





**IMAGE EVALUATION  
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**



**Photographic  
Sciences  
Corporation**

23 WEST MAIN STREET  
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580  
(716) 872-4503

25  
28  
32  
36  
40  
2.0  
1.8

**CIHM/ICMH  
Microfiche  
Series.**

**CIHM/ICMH  
Collection de  
microfiches.**



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

10  
01

**© 1987**



The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:



Metropolitan Toronto Library  
Canadian History Department

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol  $\rightarrow$  (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol  $\nabla$  (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:

Metropolitan Toronto Library  
Canadian History Department

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole  $\rightarrow$  signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole  $\nabla$  signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.

T

RE

In p

10

+

**A D D R E S S**

971.06.137

*To the People of the Colborne District,*

BY THE

**Reform Association of Peterboro,**

BEING A BRANCH OF THE

**REFORM ASSOCIATION OF CANADA,**

In pursuance of a Resolution adopted at a General Meeting  
held in Peterboro, on the 25th day of April, 1844.

---

**P E T E R B O R O .**

PRINTED AT THE CHRONICLE OFFICE.

ALBERTA

To the Board of the ...

A-17912

...



MAY 5 1936

...

...

...

...

F  
In  
affair  
to a  
time  
love  
enjo  
Brit  
to s  
C  
thea  
litic  
tent  
been  
min  
tion  
even  
V  
py o  
ty v  
ago  
and  
den  
are  
infl  
each  
from  
nin  
part  
cons  
fille  
but  
coli  
C  
pop  
hab  
telli  
mit  
are  
The  
and  
mal

## ADDRESS, &c.

### Fellow Subjects,

In the present condition of the public affairs of this Province, we think it right to address you. We consider that the time has arrived when every man who loves British liberty and who wishes to enjoy the blessings and protection of the British Constitution should do something to secure them.

Canada has once more become the theatre of excitement and of violent political discussion. That peace and contentment which so lately prevailed, have been scattered to the winds and people's minds have again been disturbed by questions which they thought had been forever set at rest.

When we compare our present unhappy condition with the universal tranquillity which prevailed only one short year ago, and when we look upon the violent and bitter contentions which have suddenly sprung up amongst us, and which are dividing our population into parties, influenced by the worst feelings towards each other and when we see men forced from their usual avocations and brought to mingle once more in political warfare and party strife and when we reflect upon the consequences of all these things, we are filled with sorrow and alarm and cannot but lament that they are actively encouraged.

Canada is capable of affording to its population innumerable blessings. Its inhabitants possess energy, activity and intelligence, which combined with an indomitable love for civil and religious freedom are their most prominent characteristics. They therefore necessarily require a just and an impartial Government, one which makes no invidious distinctions, and

whose conduct shall be in accordance with their interests and feelings.

After so many years of dissention and supplication, we had flattered ourselves that we had at last obtained our rights, and that we were hereafter to enjoy what we should have enjoyed fifty years ago, viz., "the image and transcript of the British Constitution." But it seems that in this we were mistaken. Sir Charles Metcalfe has declared that Responsible Government is still undefined, that therefore it still remains open, subject to the various interpretations of any successive Governor who may come among us.

Let us examine into the truth of this. On the 3d of September, 1841, certain Resolutions were proposed by the Government to and adopted by Parliament, for the purpose of placing beyond all dispute the future working of Responsible Government. Among them were the following:

"That the Head of the Executive Government of the Province, being within the limits of his Government, the Representative of the Sovereign, is responsible to the Imperial authority alone; but that, nevertheless, the management of our local affairs can only be conducted by him by and with the assistance, council, and information of subordinate officers in the Province.

That in order to preserve, between the different branches of the Provincial Parliament, that harmony which is essential to the peace, welfare, and good government of the Province, the chief advisers of the Representative of the Sovereign, constituting a Provincial Administration under him, ought to be men possessed of the confidence of the Repre-



representatives of the people, thus affording a guarantee that the well understood wishes and interests of the people, which our Gracious Sovereign has declared shall be the rule of the Provincial Government, will on all occasions, be faithfully represented and advocated."

