forget those breeches. What! Wagstaff is flaunting in a coat of Nugee's, and his son has that sweet, humble tailor. Wagstaff is preparing for Blackwall, and here is his wife plying her gentle needle. Wagstaff feasts off plate and frothing wine, and Arabella sits down to cold mutton in the nursery, with her little ones ranged about her. Wagstaff enjoys—Arabella suffers. He flings about his gold; and she tries to stave off evil days by little savings of meek pence. Wagstaff sins, and she forgives—and trusts, loves, and hopes on, in spite of carelessness and coldness, neglect and extravagance.

This is the moral of the last story. O, ye Wagstaffs of this world, profit by it. O, ye gentle, meek angels of Arabellas, be meek and gentle still. If an angel can't reclaim a man, who can!

THE BISHOP OF NEWFOUNDLAND'S CHURCH SHIP.—Some interest has been lately excited by the fitting out of a schooner for the use of the Bishop of the remote colony of Newfoundland in his visitations. It is designed that the vessel should be also used as a church in the smaller and more remote settlements, where there is no permanent house of prayer. A very pretty yacht, the Hawk, of about 60 tons, (a larger vessel would be unfit for the peculiar navigation of the narrow creeks of the island,) has been given to the Bishop of Newfoundland by a private clergyman, Mr. Eden, the rector of Leigh. On Saturday the Bishop of London inspected the "Church Ship" previous to her departure, which takes place to-day; the missionaries and catechists who are about to proceed to Newfoundland were addressed by his Lordship, by whom the vessel and her good purpose were at the same time solemnly committed to God's protecting care. The Hawk has been supplied with the necessary ecclesiastical fittings, such as plate, an altar, table, books, &c., for the decent celebration of divine service, by the private contributions of the friends of Bishop Field. Many of those interested in the missions of the Church were present; among them were the Rev. Dr. Grant, the Rev. Messrs. Hawkins, Dalton, Jas. Anderson, Evans, Bowdler, Scott, Brown, Marriott, Eden, &c., Sir Howard Douglas, M. P., Mr. Acland, M. P., Mr. Cotton, the Governor of the bank, Messrs. Brooking, Crawley, and others. The occasion was a very affecting and pleasing one, not the less so because it is one almost new to the Church of England; and we cannot but think that her missions would be more effective if similar means were more generally adopted. The Hawk attracted considerable notice when lying in the Thames off the Brunswick-pier at Blackwall; at her masthead was displayed an ensign, one certainly new to the nautical authorities, which caused many various speculations on the river—the arms of the Bishop of Newfoundland appropriately emblazoned. This schooner will carry out five or six persons to be employed in the various work of the Newfoundland mission, as clergy, schoolmasters, &c. We understand that the cost of fitting out the Hawk, her stores, &c., will be defrayed from a special fund, which is in some measure under the auspices of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

A CURIOSITY IN SHAWLS.—The Liverpool correspondent of the Boston Atlas, states that a curiosity in shawls "has just been manufactured at the well known manufacturing town of Paisley, where the most costly shawls worn by the English nobility are made. In 1842, when there was great and general distress in the principal manufacturing districts, and when the people of Paisley suffered greatly from the stagnation in the trade of the town, Her Majesty,—Queen Victoria, purchased several Paisley shawls of a high cost, to patronize domestic manufactures, in consequence of which the nobility soon followed the Queen's example, and this single act gave great relief to the operatives. The great curiosity referred to in the shawl trade, is a scarf-shawl, so constructed, that four colors will fold into twenty different effects; either color can be worn alone, any two together, three or all four, according to the caprice of the wearer. Mr. Kerr, of Paisley, is the enterprising manufacturer who has accomplished the weaving in one piece of this extraordinary shawl, which is pronounced to be a scientific production of far greater merit than any thing of the kind that has appeared in the French exposition of manufactures.

Orthography teaches the use of letters, and the proper method of spelling words as—

L E G,	Elegy;	B A C,	Be aisy;
M L E Q,	Emily Kew;	P Q R I,	Pick your eye;
X S,	Excess;	G O,	Gee ho;
D C,	D'ye see;	U R,	You err;
U R K,	Your key;	C D,	Seedy;
D K,	Decay;	U L B C N,	You'll be seen.

