

ties, but in support of an immediate and final settlement of Canadian affairs by act of Parliament. It would be seen whether he was earnest while condemning the ministerial abolition, or only playing a part to gratify his despised followers. In the former case, Lord Melbourne's readiness to sacrifice the Canada once more to his own ends, will be no small proof.

Supposing the latter case, and that the Tory leader, after some more flourish in front of his party, should withdraw from the contest for fear of a victory which some believe he does anything but covet, what a prospect is there for the people of Canada! Three years more of Garrison government and tormenting suspense—the farmers turned into soldiers—and the fields neglected—emigration stopped—this is the chief means of Colonial prosperity, and permanently directed to other channels—another rebellion, or two, in the north arising from the wavering policy of the Imperial Government, and only to be suppressed by fire and sword, and to mention any other cost of ruinous emigration from the Colony (for the Duke of Wellington should be told that the militia and volunteer force to which he so strongly objects on account of its tendency to provoke a war with the United States is necessary in Canada, as is necessarily placed on the frontier, in order to check the desertion of the regular troops)—in a word all check three years more of "Continentalism"—such as the prospect which the Whigs, if they should not be succeeded by the Tories, hold out to the inhabitants of the two Canadas. And then in 1840 for effect in 1842, there is to be practical legislation; Lord Durham's report being forgotten, new excitements and states of feeling arising, new desires there and new opinions here; and new information from the spot being required in order to legislate for distant provinces with any chance of a happy result.

In 1842, as well as 1840 or 1842, is the Government mad or what? We answer the question by recurring to the opinion with which we set out. The Government is utterly helpless, its policy is a length complete, its death very near at hand. In fact, England is without a government, and would matter little or nothing therefore what Lord John Russell proposed with respect to Canada. A piece of folly more or less coming from men who have destroyed their party by folly after folly will excite no surprise, and is of no sort of consequence. If any wonder at the extensive absurdity of suggesting an abstract proposition in this case instead of legislation, let him reflect that a truly national government cannot deal with realities and should be excused for making believe to do something. The fate however is nearly over. Would that the curtain might drop on Thursday night. Some imagine that Lord Melbourne participates in this wish, and new hopes of office for no other purpose than to smooth the way for a Tory Minister—if it should prove so, these who have watched him will not be astonished.

HINT TO HER MAJESTY'S SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES. There is already on the table of the Lieutenant Governor of an Island not 100 miles from the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the following official persons. One of Her Majesty's Executive Council. One of the Legislative Council. The Treasurer. The Sheriff of the Instance Vice Admiral's Court. Three Commissioners of the Vice-Admiral's Court for trial of offences on the seas. The Provost Marshall. (A squire.) A Justice in Chancery. An Examiner in Chancery. A member of the Court for Hearing and determining Divorces. A Justice of the Peace for the whole Island. A Referee of the New Brunswick Assurance Company. A Trustee and Governor of the Central Academy.

HINT TO HER MAJESTY'S SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES. There is already on the table of the Lieutenant Governor of an Island not 100 miles from the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the following official persons. One of Her Majesty's Executive Council. One of the Legislative Council. The Treasurer. The Sheriff of the Instance Vice Admiral's Court. Three Commissioners of the Vice-Admiral's Court for trial of offences on the seas. The Provost Marshall. (A squire.) A Justice in Chancery. An Examiner in Chancery. A member of the Court for Hearing and determining Divorces. A Justice of the Peace for the whole Island. A Referee of the New Brunswick Assurance Company. A Trustee and Governor of the Central Academy.

HINT TO HER MAJESTY'S SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES. There is already on the table of the Lieutenant Governor of an Island not 100 miles from the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the following official persons. One of Her Majesty's Executive Council. One of the Legislative Council. The Treasurer. The Sheriff of the Instance Vice Admiral's Court. Three Commissioners of the Vice-Admiral's Court for trial of offences on the seas. The Provost Marshall. (A squire.) A Justice in Chancery. An Examiner in Chancery. A member of the Court for Hearing and determining Divorces. A Justice of the Peace for the whole Island. A Referee of the New Brunswick Assurance Company. A Trustee and Governor of the Central Academy.

had in 1836, we should have opposed it; and for the following reasons:— 1. We were fully satisfied with the principles and instructions of Lord Glenelg's despatch of the 15th December, 1835, and with the policy recommended in Lord Goderich's despatch of Nov. 8, 1835, to which Lord Glenelg referred Sir F. Head as the platform and rule of his government. Every thing that could be reasonably desired in the government of this province was recommended in those despatches, in relation to the appointment of persons to office possessing the confidence of the public, the Clergy Reserves, and the entire administration of our provincial affairs.

