

pon the re-
man's Report.
1841? Are
d claims as
time of the
othing more
since then
ations did
hands made
ake any to-
e demands,
Charta reso-
s from Lord
not be for-
Government
olutions of
d Durham's
e limitations
Despatch of
n explained
dded the ac-
ed working.
joined toge-
be put asun-
aldwin took
Mr. Sullivan
an prove to
in that des-
gans of the
emselves sa-
on. The fol-
which I in-
an, April 8,
owing papers
ves satisfied
rd John Rus-
ish Colonist,
Mirror, the
ion Express,
Montreal Ga-
s') pronoun-
ession of re-
always un-
is an extra-
pleased that
Ve have been
DRAPER is
it stated that
efore he was
Thus are all
ature system
st differences

rmers as well
ting the ex-
Despatch.—
15th of April,
on that des-
of agreement
ord Durham's
what was not
armed with it
express my-
id he and his
however, bow
am not pre-
to deny my
he right of fu-
the subject;—
utiful respect,

and under pledge of good government, we bow to the royal decision; we do so frankly, openly, unequivocally, and calmly await the experiment of the Government remedy. We shall exercise our pleasure as to our opinion on the theory itself, and as to what we may say or do respecting it in future years; but for the present we yield obedience to the mandate from the Throne; and will render the Governor General's administration all the support in our power."

It is all-important that every man in Canada should not be mistaken as to the decision of Her Majesty's Government. That was stated by Lord Stanley, "in every word of whose statements (Sir Robert Peel said) I—and I am sure I speak their sentiments—and the rest of the Government entirely concur. Lord Stanley said that Her Majesty's Government concurred in Lord Durham's Report, as explained and applied in the despatch of Lord John Russell.—Then Lord Stanley expressed the sentiments (sanctioned by the cheers of the House) of Her Majesty's Government thus, in reply to Mr. Roebuck:—"Now the hon. and learned gentleman had asked him (Lord Stanley) whether he concurred in the views which had been taken by Sir Charles Bagot on the subject of Responsible Government, whether he would state explicitly to the House what his own sense of Responsible government was? (Hear.) He would do so. (Hear.) By responsible government, he understood that the administration of Canada was to be carried on by the heads of departments enjoying the confidence of the people and of the Legislature of Canada; and responsible to the Legislature of the colony for the due exercise of the functions of each of their departments. (Hear.) Nay, more he also understood by it that the Governor in introducing and expounding measures for the consideration of the Parliament of Canada, should be guided by the advice of those whom he might have called to his council. But if the honourable gentleman asked him whether, by responsible government, he meant that the Governor was to be the mere machine or passive instrument of any set of men or party in the colony, his answer was, that he could understand very well to what it might lead, but that such a system was not consistent with constitutional government in a British colony, under the authority of a British Governor. (Cheers.) He therefore approved of the conduct of Sir Charles Metcalfe—(cheers).—in not agreeing to the terms which his council wished to impose upon him. Sir Charles Metcalfe, however, they laid down in express terms, his adherence to the resolutions of the third September, 1841, to which the honourable and learned gentleman had adverted—that the head of the Executive Government was responsible to the Imperial authority alone, but that the management of the local affairs of the colony were only to be carried on by him, with the assistance of subordinate officers of the government. Sir Charles Metcalfe had, in the most express and explicit terms adhered to the principle of the resolu-

tions to which he had just adverted, and said, in doing so, that he considered any other system of government, as impracticable in the Province of Canada. (Hear, Hear.) He (Lord Stanley) was not disposed to enter into the question whether responsible Government was or was not the one most likely to conduce to good government, to conciliate the opinions of the people of Canada, or to enlist in the public service men of honesty, character, integrity and faith; but the principle had been conceded both here and in Canada, and to it Sir Charles Metcalfe had agreed. The resolutions in question said that the Governor General was to be responsible; but the hon. and learned gentleman would leave him without responsibility at Home, but an instrument in the hands of the Executive Council and responsible to them. The two responsibilities might, by possibility be exercised by mutual forbearance and good sense on the part of the hon. and learned member (Mr. Roebuck) be adopted, and the Governor could be nothing more than a mere agent in the hands of the Executive Council—(hear, hear)—and yet, at the same time, responsible at home.—This was practically absurd, for without power there could be no responsibility."

I submit, therefore, that the Imperial authority has fully sanctioned responsible government, as desired by the people of Canada; and that every man and association should be rejected and avoided that persists in resistance against Her Majesty and her Representative in Canada.

2.—I would remark, in the next place, that the people can have no interest in perpetuating strife and contention. Party editors and office-seeking partizans may gain by it; but the people will be as a picked goose or a pillaged householder. The value of property is not increased by agitation; nor the transaction of commerce advanced by strife; nor the influx of immigration, or the investment of capital, promoted by commotion; nor are the interests of Religion extended by calumny, or its spirit diffused by clamour; nor are the resources of the country, improved by collision, nor its laws best administered by confederacy, nor its energies strengthened by division. In every respect must the people be a loser, and the country a sufferer from strife and contention.

3.—Nor can the people advance their interests by ranging themselves under the banner of party leaders, and disputing about men. To contend for principles is patriotic; but the Home Government have avowed all the principles ever contended for: and to dispute about men—the only remaining topic of contention—is factious. The late Rev. Robert Hall has forcibly remarked that "factions are founded on men;" and that in contending for them, "the people are candidates, for servitude, and are only debating whose livery they shall wear." The same writer, after noticing that in the early times of the Roman Government, they were disputes relative to the principles of the Government between the patricians and plebians, and remarks—"in the