
C I R C U L A R

OF THE COMMITTEE OF THE

ANNEXATION ASSOCIATION

OF

M O N T R E A L .

Annexation Association of Montreal.

TO THE PEOPLE OF CANADA

WE now propose to place before you a short tract, which will enable you to judge for yourselves of the comparative merits of our system of Government, and that of our neighbours of the United States. We shall confine ourselves for the present to showing the comparative EXPENSE of the two systems, and for the purpose of comparison will select the populous and wealthy State of New York, which is usually designated by Americans themselves as the Empire State to mark its prominence in the Union for wealth, population and power. It may be said, indeed, that in doing this we are conceding to our opponents more than candour requires of us; but, in reply, we would state that the extravagance of our system makes it necessary to select the State of New York for comparison, as the expenses of any other State compared with ours would be so ridiculously small, as to lead people to suppose that ours could not be assimilated to theirs. With this view, therefore, we select the Empire State, containing a population of three millions of souls to compare with Canada containing only a million and a half. These facts, of relative population should be steadily borne in mind, as they are important in estimating the disadvantages of our costly and defective system. We have prepared tables (which will be found annexed), showing the cost of our Executive, Judicial and Legislative Departments, compared with the cost of the same Departments in the State of New York. These tables have been compiled with great care and may be relied upon as correct. The expenses of our own Departments have been made up from Parliamentary documents, and those of the State of New York from the report of the Comptroller of the State, the Legislative Manual, and the United States Almanac.

Let us now analyse them and compare the more important items.

First, there is our Governor General; he receives \$31,111 £ annum. Against him we place the Governor of the State of New York, who receives \$4,000 £ annum.

Our Governor presides over the affairs of a million and a half of souls; theirs over the affairs of three millions of souls. Ours, by a fiction of our Constitution, is a cypher, his duties performed by deputies, his office to all appearance a sinecure; theirs is a working man and directly responsible to the people for every Act of Government he performs. Without drawing invidious comparisons, it may be safely affirmed that the two offices require to be filled by men eminent for talent, industry and character. Governor Fish, the present Governor of the State of New York, the people's choice, is a man of acknowledged worth and ability, and his salary is only \$4,000 £ annum. Our Governor—of whom we will only say that he cannot stand higher in the estimation of the people of Canada, than Governor Fish does in that of the people of New York—receives, as already stated, \$31,111 £ annum for doing by deputy what Governor Fish does in person. Reader, can there be one good reason set up for such enormous extravagance—for paying our Governor about eight times as much as the State of New York pays to the man of her choice?

We will next compare the expense of the Governors' Secretaries. By our table it will be seen that the Secretary of the Governor of three millions of people receives \$600 £ annum, whilst our Governor General's Civil Secretary and Clerks, cost us \$7,700 £ annum. Were we here merely advocating retrenchment in our expendi-

ture—which we are not, but advocating also and chiefly annexation which would involve retrenchment as a minor, yet important reform—we would affirm the opinion that England, whilst she holds Canada as a Colony, should defray out of the Imperial Exchequer and not out of Colonial funds, the expense of the Civil Secretary's Office, and the Governor General's salary besides. But we do not insist upon this reform here because nothing short of annexation will satisfy us; and we should consider it a loss of time to advocate minor reforms, which the GREAT MOVEMENT is sure to carry along with it.

Next, let us compare the expense of our Provincial Secretary's Department with that of their Secretary of State—the two Departments being similar in their nature and duties. Our department we find costs \$18,424 $\text{\pounds}$ annum; theirs costs \$7,000 $\text{\pounds}$ per annum; whilst at the same time, be it remembered, our population is a million and a half, and theirs is three millions. In other words, ours costs about 12 cents per head, while theirs costs less than quarter of a cent per head!

Reader, is the contrast sufficiently marked to satisfy you that our system is extravagant to a degree beyond endurance?

The next on the list for comparison is our President of the Executive Council. He and his clerks get \$11,388 $\text{\pounds}$ annum of our public money; a pretty fair share of plunder, we conceive, for occupying a post which, so far as we can see, has no specific duties attached to it. Against this officer and his staff we are really at a loss to find an offset in our neighbour's system. They can only be compared to the fifth wheel of a coach; an absurdity which our neighbours are not likely to commit.