2. We had not the shadow of a doubt as to the faithful and efficient observance of those instructions by the Governor of the province, and more especially after he had published them and assumed the title of Imperial Government, and that they should be the rule of his government. 3. We supposed the Imperial Government, in the maintenance of its own dignity and authority, and good faith with the people of Upper Canada, would not suffer any disobedience of its orders, and would visit with due punishment any departure from them.

Entertaining such opinions and such confidence, we thought the inhabitants of this province had succeeded in their representations to the Imperial Government, and that the means of redressing any grievance which was in their own hands, and that it only remained for them to avail themselves of the advantages they had thus acquired. But we are now of a different opinion, and for the following reasons: 1. The facts referred to have proved a dead letter in the government of Upper Canada to this day; nay, they have proved worse than a dead letter—they have proved a barbed arrow of disappointment in the hearts of those who trusted in them, and staked their public reputation and support of the government upon their integrity and efficiency.

2. Those despatches have never yet been cancelled; yet the administration of the government has been sitting in the face of the Imperial Government during the last three years, by disobeying its instructions and falsifying its promises to the people of Upper Canada, are unpunished, unrepented, and even upheld! And there is no redress. We happen to know of official instructions which were sent out to this province a long time since in relation to the Indian trade, &c., and which we retained a dead letter to the present hour! We were therefore convinced, 1. That the people of Upper Canada must have better security than Imperial Despatches and the motions of governors for the proper administration of their government and the promotion of their civil and general interests. 2. That no such security can be obtained under our present form of government and in connection with Great Britain, except in the responsibility of the Provincial Ministry to the Representatives of the people, as recommended by the Earl of Durham.

From the Examiner. **RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.**—Let us compare the state of England before and after the accession of this principle. Before the revolution of 1688, we find that the country was almost constantly in a state of anarchy, with little if any security either for life or property. The history of England during the reign of the House of Stuart, is a history of warfare between the Executive and the Parliament, of rebellions, impeachments, executions on the scaffold. Since the revolution, the government has been marked in perfect harmony. There have been few instances of impeachment, none of the execution of ministers. To what is this different state of things to be ascribed? We answer, since the revolution the Crown has selected advisers acceptable to the representatives of the people. Before that time, it was deemed an infringement on the "prerogative" for the House of Commons to dictate to the Sovereign what advisers he should choose, such as Sir Francis Head and Sir George Arthur deem it an infringement on their prerogative for the House of Assembly to presume to interfere with their choice. The English people were repeatedly thwarted in their noble efforts for responsible government. Rebellion after rebellion was put down by the despotic and tyrannical Stuarts, and the blood of English patriots flowed upon the scaffold; but that blood was not shed in vain. The rights of Englishmen have long since been acknowledged, and the memory of the martyred patriots, Russell and Sidney, is enshrined in the hearts of their regenerated posterity.

But we are, the people of Upper Canada, less entitled to the rights and privileges of British subjects than our ancestors? Are we less intelligent? Are we in any one way inferior? We leave to the kinsling Tory prints the degrading task of writing down the abominable slander that the people of Upper Canada are unfit for the full enjoyment of all the privileges which their forefathers have won in the blood of patriots. We claim the rights of British freemen. We want no more, with less we should be ashamed to say that we were contented.

From the Peterborough Backwoodsman, July 5. **ADMIRABLE EXPOSITION OF THE RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT RECOMMENDED BY LORD DURHAM, AND REQUIRED IN UPPER CANADA.**

Union in sentiment can alone ensure union in action, and the former can only be obtained by a thorough acquaintance with the subject and conviction of its truth; to lead to this result we shall endeavor to explain to the constituency of this district, the objects and advantages to be obtained by a RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT, and in what that responsibility should consist. Enthusiastic admirers and devoted supporters of our revered and glorious Constitution as secured by the bravery of our Ancestors in 1688, and pledged to us by the act of settlement in the accession of the House of Hanover, we would wish to see its general rays penetrate the darkening gloom of the Canadian forests in their primeval purity, and raising to maturity those rich harvests of blessings, which centuries of cultivation in our native land, have made the glory of England and the envy of the world. To effect that purpose we must transplant a cutting from the venerable trunk which may combine the various virtues of its several branches, and by constant care and attention, daily drip to it the incense of our new country. As the just and wise observer, "The government of England was founded on principles of liberty: its constitution is the work of a wise and brave people; who, considering that all power was derived from them and was to be subservient to their happiness, committed it into the hands of three estates who were to be a mutual support and a mutual check upon each other, and yet so ordered, that the interest of each is best promoted by each confining itself within its proper bounds." This in a few words is the principle of the constitution which is every Briton's inheritance. To enjoy the blessings of that constitution in its fullest sense we have selected this rising colony for our adoption of it, and how far we do enjoy it we shall try to show.