A Student being asked for a definition of the three cardinal virtues, Faith, Hope and Charity, replied as follows:

Quid est Fides?	*Quad non vides.*
What is Faith?	What no one sees.
Quid est Spes?	*Vana res.*
What is Hope?	A vain thing.
Quid est Charitas?	*Magna raritas.*
What is Charity?	A great rarity.

MATRIMONIAL SECRETS.—Sir Philip Sydney says:—"What is mine, even to my life, is her's I love; but the secret of my friend is not mine."

Hear that, ye loving wives and husbands, who communicate to each other in a certain confidence, every thing you know, and a thousand things you don't know and have no right to know, your own secrets, the secrets of your friends and the secrets of your imaginations! Hear that and reform your custom; and our word for it, there will be less envy, jealousy, bitterness, misunderstanding, malice, and all other uncharitableness that there now is—to say nothing of scandal, slander, misrepresentation, gossip, and "lies of first-rate malignity," as Miss Amelia Opie calls such lies as are thus begotten and conceived, in her "Illustrations."

A correspondent of the Planters' Banner, writing from New Orleans, under the signature of "Fish-hooks," thus speaks of the fashions of the ladies there:—"It is supposed *shoes* are worn, and perhaps *stockings*, but the ladies' dresses are so long that this is mere conjecture. *Ankles*, are *completely obsolete*, and were it not that the ladies cut from the *bosom* of the robe as much as they put on at the *bottom*, we young men would be disconsolate."

VERY AFFECTIONATE.—"Phillurs, dear," said a loving husband to his loyal spouse, who was several years the junior, "what do you say to moving to the West?" "Oh I'm delighted with the idea. You recollect when Morgan moved out there, he was as poor as we are, and he died in three years worth a hundred thousand dollars."

A GOOD ONE.—It is a shame to make the Presidents of the United States *give their countenance* to such a business, said a lady on observing a sign having thereon painted the likeness of all the Presidents hanging before a tavern.

REASON FOR DRINKING.—A gentleman having used some argument in favor of drinking, concluded with "You know sir, drinking drives away care, and makes one forget what is disagreeable. Why not not allow a man to drink in that case?" "Yes, sir," replied Johnson, "if he sat next to you."

ABSENCE OF MIND.—A gentleman down east seeing his pretty maid with his wife's bonnet on kissed her, supposing it to be the "real one."—He discovered his error through the assistance of his wife.

If you have no distinct idea of your ancestors, their habits, characters, principles and occupations, get nominated for some prominent office, and the opposition prints will give you your genealogy to the farthest remove. They will tell you what your great grandfather preferred for dinner.

"I'd give any thing to hear Ole Bull," said an up country lass to her lover an evening or two since.

"Well," answered he, "dad's got an old brindle chap, and you can hear him better a'most any time you like."

The reason why most people think more of their stomachs than they do of their souls, is because their stomachs are a confounded sight the largest of the two.

A Yankee has invented yellow spectacles, for making lard look like butter. They are a great saving in expense, as lard eaten with these spectacles on, tastes very much the same as stewed oil.

A young man without money is like a steamboat without fuel. He can't "go ahead."—Among the ladies he is like a moon in a cloudy night. "He can't shine."

"Each pleasure has its pang," as the bee said when he shoved his sting into the smellers of the floral admirer.

"Lend me your ears," as the chap said when he robbed the cornfield.

CONSCIENCE.—An article made out of Indian rubber!

Responsible Government

DEFENDED AGAINST THE ATTACKS OF THE

REV. EGERTON RYERSON.

LETTER XI.

To the Editor of the Examiner.

SIR,—Mr. Ryerson in his sixth letter informs us, truly, that there is not an example in the history of England, since the commencement of Responsible Government in 1688, of any British Monarch having been called upon to explain his views of that system, his reverence for it, or his adherence to it.