Now it must be manifest that by these Resolutions, both the Government and the House of Assembly intended to define and did define what was really meant by Responsible Government. The resolution can bear but one interpretation. They must mean something and what that something is can only be gathered from the words of the resolution themselves.

Lord Stanley, whose opinion we presume our opponents will not deny, has lately declared in his place in Parliament, that he understood by Responsible Government that the Administration of Canada was to be carried on by heads of departments enjoying the confidence of the people of Canada, responsible to the Legislature of Canada, and that the Governor in propounding and introducing Legislative measures to the Parliament of Canada, was to be guided by the advice of those whom he had called to his Councils and to introduce measures upon their advice."

Sir Robert Peel also stated, "that the Governor would act most unworthily if in respect to all local matters, he did not consult the opinion of his Council."

W. C. Buller, at the same time made the following observations.

"It was the want of a Responsible Government which had been the main, obvious, and permanent cause of discontent and disorder in Canada—namely, the attempt to carry on the Executive Government by persons not possessed of the confidence of a Legislature, and who were entrusted with power to make laws. It seemed to him, and no argument that had ever been used, and very few had

been, had ever shaken his opinion, and it stood on plain common sense, that if they had the power of legislation vested in a Parliament, they must place the Executive Government in the hands of those who had confidence in that Parliament. He need not now refer to the time of Lord Durham's report; for ten years preceding that report, anarchy had existed, and, in spite of the difficulties which might at present exist, he could look with triumph to the results of that recommendation wherever it had been fully and fairly carried out. So long as the principles of that report were acted on, so long had contentment been given to the people of Canada. Any attempt to abolish those principles produced immediate confusion and collision; the machine of Government was stopped, and such ignominious disasters ensued as threatened a separation between the colony and the mother country. Considerations such as these should, he thought, induce honorable members to pause before they trifled with anything so serious and so very important as the peace of the whole country. He felt bound to insist upon this, that the principles upon which that report had been founded should fairly be carried out."

Lord Durham in his celebrated report in Canada says, "The responsibility to the United Legislature of all officers of the Government, except the Governor and his Secretary, should be secured by every means known to the British Constitution. The Governor as the Representative of the Crown, should be instructed that he must carry on his government by Heads of Departments in whom the United Legislature should repose confidence, and that he must look for no support from home in any contest with the Legislature except on points involving strictly Imperial interests."—Lord Durham's Report.

Again he says, "I know not how it is

possible to s  
way than by  
of Canada o  
been found  
Britain. Th  
necessary co  
stitutions,  
Governmen  
ive body, it  
those in wh  
has confiden  
As long a  
Stanley state  
I do think  
with great ac  
possible char  
il, which at  
ous body, h  
stitution, an  
of patronag  
The follow  
of the House  
since's wort  
House was  
ries. "We  
ended to g  
with our inte  
interference,  
but plainly  
those sacred  
a free Gro  
hat if your  
ance of four  
all controul  
Majesty's su  
necessity a  
edge of the  
ry, the want  
the inhabitan  
ing business  
rent course  
by ourselves  
people by the  
the concurren  
the Provincial  
are reduce  
nce upon t

possible to secure harmony in any other way than by administering the Government of Canada on those principles which have been found perfectly efficacious in Great Britain. The Crown must submit to the necessary consequences of Representative institutions, and if it has to carry on the Government in unison with a representative body, it must carry it on by means of those in whom that representative body has confidence."

As long ago as the year 1828, Lord Stanley stated, with reference to Canada, "I do think that something might be done with great advantage to give a *really responsible character to the Executive Council*, which at present is a perfect anonymous body, hardly recognised by the Constitution, and effective chiefly as a source of patronage."