We have a House of Assembly or Commons composed of the representatives of the people, elected by them and under their control; who every fourth year at furthest must be dissolved, and again chosen upon the votes of their constituents for a constant term of their confidence. We have a Legislative Council (representative of the aristocracy and landlord to the Lords) chosen by the crown; but rendered independent of its influence by their appointment for life: of the component parts of the Assembly we shall say more in due season, farther than that it might receive, without injury to the purposes for which it was embodied, a considerable accession of talent and numbers.

As the supreme head of the Executive, or body to which is entrusted the administration of the laws, and the efficient execution of the legislative enactments, stands the Lieutenant Governor, the representative system, alone responsible to the powers in England for the abuse of mismanagements of the local affairs in a distant colony, whose more immediate necessities can scarcely be appreciated or known at home.

We have next an Executive Council or MINISTRY, which as at present constituted, is merely a cipher to give a numerical weight to the value of the whole; having absolutely no executive functions to perform: in the inefficiency of this council lies the root from which all the grievances, imaginary and real, of the province originate.

It being presumed that the Lieutenant Governor, however versed in the constitutional rights, and Imperial interests in the colony, could not possibly, by his own knowledge become acquainted with our local details, and in consequence, for the purpose of enacting to effect the local policy of our provincial legislature, must be guided by the advice of those whose residence in the colony and engagements in conducting the heads of Departments, have enabled them to form opinions in their several branches from observation and experience. To guide his Excellency in such matters, he is empowered to call to his council such persons as may be deemed best qualified to afford that advice which may enable him to carry on the executive functions of his station, in all that relates to our LOCAL affairs in accordance with the spirit of our PROVINCIAL ENACTMENTS.—The Imperial interests in the colony being of course wholly under the control of Downing Street. For this purpose a counter part of those through whose interposition the Crown can do no wrong, and who are responsible for their advice, which the Crown is bound to seek and to give, was originally intended to be afforded to this province by our provincial constitution under the title of the "EXECUTIVE COUNCIL." The constitution and advantage of such a council has been totally abrogated in this province, by the principle as laid down by the late Lieutenant Governor "that though bound to call them together he was not compelled to consult them;" and the fact of their functions having been wholly usurped by the self-constituted and irresponsible body, usually designated as the "Family Compact," who have so long used an undue influence in the affairs of the colony, and in truth controlled and guided the Executive functions of the government, around which they form a barrier through which none but those devoted to their interest can possibly obtain a passage.

Through our representatives in the Assembly we have generously voted enormous sums for the improvement of the country, and saddled ourselves with a debt, which individually we would cheerfully struggle to afford our shares to liquidate, could we but see those appropriations judiciously and honestly expended for the purposes we designed them, under the direction of a Responsible Executive!—But can any feeling save that of disgust and dissatisfaction pervade the public mind, when we see the sums which we so lavishly granted for the public good, in almost every instance, devoted to a graduated system of jobbery, from their original purpose to the individual agrandement of the heads of the compact, and the selfish backs who form the medium through which their dirty work is shamelessly accomplished. When they were the means of appointing them, and securing the commissions for themselves or their understrappers, we see Jobs (for Contract and Job is one synonymous) given to men totally inadequate to their accomplishment, because they may chance to be indebted to a Commissioner, and the public funds handed over to pay their private debts, in open violation of honor and principle. When we see the grossest cases of dishonesty in the part of Commissioners, openly exposed and reprehended in the public prints, and loudly complained of by the constituency, yet the delinquents screened & honored by the very Compact Legislature, who were the means of appointing them!