We scarcely needed the information that since that memorable stipulation, the declaration of rights, which William the Third was obliged to assent to before his coronation, no Monarch has been called upon to explain his views of Responsible Government. Since that period the Parliament has been satisfied with limiting undoubted prerogative from time to time, by acts of the Legislature, and with punishing ministers who advised its unwise exercise. William himself refused his assent to the bill for limiting the duration of Parliament, but was met by a resolution of both Houses, that whoever advised His Majesty was an enemy to his country. Many a time and oft since the bill of rights, Monarchs have, in England, desired to set prerogative on its ancient footing. Ministers of State and Ministers of Religion have vainly attempted the same purpose; but still I admit there has been no new bill of rights—no definition of Responsible Government by the Sovereign.

This allegation of Mr. Ryerson would have been a very good argument against the late Counsellors, had they instituted an examination of the Governor General, with a view of disqualifying him, had he not been able or willing to define Responsible Government. But they did no such thing. They alleged that His Excellency had expressed views which, being acted upon, were incompatible with their continuance in office—and, therefore, they resigned. To meet this case, and to criminate them, his Excellency has attempted to define Responsible Government.—He has done it voluntarily. If his definitions be false and unconstitutional, they cannot be defended on the ground that definitions were not necessary: neither can practice, contrary to his definitions, be supported because the definitions are uncalled for; and, what is still of greater consequence, definitions on his part, whether false or true, will not alter his position as an enemy to Responsible Government, if his acts are unconstitutional.

I have at present to deal with his Excellency's declarations and definitions, for which, according to Mr. Ryerson, the people of Canada should feel under such deep obligations. These declarations are, in Mr. Ryerson's view, in harmony with the Resolutions of 1841; First, because, as he says, "they are declared to be so by the great statesmen in England, all of whom declare those resolutions as the practical basis of Canadian Government,"—"all of whom declare the views of Sir Charles Metcalfe to be in harmony with those resolutions, *and with the practice of British Responsible Government.*"

Mr. Ryerson must, it appears to me, have written his defence in the expectation that most part of his readers would confine their researches to his writings. I cannot on any other principle discover what advantage he could have hoped to gain by asserting that either Sir Charles Metcalfe's declarations or acts were declared by British Statesmen to be in harmony with the practice of British Responsible Government.—Lord Stanley justified Sir Charles Metcalfe upon the ground, that although in England the Sovereign was not responsible, and, therefore, did not personally exercise political power, yet in a Colony it was wholly different; for the life of the British Constitution could not be extended to a Colony. Lord Stanley justified Sir Charles Metcalfe for refusing a stipulation which he, Lord Stanley, most untruly, though with unintentional untruth in his part, asserted several times in his speech to have been demanded under the Governor's hand and seal. Lord Stanley drew a marked distinction between a Colony and the Mother Country, with respect to the distribution of patronage. Upon these distinctions he defended Sir Charles Metcalfe, and yet Mr. Ryerson would have us believe, that Lord Stanley declared Sir Charles Metcalfe's views and declarations to be in harmony with British practice. I think that those who will take the trouble to refer to Lord Stanley's speech will find that he declared directly the contrary. The art with which Mr. Ryerson has claimed the support of British Statesmen, I have already exposed.—He dares not openly take the distinctions which form so prominent a part of Lord Stanley's defence. He has passed them by. He knew they would be offensive and hateful to his liberal readers; and he knew that to controvert them would neither please his master or his tory supporters. He, therefore, covers them with a cloud, through which irresponsible prerogative may be seen by one party and British Constitutional practice by the other.

Mr. Ryerson is never tired of reiterating his argument, "That the Head of the Executive Government of this Province being within the limits of his Government the Representative of the Sovereign, is responsible to the Imperial authority alone;" and, that the authority to which Sir Charles Metcalfe is alone responsible has declared that both his views and practice are constitutional according to the resolutions of 1841.

