

en is the great
ce of all our
in England
according to
Governor
ling to Ameri
n's deputy
capital of Can
can do in the
ery heart
a powerful
despot, while
tutional and
and the Gov
with the ap
re it may be
Surely there
British prin
ch a course
ogs continue

the Country in the hands of persons who are not responsible to the people, and then what will be our condition. How long would it be before the Province would again be at the mercy of the old "Family Compact." How long would it be before the people would be powerless and the country ruined. It is unreasonable to argue that, where there is no responsibility there will be faithfulness, and we have ever found that nothing but a careful watchfulness on the part of the people over their public servants, and a direct control over their conduct and actions, can or will secure a due regard to the public interests. This Province furnishes but too melancholy a proof of what a country suffers where there is no responsibility to the people.

The great Mr. Gowan in the same pamphlet says, "Thus we find that the irresponsible system, instead of benefitting Canada, discourages British population, inflames the Reformers, satisfies none but the vile 'Compact,' taxes England, impoverishes Canada and benefits the United States. If any man of common observation will only divest himself of prejudice and look at the Country from East to West, he cannot fail to behold the fruits which the irresponsible tree has produced."

Again he says, "Do we not see Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward's Island, Newfoundland, and Cape Breton, all 'hungering and thirsting' for local responsibility, and all declaring in language not to be misunderstood, that without it they can hope for no peace, no prosperity."

Again Mr. Gowan says, "The very nature of a free constitution necessarily involves responsibility without which principle the name is but a mockery. If there is to be no direct and immediate accountability within the Colony it is absurd to talk of a Colonial Administration. But if we are to have a free and represen-

tative form of Government, let us have that local independence and responsibility, which its spirit guarantees. Let us not be mocked with the name and deprived of the reality. Both systems, the responsible and irresponsible have been tried. The former in England, the latter in Canada. One has succeeded, the other has failed. One has produced charity, power and wealth, the other sanguinary strife, weakness and poverty."

Sir Charles Metcalfe contends that the people of Canada have no right to interfere in appointments to office. That it is the prerogative of the Crown with which we have nothing to do. That therefore he may exercise the patronage of the Country, even in direct opposition to the advice of his Council, and it may be to the prejudice of the public interests and in violation of the public feeling. This is certainly unjust. The people of Canada are alone interested in the good or bad conduct of their public servants, and we therefore ask if it is right or reasonable that they should have no voice in the selection of those servants. How can we look for or how can we secure that careful attention, and that strict integrity on the part of our public servants which it is necessary for them to maintain, when they know and feel that they hold their offices independent of us. To make them industrious and honest we must make them responsible to the people of Canada. This is what was intended by Responsible Government.

Again Mr. Gowan says, "It seems absurd to argue that the people do not desire Responsible Government, which simply means in other words, that they do not desire the Government to be conducted as they wish. To suppose that any set of men could desire a government to be conducted by persons in whom they have no confidence, in opposition to those who possess their confidence is too pre-