When we see the most flagrant acts of injustice unblushingly committed and loudly complained of, yet no redress afforded; is it not time to UTTER? Is it not time to insist that some degree of RESPONSIBILITY must be afforded us, to secure the honest expenditure of the funds which spring entirely from the industry and liberality of our population? And what is the remedy we ask? All we require is, that we may be permitted to enjoy the first great vital principle of the constitution, which is our birth right and our blessing, as secured to us by the unwavering promises of our Ancestors in 1688—viz.—A similar responsibility to the people of the Executive or Ministry in this country to the Provincial Parliament, AS FAR AS THE CONDUCT OF LOCAL AFFAIRS EXTENDS, as is established between the Ministry or Executive in England and the House of Commons; in fact that the persons who carry into execution the enactments of the Provincial Parliament should, in common sense, enjoy the confidence of those by whom those acts are framed and for whose government they are promulgated.

The general outcry which is re-echoed from one end of the province to the other against the "Family Compact" has been raised not against the ministerial or executive functions, and their total responsibility for their unconstitutional and injurious exercise of them. If for the purposes of provincial improvement we willingly burden ourselves with a heavy debt, in the fond hope of increasing our prosperity; if it is our constitutional right, that those to whom the execution of our projects are entrusted, should be responsible to US for their honest expenditure in accordance with the spirit of the acts under which they are appropriated.

We ask not in the slightest degree to interfere with the IMPERIAL policy or interests in the province. As a portion of the British empire, and the most essentially British of her colonies, we have striven and will strive every nerve to maintain our connection with the mother country, our dependence upon which is our highest glory.

We only ask an equal control over our LOCAL affairs, to which a mercantile business, viz.—That it would carry on its LOCAL business to the best of its judgment, for the benefit of the colony; but that on all subjects affecting the general interests of the Firm, that it would look to the head for assistance and advice.

Thus dutifully respecting the parent state; we only wish to be placed in such a situation as may enable us to devote our means and energies, with the greatest degree of efficiency, to our LOCAL advantage, and in consequence, to the general benefit and glory of that great nation, to maintain a filial dependence upon, and mutual affection with her, we would willingly sacrifice our lives, our fortunes, and our homes, fervently praying that our latest breath on earth may be yielded beneath the ample folds of England's cherished flag.

The Herald.

KINGSTON, TUESDAY, JULY 23, 1839.

In our recent remarks on the ministerial plan for Canada, we have considered the question as it is usually taken—that is, as a question between the Colony and the Home Government. In this light it has generally been placed; in the light it was discussed in the House of Commons, and in this light it is quite possible that the British ministers solely consider it. This view of it is tolerably correct, so far as an immediate remedy is concerned; but a little reflection on the matter will show that the question is less between the Colony and the Home Government, than between two parties in the Colony, one of which has, in some extent, induced the ministry to espouse their cause. The question, as it is taken, is a question, not really between the "family compact" party on the one side, and the friends of civil and religious equality on the other. The former are striving to retain and extend their exclusive privileges; the latter are striving to render the government free and equal, impartial in distributing favors, and inflexible in maintaining the equal rights of all classes of its people. The Church and State party have enjoyed by far the greatest share of government patronage, indeed nearly the whole of it, and have used it for the purpose of laying the foundations of their power, broad, deep, and strong. This unjust monopoly has roused the peo-

ple to assert their equal rights, and cast off the abhorred yoke of the "family compact." The struggle was delayed too long. The compact had a monopoly of place, and from this vantage ground they plied their schemes so diligently that they have almost persuaded the Home Government to identify itself with them. In this base work the rebellion also gave them great advantage, and they have used it most unscrupulously, by representing their opponents as "rebels not found out," in the teeth of the notorious fact that a large number of them were among the first to put down rebellion, as was acknowledged by Governor's speeches, and reports of legislative committees, and written in blood on the battle field.

Aided by these advantages, and their own long practice in misrepresenting colonial affairs for their own benefit, the Church and State men have nearly succeeded in placing the Home Government in a false position, by adopting the quarrel of our Tory officials and fighting their battles against the people. Yet how little are Imperial interests served by such a course. Rather, how much they are weakened and perilled. The interest of the Home Government is to make our people contented and prosperous; but they cannot be so while a small faction usurps the chief advantages of government; therefore the interest of the Home government is to reduce that faction to its proper place as a small part of the whole and servants of the whole, instead of being their imperious masters. A mixed population like ours will not endure the exaltation of one class above all others. And British freedom, accustomed to the working of the British constitution, will not endure a system which renders representative government a farce, by placing the full power of the state in the hands of men who are independent of the people's representatives, and in no shape or sense accountable to them for any improper or illegal act. Men who have been accustomed to see their votes influence the government, and produce a prompt agreement with the opinions of a majority, naturally reject a system which renders their votes useless, and enables the cabal who rule to set those votes at defiance for a series of years with impunity. It would not be easy to devise a plan that could produce greater irritation than this. If we had no pretence to the British constitution, but were avowedly under the sole control of a few irresponsible men, at any rate we should not be disappointed. We should expect nothing liberal or equal, and having no right to interfere with the government, we could not complain that it never regarded us. But to be mocked with a shadow, yet denied the substance: to be told that we are governed under the British constitution, yet be denied the vital principle which is essential to its successful working, is to add insult to injury, and to give us a stone when we ask for bread.

