

of their rulers have overflowed with grain. In 1837, it is computed that half a million were swept off by hunger alone. In India, parents are permitted to sell their children for bread. The worst slavery is thus legalized, and the strongest instincts of nature paralyzed by the strong arm of the law.

This system of things obliges the government—by which will now be understood the East India Company—to keep up a standing army. This army is now about 250,000 strong, about 30,000 of whom are troops imported from Europe. The natives all prefer agriculture to a military life, but like the conscription of Ibrahim Pacha in Western Asia, thousands have been seized, dragged into camp, and forced to fight their countrymen.

The vast income or revenue of the East India Company it is difficult to ascertain with precision. In 1829, it was estimated at 23,000,000 pounds sterling—a sum greater than the revenue of any European kingdom, if we except France and England. Although the profits of the company are very great, and although the officers and agents in their employ amass extensive fortunes, and return to England laden with wealth, yet it must not be understood that the consumption of foreign articles in India, or the growth of home products, is by any means as large as they would be under the operation of just and liberal views of policy. The vast and fertile plains of Hindostan are sufficient to furnish tropical productions for all Europe at the cheapest price and in the greatest abundance. Yet, with all her abundant resources, such has been the foreign policy of England with Hindostan, that she has not been able to buy annually but six pence worth per head of British manufactures. By an examination of the amount of goods imported from England into her colonies, and especially into her West India islands, it will be found that there is a difference of 1,600 per cent., between their import and that of India—the average of the former being about four pounds a head per annum.

The duties levied upon British goods sent into Calcutta, Madras, Bombay and other parts of India are nearly nominal, being but two or three per cent., so that it is not high duties which render the trade so small. Neither are there duties or charges upon the passage of articles through the country, after they are landed. Interchange is free throughout the whole peninsula. The gross amount of exports is now but about £4,000,000, whereas, were the consumption of manufactures in India equal to that of many of the British Colonies, or even twenty shillings a head annually, the trade would be £100,000,000 per year or \$500,000,000.—*Northern Light*.

GREAT WESTERN STEAM SHIP COMPANY.—The affairs of this company being in a very bad state, at a meeting lately held, a committee of ten proprietors was appointed to confer with the directors, and report to the company on the state of its affairs. The committee having prepared its report, a special general meeting of the company was held at Bristol on Friday, at their offices in Prince's-street, for the purpose of taking it into consideration. Mr. B. Bright, chairman of the directors, having taken the chair, Mr. G. Jones, chairman of the committee, read the report (a copy of which had been previously sent to the directors with a request that it might be published for the use of the shareholders; this request was not, however, complied with). The report recommended the sale of the Great Western, of the iron ship Great Britain, as she now stood, and of the company's yard, works, and other property, and the winding up of the concern. Mr. J. Cunningham having moved a resolution according with the committee's report, it led to a very long and stormy discussion; and in answer to various questions put to the chairman, it was elicited that of the £170,000, subscribed capital, there was due on calls £17,000. The liabilities of the company were stated to be £23,818, and deducting the £17,000 unpaid calls, it left a balance against the company of £6,818. The entire cost of the steam ship Great Western was stated to be £61,671, while the estimated cost of the Great Britain would be £100,000. Loud complaints were made of the extravagant management of the company's affairs; Capt. Hosken being paid, as it was said, at a very much higher rate than any of the captains of the Royal Mail Company, and it being suggested that the salaries of Mr. Guppy, one of the directors and manager of the works, for which he received £500 per annum, and of Captain Claxton, managing director, for which he was paid £300 per annum, might be saved. It was also stated that the yard and implements had cost about £60,000, while the company had only been offered a very reduced sum for it, and that the highest bona fide bidding for the Great Western, at the late sale, had been £17,500. It was, however, stated in justification for the expenditure at the yard, that no person would undertake the building of the Great Britain, and that it was therefore necessary to erect machinery of their own, and it was stated that Mr. Guppy acted as engineer. It was also stated that the Great Western, of herself had paid 6 1/4 per cent. A counter resolution was proposed on the part of the directors, and very ably advocated by the chairman, and ultimately adopted in a modified form by the meeting. The resolution was to the effect—that the directors should be empowered to raise £20,000, on the security of the company's property; that the Great Britain should be completed with all possible

despatch; that none of the company's property should be sold at a sacrifice; and that the Great Western should continue her voyages to New-York as usual, unless sold in the meantime to advantage. The meeting then separated.

"RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT" NOT APPLICABLE TO THE COLONIES!!

Copy of a Despatch from Lord Russell to the Right Honourable C. Poulett Thomson.

Downing Street, 14th Oct., 1839. SIR,—It appears from Sir George Arthur's despatches that you may encounter much difficulty in subduing the excitement which prevails on the question of what is called "Responsible Government." I have to instruct you, however, to refuse any explanation which may be construed to imply an acquiescence in the petitions and addresses upon this subject. I cannot better commence this Despatch than by a reference to the resolutions of both Houses of Parliament, of the 25th April and 9th May, in the year 1837.

The Assembly of Lower Canada having repeatedly pressed this point, Her Majesty's confidential advisers at that period thought it necessary not only to explain their views in the communications of the Secretary of State, but expressly called for the opinion of Parliament on the subject. The Crown and the two Houses of Lords and Commons having thus decisively pronounced a judgment upon the question you will consider yourself precluded from entertaining any propositions on the subject.

It does not appear indeed, that any very definite meaning is generally agreed upon by those who call themselves the advocates of this principle; but its very vagueness is a source of delusion, and if at all encouraged, would prove the cause of embarrassment and danger.

The Constitution of England, after long struggles and alternate success, has settled into a form of Government in which the prerogative of the Crown is undisputed, but is never exercised without advice. Hence the exercise only is questioned and however the use of the authority may be condemned, the authority itself remains untouched.

This is the practical solution of a great problem, the result of a contest which from 1640 to 1690 shook the monarchy and disturbed the peace of the country.

But if we seek to apply such a practice to a colony, we shall at once find ourselves at fault. The power for which a Ministry is responsible in England, is not his own power, but the power of the Crown, of which he is for the time the organ. It is obvious, that the Executive Council of a colony is in a situation totally different. The Governor, under whom he serves, receives his orders from the Crown of England. But can the colonial Council be the advisers of the Crown of England? Evidently not, for the Crown has other advisers for the same functions, and with superior authority.

It may happen, therefore, that the Governor receives at one and the same time instructions from the Queen and advice from his Executive Council, totally at variance with each other. If he is to obey his instructions from England, the parallel of constitutional responsibility entirely fails; if, on the other hand, he is to follow the advice of his Council, he is no longer a subordinate officer but an independent sovereign.

There are some cases in which the force of these objections is so manifest, that those who at first make no distinction between the constitution of the United Kingdom and that of the Colonies, admit their strength. I allude to the question of foreign war, and international relations whether of trade or diplomacy. It is now said that internal government is alone intended.

But there are some cases of internal government in which the honour of the Crown, or the faith of Parliament, or the State, are so seriously involved, that it would not be possible for her Majesty to delegate her authority to a Minister in a Colony.

I will put for illustration some of the cases which have occurred in that very Province where the petition for a Responsible Executive first arose—I mean Lower Canada.

During the time when a large majority of the Assembly of Lower Canada, followed M. Papineau as their leader, it was obviously the aim of that gentleman to discourage all who did their duty to the Crown within the Province, and to deter all who should resort to Canada with British habits and feelings from without. I need not say that it would have been impossible for any Minister to support, in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, the measures which a Ministry, headed by M. Papineau, would have imposed on the Governor of Lower Canada; British officers punished for doing their duty; British emigrants defrauded out of their property—British merchants discouraged in their lawful pursuits, would loudly appeal to Parliament against the Canadian Ministry, and would have demanded protection.