The following formed part of an address of the House of Assembly of this Province shortly afterwards, and *which House was composed principally of Tories*. "We cannot think that it was intended to give a power of interference with our *internal affairs*. Against such an interference, however, we respectfully, but plainly protest, as inconsistent with those sacred principles which are essential to a free Government, since it is manifest that if your Majesty's Ministers, at a distance of four thousand miles *and not at all controulable or accountable to your Majesty's subjects here*, and possessing necessarily a slight and imperfect knowledge of the circumstances of the country, the wants and habits and feelings of the inhabitants and the mode of transacting business among us, can dictate a different course *in relation to measures affecting ourselves only*, from that which the people by their Representatives and with the concurrence of the other branches of the Provincial Legislature have chosen, we are reduced to a state of mere dependence upon the will and pleasure of a

ministry who are *irresponsible to us, and beyond the reach and operation of the public opinion of the Province.*"

And again the same principle was insisted upon by the following resolution, which was adopted unanimously, with the exception of two dissenting voices, in the second session of the 12th Provincial Parliament. "Resolved, That this House considers the appointment of a *Responsible Executive Council to advise the Governor or person administering the Government, on the affairs of this Province*, to be one of the most happy and wise features in our Constitution, and essential to our Government, and as being one of the strongest securities for a just and equitable administration of the Government and for the full enjoyment of our civil and religious rights and privileges."

We presume therefore, that we will not be incurring high displeasure, if we keep within the limits prescribed and acknowledged by her Majesty's Ministers and other Constitutional authorities, and we are happy to see that the views of the Reformers of Canada upon Responsible Government are sustained by Imperial authority, and by the best and wisest of English Statesmen.

Sir Charles Metcalfe therefore differs both with the Canadian people and with the foregoing declarations of her Majesty's Ministers and of the other Members of the Imperial Parliament. Whilst the resolutions of 1841, declare that his Administration is to be conducted by heads of departments enjoying our confidence, and responsible to our Parliament, and that he shall be guided by the advice of his Council in all our local affairs—he declares at one time that Responsible Government is still undefined—an other that he is not bound to advise with his Council at all—at another that he will do so upon cases of adequate importance, (of which by the way *he is to be the judge*)

—at another that our affairs would be better administered by him alone without a Council.

One minutes reflection will convince any man that all this is in direct violation of our Constitution. Whilst at the same time we have the fact before us, that for the last eight months we have not enjoyed Responsible Government, and that Sir Charles Metcalfe carries on his administration without heads of departments and without a Council as contemplated by the resolutions of 1841.

Mr. Ogle R. Gowan, formerly a great advocate for Responsible Government, states in his pamphlet, published in defence of it in 1839. "There can be no person acquainted with English annals, who will deny that responsibility, immediate, direct and unequivocal in every department of the Executive Government, is a part and parcel of the Constitution itself; that it is so interwoven with the customs and practices of Britain as to be considered the modern Magna Charta of the Parliament of the Empire. Responsibility on the part of the Executive to the people's representatives is characteristic of the British name. It is blended with the very nature of her political institutions, and it is the most distinguishing and prominent principle of the compact between the British Sovereign and the British people. It is written as clear as with a sunbeam in every page of her legislative history. In the Mother Country, we behold the Sovereign so far consulting the wishes of the people, as to continue no Minister in office, no matter how powerful by connection or how great or varied may be his talents, except he possess the confidence of the nation, as expressed through its representatives in Parliament, while here (in Canada) on the other hand, we behold that Sovereign's deputy, continuing his advisers in office whether they possess the confidence of

the people or not. *Here then is the great distinction and the true source of all our difficulties.* The Sovereign in England administers the Constitution according to *British principles*, while the Governor in Canada administers it according to *American practice*. The Queen's deputy allowed to do more in the Capital of Canada than the Queen herself can do in the Capital of England, the very heart of the Empire. *He may act as a powerful and colonial irresponsible despot, while she must act as a Constitutional and limited Monarch.* In England the Government must be carried on with the approbation of Parliament—*here it may be conducted in defiance of it.* Surely there is nothing of British practice, British principle or British feeling in such a course.

If the present state of things continue, what will be our condition. The great fundamental principles of our Charter will have been destroyed. There will be a Government in name only, and that Constitution which is a Briton's pride and glory, and which it is the right of every British subject to enjoy will have been wrested from us, and we shall be reduced to a mere cypher in the administration of our own local affairs.

We ask you therefore to consider the importance of the subject. To bear in mind that the question to be decided is whether the Government of the country is to be carried on in harmony and in accordance with our interests and feelings or not. Whether there shall be a responsibility from the public servants of the country to the people of Canada, or whether there shall be no responsibility. Whether our affairs are to be mismanaged by those in whom we have no confidence, or whether they shall be conducted by men of patriotism and of principle.