A great part of the evil consequences of such a system falls on the British Government, without its desiring any countervailing benefit from it. Disorder and contention, embarrassment and expense, loss and disgrace, flow plentifully from such an unconstitutional plan of government, and of all these Great Britain must of course sustain the greatest share. Her most important domestic interests are greatly affected by the contentions of her colonies. Indeed, the continuance of her ministry and their policy is suspended on the fate of a bill for the government of a colony. If colonists often feel that their interests are sacrificed to the interests of a few men, it is no wonder that those interests are made the means of inflicting mutual wounds by every party there. Thus the colonists are both the means and the victims of party strife in Great Britain. A false system here reacts on its authors there, and misgovernment in Canada upsets the Government in England.

If such acts were unavoidable, they should be endured with patience; but they are not; for both imperial and colonial interests require that the established principles of the British constitution should be applied to the government of these colonies. It is not enough that we have received a few phrases, or general professions of paying deference to the House of Assembly. The government must no longer depend on any man's discretion or caprice, but must be so arranged that the people may exert their legitimate control over it, and know that it must be agreeable to their collective will.

The Tory destructive of this province—the enemies of the British constitution, who have seduced the ministry by representing that to make the government here amenable to the people would lead to a dissolution of British connexion. This argument, or assertion rather, says in effect, that our people are either too ignorant or too corrupt to enjoy the privileges of Britons. If they were invested with a British control over their government, they would ignorantly or corruptly use it to dissolve their union with Great Britain. This is the Tory plea, and the cry of the people. The people demand their constitutional rights, but they are denied under the base pretence that they may abuse them. If the Tory destructive display their usual short-sightedness. They cannot see that the stiffest and surest way to dissolve British connexion, is to withhold from the people the full benefit of the British constitution. No man likes to be mocked, nor yet to be deprived of his rights; but when he is visited with both in one he will surely seek a remedy some where. The Tory pleads a liberal and the British constitution, as if the free play of its essential principles would lead to a republic. In opposition to all this Tory cant, we say, let the constitution be fairly tried; and let our people also be fairly tried, and see if they are not worthy of their sites, and worthy of every privilege which a Briton enjoys at home. Are they to be told, and by the guilty interested parties too, that after having possessed certain political rights common to every Briton, they must lose them by coming to Canada, though the colony is professedly ruled by the British constitution? Is this the way to render them contented and prosperous? Are the men against whom the people have complained thus to evade enquiry and punishment? Are they to gain a few sips in their respective offices, by inducing the only means that can subject them to a just accountability? Truly we are "advancing a few steps backward," as the Irishman said, when the parties who are impeached are allowed to be witnesses and judges in their own cause, and to malign the high tribunal before which they ought to be arraigned. Does not the very mode of their defence render them subject to greater suspicion? But why do we speak as if the case were doubtful? Has not the country condemned them already? and is not this the reason why they invent every flimsy pretext for avoiding a responsibility to the country? The people are not to be treated with the British constitution, forsooth, for fear they should turn its powers against the British empire! It wanted but this insult to cap the climax of the "family compact" folly. As the slave-holder justifies his iron rule by saying that the slave is fit for no other, so the "compact" justify their robbery of the people's rights by pretending that they do not know their value, and are not fit to be entrusted with them. Trace the people in order to maintain an unconstitutional away order them! Well do the "compact" copy the slave-holders.

