

COPY of CORRESPONDENCE between the GOVERNORS of the BRITISH NORTH AMERICAN PROVINCES and the SECRETARY OF STATE, relative to the Introduction of Responsible Government into those Colonies.

C A N A D A.

CANADA.

—No. 1.—

(No. 19.)

COPY of a DESPATCH from Lord *John Russell* to the Right Hon. *C. Poulett Thomson*.

Sir,

Downing-street, 14 October 1839.

It appears from Sir George Arthur's despatches that you may encounter much difficulty in subduing the excitement which prevails on the question of what is called "Responsible Government." I have to instruct you, however, to refuse any explanation which may be construed to imply an acquiescence in the petitions and addresses upon this subject. I cannot better commence this despatch than by a reference to the resolutions of both Houses of Parliament, of the 28th April and 9th May, in the year 1837.

The Assembly of Lower Canada having repeatedly pressed this point, Her Majesty's confidential advisers at that period thought it necessary not only to explain their views in the communications of the Secretary of State, but expressly called for the opinion of Parliament on the subject. The Crown and the two Houses of Lords and Commons having thus decisively pronounced a judgment upon the question, you will consider yourself precluded from entertaining any proposition on the subject.

It does not appear, indeed, that any very definite meaning is generally agreed upon by those who call themselves the advocates of this principle; but its very vagueness is a source of delusion, and, if at all encouraged, would prove the cause of embarrassment and danger.

The constitution of England, after long struggles and alternate success, has settled into a form of government in which the prerogative of the Crown is undisputed, but is never exercised without advice. Hence the exercise only is questioned, and however the use of the authority may be condemned, the authority itself remains untouched.

This is the practical solution of a great problem, the result of a contest which from 1640 to 1690 shook the monarchy and disturbed the peace of the country.

But if we seek to apply such a practice to a colony, we shall at once find ourselves at fault. The power for which a minister is responsible in England is not his own power, but the power of the Crown, of which he is for the time the organ. It is obvious that the executive councillor of a colony is in a situation totally different. The Governor, under whom he serves, receives his orders from the Crown of England; but can the colonial council be the advisers of the Crown of England? Evidently not, for the Crown has other advisers, for the same functions, and with superior authority.

It may happen, therefore, that the Governor receives at one and the same time instructions from the Queen, and advice from his executive council, totally at variance with each other. If he is to obey his instructions from England, the parallel of constitutional responsibility entirely fails; if, on the other hand, he is to follow the advice of his council, he is no longer a subordinate officer, but an independent sovereign.

There are some cases in which the force of these objections is so manifest, that those who at first made no distinction between the constitution of the United Kingdom and that of the colonies, admit their strength: I allude to the questions of foreign war and international relations, whether of trade or diplomacy. It is now said that internal government is alone intended.

No. 1.

Lord John Russell
to the Right Hon. C.
Poulett Thomson.
14 October 1839.