Now the doctrine of despotism, all over the world, is founded on the irresponsibility of Sovereigns. Join this to authority, and you have perfect despotism. The divine right of Kings to rule, and exercise prerogative, with accountability, was the very one overthrown by the revolution of 1688. It is true that the limitations of prerogative, then introduced, brought no personal responsibility of the Sovereign, but they produced an actual and practical necessity, that all the advisers should be responsible. The practical Constitution of England may in this point of view be defined almost in the words of our Canadian Resolution; that the Head of the Executive Government in England is responsible to divine authority alone. According to Doctor Sacheveral it was rebellion to question the acts of the Sovereign; but this is not what follows, according to the British Constitution. Responsibility without power is a contradiction and an absurdity, according to Lord Stanley, and power without responsibility is tyranny. To escape that tyranny the British people hold the Crown *incapable* of acting without advice; and they hold the advisers responsible. This incapability in the Sovereign of acting without responsible advisers, is really and truly the essence of Responsible Government. Admit for a moment the capability or power of the Sovereign to do individual public acts, and the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance follows inevitably that of irresponsibility of the Sovereign. What, Sir, is Lord Stanley's conclusion, from premises like these,—"the Sovereign in England exercises no political power." This is in England a well understood principle, and strange it would be if, in the assertion of irresponsibility in a Governor General, our Parliament had been led into consequences such as Mr. Ryerson would contend for, destructive not only of Responsible Government, but also of any particle of liberty that lingered in the ancient Colonial Constitution.

The Parliament of this country asserted the principle that the Governor was responsible to the Imperial authority alone. Well, Sir, were they satisfied with this responsibility? If they had been, the resolution might and would have stopped; but on the contrary they went on to declare, "but that nevertheless the management of our local affairs *can only* be conducted by him with the advice, counsel, and information of subordinate officers *in the Province.*" It was thus that the Canadian Parliament placed the representative of the Sovereign in precisely the same position respecting the local affairs, as the Queen is placed in England, irresponsible, personally, to the people; but incapable of acting without the advice of some persons responsible in the Colony, unless in breach of the Constitutional principle which is the essence of Responsible Government.

But what is the doctrine of our Canadian Sacheveral, Dr. Ryerson; but that the Governor General being responsible to the Imperial authority alone, he must be right whenever that authority approves of his conduct. Had the resolution of the Assembly, after declaring the Governor's responsibility to the Imperial authority alone, gone on to say, "and, therefore, the Canadian Parliament and people have no right to interfere with the exercise of the prerogative, or to inquire into the advice upon which it is exercised, or to seek responsibility amongst themselves for its exercise," the resolution would have borne out the Doctor's argument,—and then instead of voting confidence or want of confidence in provincial Ministers, our Parliament would have been petitioners or suitors to the authorities of the Empire, like Her Majesty's East Indian subjects. But the Resolution did not so conclude. It established local responsibility, which neither the Governor General's will, or the approval of the British Ministers could affect. Without this Canada has no Responsible Government. With it, the people of Canada are the judges of their own confidences—of their own wants and wishes. And, if there be advisers of the Crown, they are responsible, whether approved or not by the authorities of the Empire; and whenever a Governor General chooses to act without advice, and without producing to the country the persons who are responsible for his acts, he is conducting the Government in defiance of the principle of Responsible Government which he pretends to have adopted. If these British principles are declared by Her Majesty's Ministers to be unconstitutional in Canada, then we have no longer Responsible Government; and if to claim Responsible Government contrary to the opinion of Her Majesty's Ministers be rebellion, then we are rebels. But the question whether we are to admit or deny that we are in the enjoyment of Responsible Government remains as much as ever unsettled.—If we must do without it we must, and there is an end to the argument; but the prisoner cannot be persuaded by authority that the sun shines, and the wind blows as freely for him, as the passenger outside, whose voice penetrates to the recesses of his dungeon.

Now, Sir, as there is as yet no Royal Proclamation, or Military Provision against opinion,—let us take the liberty of examining for ourselves His Excellency's declarations; and, in the first place, his explanation to Parliament, which I intreat your readers to look into with patience and attention, keeping in mind two assertions of principle by which I desire to have this matter judged, and which I dare Mr. Ryerson to controvert, either in theory or by reference to British practice.