The Chronicle & Gazette has at length gone "clean daff." He has for some time shown decided symptoms of approaching insanity, and now the malady has reached a crisis, and he is handed

over for medical treatment. He has long been famous for finding out *Mares' nests*, and in his last paper he turns up one, over which he crowls with all the fervour of a maniac who takes himself for a dunghill fowl. The newly discovered *Mares' nest* is this—that we did not write the leading article of our last number. This silliness is peculiar to the Chronicle. He has tried the same trick in former years. When we opposed Sir F. Head on the Bank question, the Chronicle thrust his horns out of his shell, and whimpered forth that we did not write the articles. Again, when we exposed the folly of Sir F. Head's administration, the Chronicle squeaked his penny trumpet to deny our being the author of the remarks. It might have been thought that by this time he would have discovered his mistake, and have suffered himself to perceive the truth; but no. He is one of that class who are incapable of learning. His soul would go into his master's eye, and still leave room for the thread. His head is a mere squash filled with butter, which he has churned so often in rain, that in self defence, he imagines other people's heads are also mere milk bowls. We verily believe that we shall have to borrow an Irishman's shillelagh, and fetch the Chronicle a smart rap on his squashy crown, before he will admit that we have any corporal substance and attributes. He makes an excellent "Judy," for he is never tired of being laughed at. But now for the *Mares' nest* over which he has played such fantastic tricks.

Be it known then, to all whom it may concern, especially to the "Judy" of the Chronicle & Gazette, that the leading article of our last paper was written by myself, in our office, on Friday the twenty-fourth of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-nine. We must be very particular, because we have to satisfy a lunatic, and lunatics are always unreasonable. If it will stop the churning of his substitute for a brain, we will tell him the precise time when we began and finished the aforesaid article; and what kind of pens we used in writing it, whether crow quill, gray goose, swan or steel; and also what kind of ink was used, whether gray or red, blue or black; in short, every kind of information that may stop the tempest in the squash which he owns as a head, shall be fully given, free of all cost or charges, for we "pity the sorrows of the poor good man."

And this king of squashes must not only represent the author of our article, but also its nature. He kindly intimates that he dare not openly assert that we would have the people to be subjected to local self government as Mackenzie did. This villence is not peculiar to the Chronicle. Most of the Tory destructive papers in the province press the same course, and represent those who support local self government as the followers of Mackenzie, and ready to seek it by the same means as he did. Let the Chronicle speak plainly on this point, and we will give him a very plain answer. We are half inclined to give it one; but let it pass. He quotes part of our article, in order to countenance his insinuation, and as usual he garbles his quotations. He quotes part of a paragraph, but leaves out its close, which shows that the principle for which we contend is also maintained by the Tories whenever their interests are affected. It would not do for him, good honest soul, to show that none more strongly insist on local self government than the Tories do whenever their pockets are touched. We and the people happen to think that the Tory principle will cover all our local affairs as well as some of them—There is neither sense nor reason in applying that principle when it is to benefit the people, and withholding it when it is to benefit the people. But what do the Tories care for the people, except as they can sponge money from them?

The Chronicle also quotes our remarks that the people must help themselves, but he omits our statement of how they must do it. He does this, with characteristic villany, in order that he may have some room to insinuate that we would have the people to rebel. We said that the people "must choose representatives who will firmly maintain their rights, and then they will be granted;" but the infamously Chronicle could not quote that, though it immediately followed his quotation. To have done that would have laid bare his bellish motives, and have unmasked the skulking tyrant in slander.

He notices our remark that we never expected much from the Home Government. We made the same remark, in substance, about twelve months ago, and again a month before the late session of the Provincial Legislature. But why do we expect nothing from the Home Government? Not every part objectionable, but towards Canada are in every part objectionable, but towards Canada are in every part objectionable, but towards Canada are in every part objectionable. The make fair speeches, send out liberal instructions, and new Governors, but still there is no change here. The instructions are strangled in Toronto; the Governors are governed by the "family compact" and Colonial misrule continues, if not unchecked, at least unchanged. When the Home Government make a complete change of office holders in this province, we shall then think that they are in earnest, and intend to give us something more than fine speeches and promises. Even in this very speech of Lord John Russell's, which the Chronicle thinks so conclusive against our views, his Lordship virtually grants all we desire. He complained that his words had been misrepresented, and said that what "he really said was, that the Executive should be carried on in such a way as that their measures should be acceptable and agreeable to the representatives of the people, and that he saw no reason why the government should not agree to adopt the measures approved of by a majority of the colonists." Now this is the substance of all that we have ever contended for, and if the Home government act faithfully in the spirit of these words, they will content us. But in order to this, we say again that our people must help themselves, by choosing representatives who will firmly insist on this British principle, and then they will be granted.