Let us suppose the Assembly as then constituted to have been sitting when Sir John Colborne suspended two of the Judges. Would any Member possessing the confidence of the Assembly have made himself responsible for such an act? And yet the very safety of the Province depended on its adoption. Nay the very orders of which your Excellency is yourself the bearer respecting Messrs. Bedard and Panet, would never be adopted or put in execution by a Ministry depending for existence on a majority led by M. Papineau.

Nor can any one take upon himself to say that such cases will not again occur. The principle once sanctioned, no one can say how soon its application might be dangerous, or even dishonourable, while all will agree that to recall the power thus conceded would be impossible.

When I thus see insuperable objections to the adoption of the principle as it had been stated, I see little or none of the practical views of Colonial Government recommended by Lord Durham, as I understand them. The Queen's Government have no desire to thwart the Representative Assemblies of British North America in their measures of Reform and improvement. They have no wish to make those provinces the resource for patronage at home. They are earnestly intent on giving to the talent and character of leading persons in the colonies advantages similar to those which talent and character employed in the public service obtained in the United Kingdom. Her Majesty has no desire to maintain any system of policy among her North American subjects which opinion condemns. In receiving the Queen's commands therefore, to protest against any declaration at variance with the honour of the Crown and the unity of the Empire, I am at the same time instructed to announce her Majesty's gracious intention to look to the affectionate attachment of her people in North America as the security for permanent dominion.

It is necessary for this purpose that no official misconduct should be screened by her Majesty's Representative in the Colonies; and that no private interests should be allowed to compete with the general good.

Your Excellency is fully in possession of the principles which have guided her Majesty's advisers on this subject; and you must be aware that there is no surer way of earning the approbation of the Queen, than by maintaining the harmony of the Executive with the Legislative authorities.

While I have thus cautioned you against any declaration from which dangerous consequences may hereafter flow, and instructed you as to the general line of your conduct, it may be said that I have not drawn any specific line beyond which the power of the Governor on the one hand, and the privileges of the Assembly on the other, ought not to extend. But this must be the case in any mixed Government. Every political constitution in which different bodies share the supreme power, is only enabled to exist by the forbearance of those among whom this power is distributed.

In this respect the example of England may well be imitated. The Sovereign using the prerogative of the Crown to the utmost extent, and the House of Commons exerting its power of the purse, to carry all its resolutions into immediate effect, would produce confusion in the country in less than a twelvemonth. So in a colony; the Governor thwarting every legitimate proposition of the Assembly, and the Assembly continually recurring to its power of refusing supplies, cannot but disturb all political relations, embarrass trade, and retard the prosperity of the people. Each must exercise a wise moderation. The Governor or must only oppose the wishes of the Assembly, where the honour of the Crown, or the interests of the empire are deeply concerned, and the Assembly must be ready to modify some of its measures, for the sake of harmony, and from a reverent attachment to the authority of Great Britain.

I have, &c.
J. RUSSELL.

THE LOYALIST.

SAINT JOHN, N. B., Dec. 15, 1842.

ELECTIONEERING—RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT.

On the eve of an election, we were somewhat astonished to see some of our contemporaries throw off the mask, and come out strong for responsible government. Whether this course will benefit them and their friends or not, remains to be seen; our present purpose is to combat to the best of our humble abilities, a measure we conceive to be so fraught with danger, as to have a direct tendency towards a separation from the Mother Country. As to the arguments brought forward by the advocates of this measure—if arguments they may be called—we shall show presently that they are more against the measure than in favour of it, consequently we shall take the liberty of hurling their offensive missiles back on their own unshielded heads.

To consider this important question methodically, let us go back to the fountain head. It sprang from Lord John Russell's despatch, and consequently is a Whig measure, not a Conservative one; but this we do not urge as an argument for or against; for we are not so bigotted as to refuse to accept of a boon because it emanated from our political opponents; but it is because we consider this measure would prove a curse to us instead of a boon, that we lift our voice against it; and it is because the advocates of the measure would palm it off on the community for a conservative measure, that we mention its origin.