The first is, That there must, according to the principles of Responsible Government, be some person or persons, in the Colony, or in other words some persons who can be made accountable, for every act of the representative of the Queen, respecting the local affairs of the Colony; this is the essence of Responsible Government.

The second, is a practical consequence of the first, and may be thus stated—that in order to preserve harmony, the advisers of the Crown,—should have the confidence of Parliament.

The first principle is essential, and should be inviolable both in theory and practice. Any declaration, which necessarily involves a contradiction to it, is a contradiction to Responsible Government itself. The second, as we have seen, for nine months past, may be violated in practice, and a Government may be carried on without the confidence of Parliament, at the simple sacrifice of the peace and harmony of the country, so long as enemies of the country can be found in the Colony, who will take the responsibility of advising such a Government.

Now, Sir, the Governor General's objection, according to his own explanation to the demand which he states to have been made by the late Counsellors, was not because of a real or supposed stipulation, but because an agreement to take advice on all occasions of appointment,—would be a surrender of the prerogative of the Crown, "as it could not be maintained, that the mere form of taking advice without regarding it, was the process contemplated." "He appealed to the number of appointments made by him, on the recommendation of the Council, and to instances where he had abstained from conferring appointments on their opponents, as furnishing proofs of the *great consideration* he had evinced towards the Council in the distribution of patronage. He at the same time objected as he always had done to the exclusive distribution of patronage with party views, and maintained the principle that "office ought to be given to the man best qualified to render efficient services to the state, and when *there was no such pre-eminence, he asserted his right to exercise his discretion.*"

The late Counsellors, you will observe, defend the appointments made under their advice. These appointments have been approved by the Parliament, and by the vast majority of the people. The Governor General insinuates that the Council sought the distribution of patronage with exclusive party views. The Counsellors say, they advised the distribution of patronage so as to produce contentment and harmony between the Government and the people. Mr. Ryerson even approved of the conduct of the Government as they advised it, and so the public affairs of the country continued to be administered to the satisfaction of the majority of the people,—until the introduction of vice regal antagonism, and the substitution of His Excellency's discretion, for the judgment of responsible advisers.

But, what is the discretion which the Governor General asserts the right of exercising—what is the prerogative which he would not surrender? It is the discretion of acting upon his own judgment contrary to advice, or without advice—the discretion of judging for himself who are best qualified to render efficient services to the state, and where there was no pre-eminence of doing as he liked. Now, Sir, upon whose responsibility was he to exercise this judgment and this discretion? He substitutes no new or other advisers for the Council, whose advice he proposes rejecting. It is not that being displeased with the advice of his ministers as being founded upon party views; he therefore seeks other advice. No, it is his own unadvised discretion; and I ask again, who was to be responsible for the exercise of that discretion which it is treason even to question? Why, Sir, the Governor General himself, and to whom? Why Sir, to the imperial authority alone. Then, Sir, ask the question, whether the responsibility of the Governor General to the imperial authority, or the responsibility of some person to the people of Canada, was the responsibility sought by the Resolutions of 1841? If the latter, then there could not be a more direct disavowal of the principle of Responsible Government than the Governor General's own explanation; for according to that explanation, to consent to the first and essential requirement of Responsible Government—namely, that there should always be advisers locally responsible, would be a degradation of the character of his office, a violation of his duty, and a surrender of the prerogative of the Crown.

You will find that Lord Stanley, in his speech in Parliament, takes the same view of the matter with Sir Charles Metcalfe—that he has borrowed his argument from Sir Charles Metcalfe's explanation. His expression is, "For what then is the Governor General to be responsible, if not for the distribution of patronage." So that, according to both these high authorities,—you find the responsibility of the Governor-General absolutely substituted for local responsibility. There is this difference to be observed however: Lord Stanley could not bring himself in a British Parliament to argue in favor of a like discretion on the part of the Sovereign. He could not be guilty of the manifest absurdity of saying that it was in accordance with British Constitutional usage; and surely it is not upon Mr. Ryerson's bare assertion, that the people of Canada can be persuaded to such an accordance.