Take away Responsible Government, divest ourselves of the right to control appointments to office, place the business of

the Country  
are not respo  
what will b  
would it be  
again be at  
Compact."  
the people  
country ruin  
what where  
will be fail  
found that n  
ness on the  
public serva  
their conduc  
sure a due  
This Provin  
choly a proce  
where ther  
people.  
Mr. Gow  
Thus we fi  
lem, i.stead  
conrages Br  
Reformers,  
Compact?  
Canada and  
If any man  
only divest  
at the Cou  
cannot fail  
irresponsible  
Again he  
and Lower  
Prince Edw  
and Cape  
hirsting' fo  
declaring in  
stood, that  
peace, no p  
Again M  
nature of a  
involves r  
principle th  
there is to  
countability  
surd to talk  
But if we a

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 watchful-  
 ness on the part of the people over their  
 public servants, and a direct control over  
 their conduct and actions, can or will se-  
 cure a due regard to the public interests.  
 This Province furnishes but too melan-  
 choly a proof of what a country suffers  
 where there is no responsibility to the  
 people.

Mr. Gowan in the same pamphlet says,  
 "Thus we find that the irresponsible sys-  
 tem, instead of benefitting Canada, dis-  
 courages British population, inflames the  
 Reformers, satisfies none but the vili-  
 '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 misunder-  
 stood, 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* ac-  
 countability within the Colony it is ab-  
 surd 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, weak-  
 ness and poverty."

Sir Charles Metcalfe contends that the  
 people of Canada have no right to inter-  
 fere 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 Can-  
 ada 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 se-  
 lection 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 ne-  
 cessary for them to maintain, when they  
 know and feel that they hold their offices  
 independent of us. To make them in-  
 dustrious 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 ab-  
 surd to argue that the people do not de-  
 sire Responsible Government, which sim-  
 ply means in other words, that they do  
 not desire the Government to be conduct-  
 ed 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-

posterior a notion for serious discussion. If the object of retaining this Colony as an appendage of the Empire, be merely to confer the patronage of office on a Lieutenant Governor, let it at once be openly avowed, and let us not be led to believe that higher and nobler motives actuated the British nation. The Governor must advise with some one (in appointments to office) because he cannot know the parties qualified for office. Candidates for situations must either apply themselves or be recommended by some friendly influence. Whether then is it better that the appointment of Magistrates, Commissioners, Sheriffs and other public functionaries should pass under the review of the chosen representatives of the landed proprietors and commercial enterprise of the Province and be selected by the Executive Council who would be held directly responsible for the appointments or that they should as at present be chosen upon the private reference of an Attorney General, a political Judge or some secret and irresponsible courtier."

Sir Robert Peel says, "There is no doubt that the first principle is that the Sovereign should be governed in making appointments by the advice of her Ministers."

This is precisely what we desire to see carried into practice in Canada. We cannot understand why her Majesty's subjects in this Province should not enjoy the same beneficial operation of the Constitution as is enjoyed by their fellow subjects elsewhere. Or as Mr. Gowan very justly asks, "Why should we be debarred of the same privileges enjoyed by us when by our native fire sides in old England."

The doctrine of Sir Charles Metcalfe, that a British subject ceases to enjoy his rights and privileges as such by becoming a Colonist, is certainly a most extraordinary and humiliating one, which we are

satisfied will never be sanctioned or submitted to by a free people.

We have drawn largely from Mr. Gowan in the course of this Address, because we find his remarks so applicable to our present circumstances. And that gentleman is now high in the confidence of his Excellency, we the more readily refer to them. We are not ignorant that a certain faction have endeavored to charge disloyalty upon the people for their honest and constitutional exertions after a just Government, but we never heless claim the right to think for ourselves in this respect, and it may not therefore appear strange if we think differently.

Hear Mr. Gowan once more upon this very subject. "*Here (in Canada) every man no matter how loyal, who asks for the introduction of the British principle of responsibility in the administration of the Colonial Government is denounced as a rebel and a traitor to his country.* It is in vain to urge that through his whole life he has been a devoted loyalist; that though the partial insurrections of 1837, 1838, and 1839, he rushed to the post of danger, and volunteered to expose his body to every passing bullet; nay, even the wounds upon his own body, received in his country's defence are not sufficient to screen him from the malignant opposition of antagonists or to hush to silence the calumny of the secret and irresponsible enemy."