Responsible Government (so called) is

the enactment of a law, by which the Executive Council—the great officers of the Crown—shall possess the confidence of the House of Assembly, (i.e.) if the Executive should recommend any measure to the consideration of the House of Assembly, and the latter reject it, the Executive Council would have to resign; and if the House of Assembly should at any time take it into their heads to pass a vote of want of confidence in the Executive; the Governor would be under the necessity of displacing them, and appointing a new batch; and this they might do as often as they chose, or until the Governor was surrounded by creatures of their own. It is true the Governor might resist, and by dissolving the House, appeal to the people; but when we consider that the Governors of the North American Colonies are invariably sent out from Britain, and their residence here is generally limited to a few years, we must allow that their acquaintance with the people as a body cannot be extensive; and few Governors would be found to possess sufficient moral courage to dissolve the House; and if they were to do so, what a state of excitement the Province would be continually kept in! The old members would return to their constituents and tell them they were insulted through their Representatives; and in nine cases out of ten they would return them without any examination of the measures they opposed, whether they were good or not.

That the measure would tend to weaken the connexion between the Colonies and the Mother Country, we will endeavour to elucidate:—at present, while we have a House of Assembly to guard the interests and liberties of the subject, and a Legislative Council chosen from the wealth and intelligence of the community and whose interest it is to be mindful of the welfare of the people, no less than to maintain the dignity of the Crown; at the same time our Executive Council depends on the will of the Governor, who is the Representative of Her Majesty. And it follows as a matter of course that Her Majesty's Representative will have no person in his councils who is not a staunch friend of our laws and constitution, and who would not resist to the utmost extent, and the House of Commons exerting its power of the purse, to carry all its resolutions into immediate effect, would produce confusion in the country in less than a twelvemonth.

So in a colony; the Governor thwarting every legitimate proposition of the Assembly, and the Assembly continually recurring to its power of refusing supplies, cannot but disturb all political relations, embarrass trade, and retard the prosperity of the people. Each must exercise a wise moderation. The Governor or must only oppose the wishes of the Assembly, where the honour of the Crown, or the interests of the empire are deeply concerned, and the Assembly must be ready to modify some of its measures, for the sake of harmony, and from a reverent attachment to the authority of Great Britain.

I have, &c.
J. RUSSELL.

We are not alone in viewing the matter thus. On our last page will be found an extract from the *Journal des Debats*, a paper printed in the Capital of France, which in reviewing the late conduct of Sir Charles Bagot, and speaking of the probability of Canada being wrested from Britain, makes use of the following remarkable expression:—"It is singular that the metropolitan Government should have given the strongest impulse to this movement. The Whig administration caused two measures to be voted by the British Parliament, which have done more to prepare and advance the future independence of the British Colonies of North America, than the united efforts of the English Radicals and the sympathizers of the United States could have accomplished. The first of those measures

is that which united the two Provinces of Canada in one. The second is that which rendered the Executive Government of Canada responsible to the Local Legislature!!!" This is the opinion of a French Journal, gloating over the prospect of Great Britain losing her North American Colonies, and her consequent fall to the rank of a second or third rate power; and rejoicing that the French descendants in Canada are about to shake off what they term the British yoke! and can any one who calls himself a true and loyal Briton, advocate this pernicious measure? It is no wonder—let them not complain if they are pointed out as traitors.

"But," say the immaculates, "it is the law at home, it is a part of the British Constitution!" This we deny in toto. Search the British law-books from the preface to the *finis*, and no such law can be found: overhaul the journals of the Legislature from the thirteenth century down to the present year, and such an enactment is not there! It has been merely practised as an act of courtesy, for Britain being an independent nation, Ministers of late years have considered it necessary to carry on Government in accordance with the wishes of the people; but even so late as George the third's time, when the unholy coalition took place betwixt Fox and Lord North, and their united powers placed the famous William Pitt in a minority, His Majesty refused to accept his proffered resignation and sustained him against the clamours of the majority of the House of Commons; and though for a while popular opinion strongly condemned this exercise of His Majesty's prerogative, yet it finally died away, and when the House was dissolved, the people returned a majority in favour of Pitt's administration, thus tacitly acknowledging that His Majesty was right and they had been misled!