But, let us inquire what was the Governor General's duty, if he really and conscientiously differed from his Council? His duty was, certainly, not to act independently of advice and thus to violate the essential principle of Responsible Government. His duty was to seek other advisers who would agree with him. Unless he could find them, he could not by possibility have exercised his discretion, without trampling upon Responsible Government. If his new advisers happened to possess the confidence of Parliament all would be right. The Governor's acts would then be sustained, not by his own discretion,—but by the advice of his Ministers. If his new advisers happened not to possess the confidence of Parliament, then would peace and tranquillity be sacrificed to a Governor's discretion, and a line of policy would be followed which the people of Canada would condemn.

The Governor General's appeal to the number of appointments made on the recommendation of the Council, or his assertion of "the great consideration" he had evinced towards them by no means removes or even softens his denial of the essential principle of Responsible Government; for "the great consideration" is still expressed to be a matter of grace and favor, and the unconstitutional right to act independently of all advice, is as much asserted in this paragraph of the explanation as elsewhere.

The distinction cannot be kept too plainly in view, between a Governor General's procuring the assent of a Council to acts contrary to their opinions, and the exercise of a prerogative independently of their assent. Such a Council as the Governor has lately chosen—such a one as he seeks for, would depend entirely upon his strength, and could not refuse their concurrence in any acts dictated by him. If they should be supported by Parliament, the Government would be constitutional, for they would be responsible, and their individual opinions a matter of indifference: but still there would not be the concurrence of responsible advisers. But the Governor General, in his explanation, goes the length of asserting *his* right to exercise *his* discretion, in contradistinction to discretion advised in any quarter. He avowed his right to act upon that discretion; he had acted upon it; and, in so acting, produced no advisers who were to be responsible. He, therefore, substituted his own responsibility to the authorities of the empire,—for that of all local advisers, and the Council were bound to the country to place themselves in a position to disclose this startling infringement of principle. They did so act; and for this they are said to be disaffected.

To make this distinction still more plain, let us for the sake of argument, admit the principle avowed by the Governor General, of his discretion to overbear the advice of his Council, without seeking their assent, and without producing to the country other advisers. Let us suppose, that in the Government they were assenting to this doctrine, and out of doors holding themselves responsible; let us suppose an act done which the country would not bear them out in, and let us suppose their resignation. The Parliament would then have a right to demand upon whose advice the act was done. The true answer would be, that it was without advice, and done upon the Governor General's discretion. Who would then be responsible? the Governor General.—To whom? To the Home Authorities. Is this, then, the British Responsible Government Mr. Ryerson upholds—to which Sir Charles Metcalfe is so warmly attached? It certainly is;—and no wonder it should be so; for it is the Responsible Government of every Governor of Canada, up to the time of Lord Sydenham; and it is the Responsible Government practised in India—in short, everywhere in the Empire but in England itself.

Imagine for a moment a Council thus resigning, and a vain inquiry made after the advisers, to whom might be attributed an obnoxious act of power: imagine that when these resigning Counsellors, impeached the transaction before the Parliament, they were met by a statement, that, long ago, the Governor General had told them of his right to exercise his own unadvised discretion, and that they had submitted.—Then, Sir, would they have been traitors to their country; and then would they have deserved the impeachment and condemnation, which the late Counsellors avoided, by the only means in their power—a resignation.

The inhabitants and freeholders of the township of Warwick, who, it appears by the Address, are thirty-two in number, viewed with astonishment and indignation the attempt to wrest from His Excellency the prerogative of the Crown;—and His Excellency, in his answer, is cheered by the approbation and support of that populous neighbourhood in the course which he had pursued, in refusing to surrender the constitutional prerogative of the Crown." His Excellency also answers certain inhabitants of Lenox and Addington with gratitude, for their determination to support him in "vindicating the constitutional prerogative of the Crown." His Excellency's supporters in the city of Toronto are thanked for their opinion, "that the concessions demanded by these gentlemen (the late Counsellors) would be, in His Excellency's emphatic words, virtually to surrender the prerogative of the Crown to the Council, for party purposes,—to render that Council supreme, and the Gover-

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.
INCHES 1 2 3 CENTIMETRES 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8