When the late Executive Councillors accepted office, they did so with the avowed understanding *that Responsible Government was a reality.* That its concession to the people of Canada was made in good faith, and that thenceforth the people of this Province were to be permitted to exercise their legitimate control over their own local affairs.

No one ever dreamed that it could be disturbed. People believed that there

could be no substitution, and itself. But Metcalfe to and he has d that it is more dependently, voice in the ernment.

The sincere been exempl last eight m administration ers, has set and still asso to rule over meet our R the House.

of Canada w ence, and th the utmost c

This is th find ourselve remains open course of th upon to ch Upon the iss pend all our ority of the of men who who will not own interests to a happy t But should i bid adieu to

It is there especially in deration. I n the midst unmindful o our have deserted will be found your elective and religious

The occur important o

could be no encroachment upon their constitution, and that it was as sacred as life itself. But it was left to Sir Charles Metcalfe to violate and finally to annul it and he has declared that it is a fiction and that it is more fit that he should rule independently, than that we should have any voice in the administration of his government.

The sincerity of his declarations have been exemplified by his practice. For the last eight months he has conducted his administration *without responsible advisers*, has set public opinion at defiance, and still asserts his determination so still to rule over us. He refuses either to meet our Representatives or to dissolve the House. In fact he treats the people of Canada with the most perfect indifference, and their wishes and feelings with the utmost contempt.

This is the position in which we now find ourselves. One means, however, still remains open to us. In the ordinary course of things the people will be called upon to choose new Representatives. Upon the issue of the next elections depend all our future hopes. If the majority of the next Parliament is composed of men who will stand by the people and who will not sacrifice our liberties to their own interests, we may safely look forward to a happy termination of our difficulties. But should it be otherwise we may then bid adieu to Responsible Government.

It is therefore with a view to this that we specially invite your most serious consideration. It is with the hope that whilst in the midst of our trials you were not unmindful of our treatment, so in the hour of our greatest need you will not have deserted your Country, but that you will be found true to your trust, exercising your elective franchise on the side of civil and religious liberty.

The occasion will be a solemn and an important one. It is looked forward to

with anxiety not only by ourselves but likewise by our kindred and our friends in other and far distant lands, where liberty and freedom flourish, and where that Constitution of which we have been deprived, and for which we are now contending, is the happy lot of the poorest and the humblest.

We intreat you therefore not to lose sight of its importance. Our choice of a Representative must be such as is suited to the times. He must be a man of unwavering principle and in whom we have unlimited confidence: He must have passed through the ordeal of political trial and shown himself worthy of our choice. In proportion as he has always been found upon the side of the people—in proportion to his firmness and political consistency and sincerity, so and so let us judge of him.

In conclusion we would respectfully beg leave to caution the Electors against imposition. We do not wish to be considered over officious, nor do we desire or intend to dictate to others the course which they ought to pursue. We feel strongly our situation and our responsibilities and our duties, and we therefore believe that a friendly hint of this kind will be received in the spirit in which it is offered.

We know that it is usual in electioneering times, for parties to profess sentiments the most opposite to their real principles, and we regret to be obliged to acknowledge that this system of deception has too often succeeded. We trust however that experience has taught us a useful lesson in this respect, *and that hereafter we will see the necessity of discarding all doubtful characters and of relying upon men of well tried principles.*

In times like these, it especially behoves every one to look well to the men who are striving for their suffrages, and to see that our choice of a representative is such as to be beyond all suspicion.

*! must remember that every thing depends upon this, and we ought to know that they who have all their lives been violent opponents of every measure calculated to promote liberality in our institutions, and who have ever "warred to the knife" against the introduction of Responsible Government, and the liberalising*

of King's College, are the very last men for us to give our support to. We therefore do not consider that it will appear extraordinary if we do view with considerable distrust, opinions advanced by such persons, and which are contradicted by every act of their past lives.

ery last men  
We there-  
will appear  
with consi-  
dvanced by  
contradicted



