

United States, had found out that they had not a class of men capable of working the British system, so they at once disunited the Legislature from the Executive. They left to the representatives of the people the whole responsibility of making the laws, and they left to the Government only the responsibility of carrying out the laws, after these were made by the people. It is not, therefore, to be wondered at if British responsible government has been found by experience to be unfit for the circumstances of Canada. And this is still less to be wondered at when we see that, even in England, their once constitutional political parties, representing the great interests of the country and empire, are now no longer embodiments of principles, but only conspiracies of men, quite as void of any common principle as our political parties are in Canada, and which can only be allowed the name of constitutional parties by an excess of courtesy, which violates the truth. I have long seen the necessity for some change of system, and on 2nd April last I laid on the table of Parliament a notice of the following motion, which I give here as the best way of illustrating my view of our provincial position:

"That our highly prized constitutional principle of Responsible Government has become in practice an instrument of the greatest legislative tyranny, and of the most flagrant Executive injustice—members of this House, although representatives of large majorities of their constituencies, and although also coinciding in sentiment with a majority of the whole people in their Section of the Province, as expressed through their Representatives, being practically deprived of all influence in the Legislation of the Province, and of all influence over the patronage and other acts of the Executive Government in their respective localities: That until the principle of Representation by Population, without regard to a dividing line between Upper and Lower Canada, receives the sanction of the double majority, or of a majority of the Representatives both of Upper and of Lower Canada, it is imperative to the well-working of Responsible Government that the Double Majority principle should be in practical operation so far, that if, on a vote of want of confidence (of which a week's notice shall have been given) there is found a majority of the whole members from either Section (or thirty-three members from either Section of the Province) against the Government, it will be the duty of the Ministers representing such Section in the Cabinet to resign their offices, as no longer representing the public opinion of such Section of the Province."

WHAT THE CHANGE OF SYSTEM SHOULD BE.

In my Parliamentary motion, I have indicated my view to be that before adopting the American principle of officers directly elected by the people, we should give another trial to a Responsible Government modified to suit the circumstances of Canada. I have no objections that to be a member of Parliament should be a necessary qualification for the heads of departments or Canadian Ministers of the Crown, but I think that these Ministers, though in Parliament, should not be held responsible for the legislation of the country. I think their responsibility should extend no farther than for their Executive acts, and they should go out of office only on a solemn vote of want of confidence being carried against them by a majority of all the members, absent as well as present, from their particular section of Canada. All which, I see, can be easily arranged in the same way as Responsible Government was established in 1841, viz., by Resolution of the House of Assembly.

THE NECESSITY OF OUR ADOPTING A PATRIOTIC POLICY IN REGARD TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF OUR OWN PEOPLE.

But political systems or forms of Government are, after all, *not* the most important considerations, for people will starve under a Republic equally as under a monarchy. Even if we could attain Representation by Population in Canada, or something that would suit the same purpose, we should only have attained a popular *machinery*, and the question would remain as to the object to which it will be applied. At present, however, neither our Ministry nor Parliamentary Opposition possess any very distinctive principles or policy—the practice of the Government being Protectionist while their principle is Free Trade as much as is that of the Opposition, the members of both knowing that they dare not avow the principle of Free Trade or at least dare not attempt to practise it. The time seems, therefore, to have come when individuals and parties should be no longer tolerated in usurping for church questions and abstract theories of Government the *first* place in our Provincial politics, and should be told that the question of the employment of a people is THE GREAT CONSTITUTIONAL QUESTION IN EVERY COUNTRY, and one in importance far before all other questions, even those of forms of Government.

WHAT THE TRUE ECONOMIC POLICY FOR CANADA IS.

Of old, He was said to be the greatest patriot who made two blades of grass grow where