But though it has become the custom in Britain, it can never apply to the Colonies: what may be very good and very proper for an independent people, cannot apply to a people so notoriously dependant as we are. If we attempt to carry on Government here in accordance with the wishes of the people, what guarantee have we that the people will always bear in mind the fealty they owe to the Mother Country, and that they will enact no law which clashes with hers, nor levy a tariff inimical to her interests?

Responsibility is for an independent people, but how absurd to talk of independence in a country where less than half a million of acres are reclaimed from the woods, though the Province contains sixteen and a half millions! And how preposterous to urge the adoption of this measure in a Colony whose whole population amounts to only little more than one tenth of the population of London!! Surely the advocates of this measure must have lost their senses—if they ever possessed any.

We promised in the beginning of this article, to turn the weapons of our adversaries against themselves; and as we generally fulfil our promises—especially of this nature—we shall proceed to do so. Our contemporaries who are most strenuous for Responsible Government, are those who have been foremost in showing the effects of mal-administration on the part of our representatives. They say, give us the initiation of money grants—or, rather, let the initiation of money grants be placed in the hands of the Executive; and at the same time they bawl for Responsible Government! We are in favour of the former measure; we are suffering from the effects of bad administration; but not on the part of the Executive, but the House of Assembly! they have had the power of misapplying the Provincial revenue; and, the natural consequence of this measure was, that they minded their own interests, and neglected that of their constituents; they were men, and as such, were fallible, and we would wish to see them responsible; we would wish to see a check placed upon their actions—we would withdraw a portion of their power, and vest it in the safe keeping of the Executive. But the Responsible Government our contemporaries are clamouring for would, instead of lessening the power of the House of Assembly, give them more; it would give them the control of the Executive; let us imagine the harmony that would exist between such a House as this Province has been burdened with for the last four years, and an Executive of their own creation! Again, cannot the advocates of Responsible Government see, that if it were possible for a Colony to be independent, and that measure was applied to our present state, it would operate in a manner entirely dissimilar

to the British Constitution; for in Britain they have a House of Lords, composed of the wealthiest portion of the Aristocracy, and whose seats, like their titles, are hereditary; and if at any time the Executive and the Lower House should combine for the purpose of carrying a measure, inimical to the interests of the Empire; or attempt to introduce a Republican measure, this independent body would reject it with disdain. But here we have no such House! if the advocates of the measure should attempt to prove a similarity between our Legislative Council and the House of Lords, we can assure them that this similarity would soon cease, if their favorite hobby became the law of the land. Our Governors, as we before stated, are generally comparative strangers; and if they thought proper to add to the number of our Legislative Councils, or to fill up vacancies occasioned by death, they would of course do it, "by and with the advice of the Executive Council." Now, if this Council were creatures of the Assembly, it would necessarily follow that the House of Assembly would have a direct influence on the composition of the Legislative Council.

"But," say its supporters, "it works well where it has been tried;" this we also deny; in Canada it has worked so as to displace the old and tried servants of the Crown—men who had supported the British Constitution and British supremacy through evil and good report—who still maintained their ground when murder, arson, and Rebellion stalked naked through the land, and who were alike unbiassed by bribes and promises held out to them on the one hand, or intimidated by menaces on the other!—it has hurled those men from their situations without a shadow of a fault, unless indeed loyalty be a crime; and it has filched their places with the very men who brought misery and death upon that once happy country—with proscribed rebels and convicted felons!—these are the results of "RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT" in Canada. With regard to Nova Scotia, the only other colony where it has been introduced, although it has not been attended by any immediate disastrous result, yet it is slowly but surely working its way, and the hearts of the people of that Colony are corroding and festering, and disloyalty and discontent—the legitimate fruits of this poisonous doctrine—will we fear ere long be seen and felt among its inhabitants.