The Chronicle closes with some truisms and trash respecting affairs in Canada. He says that we have the choice of our representatives. We have; and the complaint is that they have not powers belonging to them by the British constitution. They cannot bring the government to agree with them. The "Family Compact" laugh the people's representatives to scorn, and take good care to suppress all measures that are not agreeable to their imperious masters. Take one notorious example. For twelve or fourteen years the people's representatives passed bills to appropriate the Clergy Reserves to education. On this point, long agreed with reformers, and whatever the Houses might be in other respects, these bills were passed by large majorities. But for all these years they were set at defiance. To say nothing then of matters sought to be carried by Reform Houses, on this matter, in which reformers and Tory were one, their untired voices were of no avail. The people's representatives have not their proper weight with the government. They are mere cyphers, to which the "family compact" give what value they choose. What would have been said or done in England if successive Home Governments, Tory and Reform, had passed bills for 14 years, to be as often quashed by the government? The answer we leave, as we do not leave the guilty and degraded Chronicle. The fallacy of some other remarks of his might be exposed, but enough at present.

A writer in the Star makes some corrections of our account of the Haldimand reform meeting—Our information was derived from authority quite as good as his at any rate; but as he and his party are very high for very little things, we will give his account. He says that the meeting was held at the Four Corners; that not more than three hundred were present, and that these were partly from the adjoining counties. He says also that the Bull which was injured was of less value than we were informed, and that its owner does not think the Tories did the deed. On this point we have our own opinion. A Tory from that quarter

boasted of the deed as a very clever thing, but his brother Tory in Kingston, and in his last paper he turns up one, over which he crowls with all the fervour of a maniac who takes himself for a dunghill fowl. The newly discovered *Mares' nest* is this—that we did not write the leading article of our last number. This silliness is peculiar to the Chronicle. He has tried the same trick in former years. When we opposed Sir F. Head on the Bank question, the Chronicle thrust his horns out of his shell, and whimpered forth that we did not write the articles. Again, when we exposed the folly of Sir F. Head's administration, the Chronicle squeaked his penny trumpet to deny our being the author of the remarks. It might have been thought that by this time he would have discovered his mistake, and have suffered himself to perceive the truth; but no. He is one of that class who are incapable of learning. His soul would go into his master's eye, and still leave room for the thread. His head is a mere squash filled with butter, which he has churned so often in rain, that in self defence, he imagines other people's heads are also mere milk bowls. We verily believe that we shall have to borrow an Irishman's shillelagh, and fetch the Chronicle a smart rap on his squashy crown, before he will admit that we have any corporal substance and attributes. He makes an excellent "Judy," for he is never tired of being laughed at. But now for the *Mares' nest* over which he has played such fantastic tricks.

Be it known then, to all whom it may concern, especially to the "Judy" of the Chronicle & Gazette, that the leading article of our last paper was written by myself, in our office, on Friday the twenty-fourth of July, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and thirty-nine. We must be very particular, because we have to satisfy a lunatic, and lunatics are always unreasonable. If it will stop the churning of his substitute for a brain, we will tell him the precise time when we began and finished the aforesaid article; and what kind of pens we used in writing it, whether crow quill, gray goose, swan or steel; and also what kind of ink was used, whether gray or red, blue or black; in short, every kind of information that may stop the tempest in the squash which he owns as a head, shall be fully given, free of all cost or charges, for we "pity the sorrows of the poor good man."

And this king of squashes must not only represent the author of our article, but also its nature. He kindly intimates that he dare not openly assert that we would have the people to be subjected to local self government as Mackenzie did. This villence is not peculiar to the Chronicle. Most of the Tory destructive papers in the province press the same course, and represent those who support local self government as the followers of Mackenzie, and ready to seek it by the same means as he did. Let the Chronicle speak plainly on this point, and we will give him a very plain answer. We are half inclined to give it one; but let it pass. He quotes part of our article, in order to countenance his insinuation, and as usual he garbles his quotations. He quotes part of a paragraph, but leaves out its close, which shows that the principle for which we contend is also maintained by the Tories whenever their interests are affected. It would not do for him, good honest soul, to show that none more strongly insist on local self government than the Tories do whenever their pockets are touched. We and the people happen to think that the Tory principle will cover all our local affairs as well as some of them—There is neither sense nor reason in applying that principle when it is to benefit the people, and withholding it when it is to benefit the people. But what do the Tories care for the people, except as they can sponge money from them?