We come now to our Attornies General East and West and the contingencies of their departments, and a clerk to boot for Mr. Attorney General East. The whole expense amounts to \$11,600 $\text{\pounds}$ annum. Against this enormous sum we have no offset in the system of our neighbours. Their Attornies General are working lawyers and their place is found as it should be under the head of "the Judiciary." Our Attornies General on the other hand are comparative sinecurists—they do not condescend to conduct the law business of the Province—but merely sit in Council with mock-monarchical dignity giving our Governor (at \$31,111 a year) advice at the rate of \$11,600 a year. Comment upon this flagitious extravagance is surely unnecessary. But we may be allowed to ask, can we wonder with such facts before us at the amount of loyalty and attachment to British connexion, which now exists where it would not have been looked for a few years ago—or at the new-born zeal exem-

plified in Militia dismissals and the persecution for opinion's sake, which distinguishes the Government of the day?

But to proceed with our comparison. Our Inspector General and his clerks next command our attention. The expense of this functionary and his department is \$16,336 a year, against which we set the expense of the Comptroller, Deputy Comptroller and Clerks of the State of New York, which amounts to \$10,800 $\text{\pounds}$ annum—the nearest approach to an equality which we have yet found, but still showing a balance against us of upwards of \$5,000. Then comes our Receiver General and his clerks; against whom we offset the Treasurer of the State of New York and clerks. Our department costs \$3,088; theirs \$4,000 $\text{\pounds}$ annum—something less than half.

Then we have a department of Public Works at \$8,000 for salaries only; against which we place their Canal Commissioners and Clerks at \$9,000 $\text{\pounds}$ annum—the only instance in which departments at all analogous in their nature are found to exceed ours in cost. But let it be remembered that the Works which our Board superintendents afford only about \$160,000 $\text{\pounds}$ annum, whilst the Works superintended by the Canal Commissioners yield upwards of \$2,750,000 $\text{\pounds}$ annum.

Reader, we will not take up more of your time in dissecting and comparing our tables. We have led the way and will leave the rest to yourself. The Judiciary and Legislative tables will well repay the trouble of an attentive examination. The first will show you that we pay \$18,784 for 23 Judges, whilst they pay only \$125,800 for 45 Judges. By their system justice is speedy and comparatively cheap; by ours it is tardy and dear. There the Judges are the people's choice; here the Judge is too frequently a ruined politician, a man who has stepped from the Executive Chamber to the Bench, saddling the country with his services at £1,000 a year for life, when the people were on the eve of dispensing with his services in every shape. The system, you will see, is bad, and must in the end lead to corruption and inefficiency, where talent, industry and integrity are most required.

The point of retrenchment cannot be dwelt on too forcibly. The Inspector General of Accounts is reported to have stated on a late occasion that retrenchment to any great extent is impossible. The admission is a condemnation of our system. Let us have the elective system of our neighbours, and your public servants will be forced to cut down their exorbitant salaries. Then we shall secure economy and efficient servants and retrenchment will follow as surely as the sun sets to rise again.

EXECUTIVE.

CANADA—POPULATION 1,500,000.		NEW YORK—POPULATION 3,000,000.	
Governor General.....	\$ 31,111	Governor	\$ 4,000
Civil Secretary.....	\$ 4,444	Lt. Governor, \$6 per day, say	1,200
Clerks, (5).....	3,256		5,200
	7,700	Secretary	2,500
Provincial Secretary	4,000	Deputy do.....	1,500
Clerks East section, (8).....	6,832	Clerks	3,000
“ West “ (8)	6,412		7,000
	17,244	Comptroller	2,500
President of Ex. Council.....	4,000	Deputy	1,500
Clerks, (8).....	7,388	Clerks	6,800
	11,388		10,800
Attorney General West and contingencies.....	5,200	Treasurer	1,500
Attorney General East and contingencies.....	5,200	Deputy	1,500
Do. East for Clerk.....	1,200	Clerks	1,000
	11,600		4,000
Inspector General	4,000	Banking Departments.....	5,900
Clerks, (13)	12,036	Canal Commissioners	5,100
Statistical Department (1).....	300	Clerks	3,900
	16,336		9,000
Registrar	2,669	Governor's Secretary	0,600
Clerks, (2).....	1,664		\$42,500
	4,333		
Receiver General.....	4,000		
Clerks, (5).....	4,080		
	8,088		
Public Works Commissioner ...	3,000		
Sub. do. ...	3,000		
Secretary, (1)	2,000		
	8,000		
	\$115,800		
8 Departments with nine heads ; average \$4,057, and 57 Clerks average \$1,554. Should be at New York proportion, \$21,250.		Six Departments, with six heads, average \$1,680, and 32 Clerks, average \$837. Should be at Canadian proportion \$231,600.	

ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

CANADA—POPULATION 1,500,000.		NEW YORK—POPULATION 3,000,000.	
Upper Canada Common Law—		Judges of Eight Districts—36	
Judges, (6).....	\$ 26,000	Judges	90,000
Chancery, (3)	13,000	Of New York City and County	
	39,000	9 Judges.....	33,000
Lower Canada Common Law—			123,000
Judges, (10)	40,000	Attorney General.....	2,000
Appeals, (4)	13,000	Clerk	800
	62,000		2,800
Attornies General charged under Executive.....	00,000		\$125,800
Allowances to Judges—East ...	1,700		
“ “ West ...	2,400		
	4,100		
Solicitors General.....	4,800		
Pensions to Judges	8,884		
	\$118,784		
23 Judges, average \$4,395 each. At American proportion should be \$62,900.		45 Judges, average \$2,795 each. At Canadian proportion should be \$236,568.	

LEGISLATURE.

CANADA—POPULATION 1,500,000.		NEW YORK—POPULATION 3,000,000.	
Presid't of Legislative Council,	4,000	From the American Almanac, which	
Clerks and Contingencies	19,700	gives no particulars	151,702
	23,704		
Speaker of Assembly.....	4,000	Members of both houses receive \$3 per	
Clerks, \$1,700; Contingencies,		day for 100 days, and after that no-	
\$116,340	118,040	thing; Speakers have an additional	
	122,040	allowance of \$1 per day	\$151,702
French Translator and Assistants	1,620		
Pensions.....	3,548		
	\$150,912		
In Canada the allowance to each		In proportion of Canada, should	
member is \$4 per day, for as many		be \$301,824.	
days as they sit; and the Speakers			
have about \$40 per day.			
In proportion of New York,			
should be \$75,851.			

MILITIA.

CANADA—POPULATION 1,500,000.		NEW YORK—POPULATION 3,000,000.	
Adjutant General East.....	2,000	Adjutant General.....	1,000
“ West.....	2,000	Commissary	700
	4,000	Clerk	800
Clerks	3,116		2,500
Contingencies.....	2,476		\$2,500
	\$9,592		
Two heads of Departments with		One head of Department with	
\$2,000 each. The contingencies		\$1,000.	
include the Provincial Aide-de-		At proportion of Canada, would	
Camp, a sinecure of \$880, held by		be \$19,184.	
Col. Antrobus, who has also a pen-			
sion of \$1,290.			
At proportion of New York,			
should be \$1,250.			

SUPERINTENDENTS OF SCHOOLS.

CANADA—POPULATION 1,500,000.		NEW YORK—POPULATION 3,000,000.	
Superintendent, East.....	\$2,000	In the State of New York the	
Do., West.....	2,000	Secretary of State is also the Su-	
	4,000	perintendent of Schools, for that	
Contingencies, East.....	2,400	Office he receives no extra pay,	
Do., West.....	2,556	and the business is transacted by a	
	4,956	Clerk charged under the head Ex-	
		ecutive.	
Should be at New York propor-		Should be at Canadian propor-	
tion nil.		tion, \$17,912.	

ADDRESS OF THE MONTREAL ANNEX-
ATION ASSOCIATION TO THE
PEOPLE OF CANADA.

FELLOW COLONISTS.