But another argument dragged forth in favour of the measure, is that it will abolish family compacts. What a fitness plea! Although a person's connexions should not qualify for a situation under Government, we see no reason why it should disqualify him! unless he is in his own *propria persona* unfit to hold his situation; and another more fitting person pointed out; we shall consider the clamour about family compacts as an outpouring of spleen from those who are languishing for their places.—But we—the Conservatives—are the party really favourable to Responsible Government! we are advocates of Responsibility of the right kind—the responsibility this Province as a Colony owes to Great Britain! and those who are clamorous for what they call Responsible Government, but what we call Responsible Humbug, are the irresponsibles! they wish to be no longer responsible to the mother country, in order that they may subvert our constitution; and introduce Republican measures with impunity!!

One remark more and we have done. We cannot pass over in silence the conduct of His Excellency in republishing at this critical juncture Lord John Russell's Despatch. If his Excellency is really favorable to the measure why does he not come out boldly, and avow it like a man? But by publishing the despatch in question at the present moment, seems to us like an act of intimidation.

THE HERALD of yesterday was certainly crazy, or it would never have let its wonted caution overcome its judgement; it speaks of the advocates of Responsible Government, as being a "body of vagrants, who came to this Province solely to steal bread out of the mouths of the natives!" Horrible Mr. Herald! we fear the "natives" would be but few and the bread they would have to spare be but little, if none of the old country "vagrants" came to settle among them. Jest aside Mr. Herald, it argues a narrowness of mind to bring up nationality at a time we should confine ourselves to measures. Were we inclined to retort, perhaps we could show you that some of the strongest advocates of this measure are natives of the soil, and

that it flags more advocates among than among "foreigners." What you think if we were to tell you that the gentlemen whom it is said will vote for the City of St. John, and who are natives, and have openly avowed themselves so! Our advice is, join to keep them out, and not to bawl about what country they belong to.

We have much pleasure in to-day Lord John Russell's despatch, the Right Honourable C. Poulett Thomson, late Governor General of North America. This despatch, dated Oct. 14th 1839; only two days after the noble Lord's famous speech, and cannot find any thing in it, which would lead us to suppose that we have been persecuted by any thing but "Responsible Government!"

Many are trying to torture out of it, instead of making them responsible to the Councils responsible to the Governor, and to him alone as Her Majesty's Representative. You will understand, says, "You will understand, case it to be generally known, after the tenure of Colonial office, during Her Majesty's pleasure, to be regarded as equivalent to good behaviour," and says, "that a change in the Governor will be considered a reason for any alteration in the list of public functionaries of course, to the future Council shall be responsible to the Queen's Representative; that Lord John Russell has been a traitor out of it, we need not readers to the despatch of days previous, and which we in full; and we hereby call on all who allege that the measure is having for its one who recommended by Her Majesty's Council, to stand forth and show right! Their assertions will us for we are determined to see their fallacy.

CAUTION! We think it necessary to readers not to put any faith in assertions of those journals as to their crude ideas of Responsible Government. The New of this morning very coolly the Hon. Charles Simonds Woodward Esq., "have at on all occasions, boldly and unflinchingly, and have not been unblinking falsehood has appeared in print. It is well known that we have advocated (so far as provincial concerned) measures, not have neither praised or denigrated individual; and there is not a Province more opposed to them than we are.—we deplore the late House of Assembly have said, and will again say, have brought ruin and bankruptcy on the Province. And with regard to whom the New shows its praise, we can say that their conduct during the of the House of Assembly; they do for several years previous no two men in the Assembly lavish, or seemingly more equander the public revenue. The Hon. Charles Simonds the delegates who went to solicit the control of the Province being placed in the hands of the House of Assembly, thus take part in the very measure been productive of such disaster and saddling the Province for 18,000 pounds a year for the next twenty years. And both he and Mr. Woodward supported all the grants, passed during Sir John's administration!! They were thousands thrown away on the Government House, which is far better than an old barn; for the thousands of pounds provided for the relief of the poor, became of it, though he was a sterling one for fifteen years, a new service of plate, that enabled to sell his old plate for the New Brunswick would find subjects on whom to gratulate! Shame! While we are on this subject