The Chronicle also quotes our remarks that the people must help themselves, but he omits our statement of how they must do it. He does this, with characteristic villany, in order that he may have some room to insinuate that we would have the people to rebel. We said that the people "must choose representatives who will firmly maintain their rights, and then they will be granted;" but the infamously Chronicle could not quote that, though it immediately followed his quotation. To have done that would have laid bare his bellish motives, and have unmasked the skulking tyrant in slander.

He notices our remark that we never expected much from the Home Government. We made the same remark, in substance, about twelve months ago, and again a month before the late session of the Provincial Legislature. But why do we expect nothing from the Home Government? Not every part objectionable, but towards Canada are in every part objectionable, but towards Canada are in every part objectionable. The make fair speeches, send out liberal instructions, and new Governors, but still there is no change here. The instructions are strangled in Toronto; the Governors are governed by the "family compact" and Colonial misrule continues, if not unchecked, at least unchanged. When the Home Government make a complete change of office holders in this province, we shall then think that they are in earnest, and intend to give us something more than fine speeches and promises. Even in this very speech of Lord John Russell's, which the Chronicle thinks so conclusive against our views, his Lordship virtually grants all we desire. He complained that his words had been misrepresented, and said that what "he really said was, that the Executive should be carried on in such a way as that their measures should be acceptable and agreeable to the representatives of the people, and that he saw no reason why the government should not agree to adopt the measures approved of by a majority of the colonists." Now this is the substance of all that we have ever contended for, and if the Home government act faithfully in the spirit of these words, they will content us. But in order to this, we say again that our people must help themselves, by choosing representatives who will firmly insist on this British principle, and then they will be granted.

The Chronicle closes with some truisms and trash respecting affairs in Canada. He says that we have the choice of our representatives. We have; and the complaint is that they have not powers belonging to them by the British constitution. They cannot bring the government to agree with them. The "Family Compact" laugh the people's representatives to scorn, and take good care to suppress all measures that are not agreeable to their imperious masters. Take one notorious example. For twelve or fourteen years the people's representatives passed bills to appropriate the Clergy Reserves to education. On this point, long agreed with reformers, and whatever the Houses might be in other respects, these bills were passed by large majorities. But for all these years they were set at defiance. To say nothing then of matters sought to be carried by Reform Houses, on this matter, in which reformers and Tory were one, their untired voices were of no avail. The people's representatives have not their proper weight with the government. They are mere cyphers, to which the "family compact" give what value they choose. What would have been said or done in England if successive Home Governments, Tory and Reform, had passed bills for 14 years, to be as often quashed by the government? The answer we leave, as we do not leave the guilty and degraded Chronicle. The fallacy of some other remarks of his might be exposed, but enough at present.

A writer in the Star makes some corrections of our account of the Haldimand reform meeting—Our information was derived from authority quite as good as his at any rate; but as he and his party are very high for very little things, we will give his account. He says that the meeting was held at the Four Corners; that not more than three hundred were present, and that these were partly from the adjoining counties. He says also that the Bull which was injured was of less value than we were informed, and that its owner does not think the Tories did the deed. On this point we have our own opinion. A Tory from that quarter

boasted of the deed as a very clever thing, but his brother Tory in Kingston, and in his last paper he turns up one, over which he crowls with all the fervour of a maniac who takes himself for a dunghill fowl. The newly discovered *Mares' nest* is this—that we did not write the leading article of our last number. This silliness is peculiar to the Chronicle. He has tried the same trick in former years. When we opposed Sir F. Head on the Bank question, the Chronicle thrust his horns out of his shell, and whimpered forth that we did not write the articles. Again, when we exposed the folly of Sir F. Head's administration, the Chronicle squeaked his penny trumpet to deny our being the author of the remarks. It might have been thought that by this time he would have discovered his mistake, and have suffered himself to perceive the truth; but no. He is one of that class who are incapable of learning. His soul would go into his master's eye, and still leave room for the thread. His head is a mere squash filled with butter, which he has churned so often in rain, that in self defence, he imagines other people's heads are also mere milk bowls. We verily believe that we shall have to borrow an Irishman's shillelagh, and fetch the Chronicle a smart rap on his squashy crown, before he will admit that we have any corporal substance and attributes. He makes an excellent "Judy," for he is never tired of being laughed at. But now for the *Mares' nest* over which he has played such fantastic tricks.

Public Record Office Reference. 47/38. COPYRIGHT OF PHOTOGRAPH RESERVED TO PUBLIC RECORD OFFICE. FOR PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE, APPLY TO PUBLIC ARCHIVES, OTTAWA.