When those whom we have the honour to represent undertook to recommend to you in the Address to the People of Canada published in October last the consideration of the peaceable separation of this Province from Great Britain and its annexation to the United States, they were fully aware of the responsibility which they assumed and were therefore anxious to adopt only such measures as would be perfectly safe for those whose co-operation they sought to enlist. They were ready to suffer whatever odium might for a time be cast on the movers in such a project; but they were resolved to do nothing which could cause civil commotion or personal calamity. Prepared to maintain the right of every people to choose that government which they believe most calculated to promote their own happiness and prosperity, they would not assent to any proposition, which, followed out, might bring those who thought with them into armed conflict with those who differed from them. Conscious of obeying no other motives than those springing from patriotism disinterested and sincere, it was yet not without some hesitation that they committed themselves to a course which, although just and lawful, might divide them from many of their fellow subjects, and from associations long endeared to them. The vast interests at stake—the welfare of themselves, their fellow countrymen and their posterity—urged them, to proceed, and the favourable reception accorded to the expression of their opinion has shown that they did not make a false estimate of the circumstances by which they were surrounded, nor of the good sense, justice and liberality of the people of Great Britain. If we refer for a moment to the condemnation passed on the Address by certain public writers of this Province, (who, we are convinced, do not express the sentiments of the great body of the people,) we do so in no spirit of triumph. But it is of importance for the advancement of the change we seek, to keep steadily before the public of Canada, the fact that this condemnation has not been confirmed by those in whose behalf it was professedly pronounced. Men in this colony who arrogated the right of speaking for the government and people of Great Britain, declared that we asked an impossibility, something to which Great Britain would never consent—which she would put down at all costs, even at that of bloodshed. They even urged the infliction of punishment—such as arbitrary power is able to visit on the guiltless expression of opinion—without waiting to learn if those in whose behalf they would persecute were really offended. We now stand in a totally different position, from that which was occupied by the signers of the original address. The most influential organs of public opinion in the mother country as well as the understood organs of its government have spoken

with as much distinctness as was possible in reply to an unofficial demand. We now know with certainty that for which we had before only well founded belief—that the people of Great Britain acknowledge the right of the inhabitants of this Province to choose for themselves and to establish the government which they deem best adapted to secure prosperity and comfort to the greatest number. We here place a few of these declarations on record, not as our title to rights which we did not possess before; but as valuable acknowledgments of their existence.

From the London Times, Oct. 31.

There was a time when so singular a document as this would have exposed it authors to the penalties of high treason, and the colony in which it was broached to the calamities of civil war; when every Englishman would have boiled with indignation at the presumption which complained of English dominion, and at the temerity which proposed to carry the presumption of language into action. But those days have passed away. We have been taught wisdom by experience; and the most valuable as well as the most costly of our lessons, has been taught by the barren issue of a precipitate conflict with a province, which from remonstrance proceeded to rebellion, and crowned rebellion with independence. We should not go to war for the sterile honour of maintaining a reluctant colony in galling subjection; we should not purchase an unwilling obedience by an outlay of treasure or of blood. If, indeed, with colonial dependence or independence there were indissolubly bound up metropolitan prosperity or decay; if it were tolerably clear that the preservation of our colonial empire would ensure the preservation of metropolitan greatness, and that the latter would wane with the extinction of the former—then such suggestions as the Montreal Address contains would find no place in the discussions, no sympathy in the feelings, of the people in England. They would one and all identify their own interests and prosperity with that which their forefathers were content to regard for and by itself, viz:—the supremacy of English power. But the difference between them and their forefathers is, that they will count and ponder on that more vulgar balance of profit and loss which was forgotten by the generation which hailed the commencement and lamented the conclusion of the great American war. Is the retention of Canada profitable, will its loss be hurtful, to England? is the question which Englishmen of the present day will put to themselves, as the converse of this question is that which Canadians are already discussing on their side. * * * * * Meanwhile—ere this question be solved—let us congratulate ourselves on the reflection that the document which we have quoted proves that the political training which England gives to her colonists is one which need neither make them ashamed of her, nor her of them; and that the future which awaits men thus trained can never be obscure nor dishonourable.

From the London Times, Nov. 2nd.

We retract nothing that we have said on the tone, the temper, and the gravity of the document. By whomsoever it was proposed, by whomsoever concocted, it reflects great credit on the skill, tact, and adroitness of its authors.

From the London Weekly Despatch.

