

	Page
sible government." A Colonial electorate too fickle, individualistic and unstable for such a trust, however suited to other conditions. The dangers are too great to throw off active Imperial control. Durham is unreliable and inaccurate.	
CXXXVI. Lord John Russell on Canadian Affairs, June, 1839 . . .	478
Various complexities and possible complications render impossible any grant of full responsible government to the Canadas.	
CXXXVII. Joseph Howe to Lord John Russell, September, 1839 . . .	480
This and the three following documents were addressed as open letters to Lord John Russell in reply to his speech of June, 1839 (No. CXXXVI.). Howe agrees with Durham that the lack of "Responsible Government" is the foundation cause of all the troubles in the Colonies. Is the withholding of it due to a suspicion of Colonial loyalty? That loyalty will bear full examination. Government by Executive Councils as absurd and unjust as it is futile. Efforts at reform only prove "the cure worse than the disease." No real remedy except Lord Durham's. The dangers? None in reality. The result? The people satisfied and happy. Does dependence in an Empire imply a different form of constitutional government than in England? If so, why, by what right, government by a minority? Will a majority be more "disloyal" governing themselves than when under the irritation of minority rule? Is Her Majesty in mortal terror because the majority of the citizens of London govern the city? Does any one, except in a spirit of humour, imagine the Lord Mayor declaring war on France? Would we do it in Canada? Suppose we did, you could easily check us.	
CXXXVIII. Joseph Howe to Lord John Russell, September, 1839 . . .	487
Examines Russell's objections to Responsible Government. The Governors could, under it, be made responsible to the Assembly, as the Ministers of the Crown in England are held responsible. They would be bound by the same limitations, and there would be neither more nor less invasion of the sovereignty of the Crown. Suppose they receive unconstitutional advice from a Colonial Ministry—what then? May not this equally occur in England? The irresponsibility of Governors at present is humourously but trenchantly analysed. Suppose a typical "Governor" made Mayor of Liverpool, with all the present bag and baggage of "instructions," "despatches," and all the present method of government as known in the Colonies—"he must be an angel of light indeed, if we does not throw the good city of Liverpool into confusion." What answer to the "confusion"? The "Mayor" can blame someone else—can throw the responsibility on the "Colonial" Office. "No form of Government could well be devised more ridiculous." The "Mayor's" officials—the "Executive"—are <i>à fortiori</i> more irresponsible.	