

## REPEAL IN HALDIMAND COUNTY.

The following Resolution was debated in County Council, Dec. 20, 1855, and adopted:

Moved by Mr. John McDonald, Reeve of Caledonia, seconded Mr. Matthew Gill, Reeve of Oneida, that, whereas this Council exceedingly regrets the unprecedented extravagant grants and waste of the people's money by the present and former Ministers of the Crown, at Quebec, aided by the people's Representatives in Parliament, who had promised better things on the Hastings; and whereas the Union of Upper with Lower Canada has only given a power to the latter to have her demands immediately satisfied to the great injury and injustice of Upper Canada:—Resolved that the Clerk of this Council be required to draw up an humble petition to Her Majesty the Queen, signed by the Warden and Clerk on behalf of this Council, humbly beseeching Her Majesty that she will be graciously pleased to recommend the passage of an Act by the Imperial Legislature to unite the whole of the British North American Provinces; or otherwise, that Her Majesty would be graciously pleased to cause a dissolution of Upper and Lower Canada, so that the inhabitants of those Provinces of British origin and who speak the English language may have their wishes and interest honestly attended to, and receive that justice to which they believe themselves entitled. Yeas,—Gill, Park, Honsberger, Kellsey and McDonald—5.—Nays,—Findlay, Blott, Young and Shannon—4. Resolution adopted; majority one.

## L. J. PAPINEAU'S FAMOUS MANIFESTO AGAINST THE UNION OF THE CANADAS, AND IN FAVOR OF REPRESENTATION BY POPULATION.

TO THE ELECTORS OF THE COUNTIES OF  
HUNTINGDON AND ST. MAURICE.

GENTLEMEN:—When a deputation of influential men from the County of Huntingdon—the first in the country as to population, and which is second to none in intelligence, in agricultural and industrial wealth, but especially in patriotic devotion, in sacrifices made, in sufferings endured, in ravages experienced, as much as in any other part of the Province, owing to its patriotic devotion—avails itself of the opportunity of the first election made since my return to the bosom of my country after eight years of absence in a foreign land, to beg of me to become a candidate for the honour of representing them in Parliament,—when in reply to my objections, they answer not only with argument, but when they appeal to reminiscences, and sentiments the most touching—and when some of them say to me, "For the holy cause of the country, we have suffered for in common: we in our families as you in yours: we in our person as you in yours; we have returned from exile, and from transportation to the Penal Colonies, where we have been ill treated; you were able to escape the vengeance of our persecutors, and our knowledge of that fact was a consolation, for us in

*France and America.*

our sufferings; you were able to find a protecting

asylum in the time of trouble in the classic land of liberty—the happy country which adjoins us, the glorious and powerful confederation of the United States—and afterwards in that hospitable, polite, and learned land of our ancestors, "La Belle France,"—the instructress for years of those European people who desire to follow in her steps in the path of liberty, progress, and the highest civilization.—We in the name of our past trials—as men who have abandoned none of our convictions—who abjure none of our former opinions—who believe you to be as unchanged as ourselves—we beg of you to consent to represent us. We know enough of the country to be able to assure you that we express its unanimous wishes; and that we shall bring joy to it, if we carry with us your acceptance. To give a refusal founded on personal considerations, upon the love of repose after long years of agitation, would be a disgrace and a meanness of which I shall not be guilty. Should I give such refusal, it will only be after full consideration of the benefit that may result from my election or my retirement. I incline to believe that at the present moment—I do not say always—my retirement will be the most advisable step. I owe it to your kindness—to my former position—not to withdraw without strong reasons for doing so; and I am compelled by your solicitude to make them public and to allow you to judge of them.

How has the confidence with which you honour me been inspired? It can only have been by your observation of my public life during thirty years—during a struggle almost incessant, energetic, but conscientious, against a bad Government; but much less guilty than that has become since.

### *The British Court and Aristocracy.*

That bad government is not, in my opinion, that of the Murphys, Haldimands, Craigs, Dalhousies, Colbornes, Thomsons, and others, under which we and our fathers have successively suffered;—it is that of England, which has censured the Prevosts, Sherbrookes, Kempts, and Bagots who endeavoured slightly to ameliorate the rigour of their instructions, through a desire to be moderately just towards us.

That this Government was a bad one is no longer a disputed question. The problem was first solved by the complaints of the people, and since by the denunciations full of bitterness as of truth which the representatives of royalty have fulminated against the system of which we complain. The report of Lord Durham, the correspondence of Lord Sydenham, in those parts in which they examine the conduct and opposing pretensions of the executive and of the representative bodies in the two Canadas, carry condemnation against all the administrations subsequent to the introduction of the representative system as formal as the most zealous patriots had ever expressed. It was Lord Sydenham who said "When I look at what the government and the administration of the Province has been, my only astonishment is that they should have endured it so long. For my own part, strong as is my antipathy to Yankee domination and rule, I would never have combatted against them as thousands of poor devils have done, whom the Family Compact never cease to call rebels, in order to preserve such a government as they had." The noble writer, thus partial to the aristocracy which had showered upon him wealth and honors, hostile and prejudiced against the wise institutions of the United States, the most perfect with which up to this time, humanity has been gifted, says here with more authority than any colonialist had ever done, that the government attacked did not deserve to be defended. Is there then a wide difference between the government which being attacked does not deserve that it should be defended by force of arms, and that which deserves that arms should be taken up to overthrow it? The writer is,

quest  
disting  
have  
have  
men.

Con.

The  
is ab  
who  
flow  
order  
reform  
and s  
has b  
at ra  
and t  
and M  
this c  
influe  
of the  
believ  
passer  
tempt  
public  
perser  
defenc  
esta h  
that  
to be  
wishes  
jority  
doing  
outwa  
who h  
assum  
upon  
fluenc  
of the  
than t  
hes, it

Lor  
to be  
govern  
not by  
prepar  
ment.  
eyes,  
blishe  
oppose  
Act w  
Sucha  
sed fe  
first p  
as nul  
nies, i  
withou  
if he r  
and a  
—that  
degrad  
tion, d  
of inte  
whom  
long a  
obey a  
not lo  
a disg  
done  
abroga

Befo  
lio op  
as to  
of con