This movement is a fine and cheering example which is wonderfully well-timed for the world's instruction. Here is no bluster and bravado. No vituperations are uttered for past wrongs. No appeal is made to the god of battles. A violent separation is not proposed; nor even one which shall be involuntary on the part of Great Britain. We are treated like rational beings, by those who act like rational beings themselves. The actual tangible loss of the present connexion is put in evidence, and side by side with it the actual tangible gain of the proposed measure. Canada exhibits her day-book and ledger, and asks Lord John Russell to add up the columns, and see the account for himself. Revolution, separation, independence, annexation, are words that conjure up the ideas of armed multitudes, troops in hot pursuit, desperate patriots, dying for the Queen, and dying for the people, courts-martial, and shootings, courts civil and hangings, sea fights and land fights, with a bitterness engendered by the result, whatever it be, that alienates men's hearts through many a generation. All these associations, inevitable in European outbreaks, are superseded by these straightforward Canadians. They show how the whole is settled by logic and arithmetic. The Duke of Wellington is not the least needed. A common accountant, or his clerk, is all the extraneous aid the Cabinet requires. Revolution is tamed and civilized. The Peace Congress may be congratulated.

From the Dundee Advertiser.

In all likelihood, Canada will cease to be a British possession, and that in a very short time. There has been a tendency to this separation for a considerable time back, and we do not think that the loss of Canada as a Colony is to be regretted. On the contrary, we are convinced that both the Colonists and the British will be benefited. The operation of free trade will relieve Colonists from the obligation of protective duties, and they will have no interest in continuing to submit to the British rule, except in so far as they require British protection against their enemies. If Canada be annexed to the United States, she requires such protection no longer. She will be as independent of England as America is, and England will be as independent of her as she is of America. Canadian produce will find its way to our markets as readily as ever, and our manufactures to the Canadian markets. We shall simply be saved the trouble and expense of her Government, and these have been of no trifling nature. We believe our Colonies have cost this country an amount of money which it is impossible to estimate—in wars, in protective duties, and in expenses of government. We shall not regret to see more of them follow the example of Canada, and be at the trouble and expense of maintaining themselves. There is no doubt that the majority of the Canadian population have a right to judge for themselves, and to choose what Government they please. It is said that they are under obligations to us, and that they are therefore not free so to choose. We say the sooner we cease from conferring obligations, the better for us. Hitherto we have paid dearly enough for maintaining our connection with this Colony. We shall now maintain all that is worth preserving—our commercial intercourse—without being taxed for it.

From the Illustrated News.

All these arguments are good as regards Canada; and could the statesmen of this country

believe that they were the sentiments of the large majority of the Canadian people, there can be little doubt but that they would agree to annexation, which in such a case would sooner or later be accomplished in spite of them. Sooner or later, the independence of Canada is sure to be accomplished—as surely as the infants born yesterday shall grow into men; unless, indeed, we shall decree all our colonies to be integral parts of the kingdom of Great Britain, and allow them to send members to Parliament, by the same right and for the same reason that we accord the franchise to London or to Manchester, to Middlesex or to Lancashire. It is possible that by such a course of proceeding we might preserve some of our larger colonies for a time; but, even with such a participation in British power, we doubt whether we could retain Canada for two generations, or the great continent of Australia for three. Their independence is a question of time; and it will be well for us at home if we have sufficient wisdom to know when the time has come, and sufficient virtue to reconcile ourselves peaceably to that which is inevitable. To be deprived of Canada by force and the connivance of the United States, would be humiliation indeed; but to yield it up of our own free-will, would be but a small sacrifice. We question, indeed, whether it would not be a gain.

We seize the first opportunity to observe, that the magnanimous promptitude of the greater portion of the British Public to admit our rights and to appreciate the feelings and respect the motives which actuated the framers of the original Address, calls for the grateful acknowledgments of the People of Canada.

The response of the people of the United States to the Address has not been less satisfactory than that from Great Britain. Not only has the press generally declared in favour of receiving Canada into the Union, if she seek that admission in a legitimate and peaceable manner; but one of the States lying immediately on our own border, in the proceedings of its Legislature has pointedly alluded to the fact that the admission of Canada was contemplated by the original articles of confederation, and has by the following Resolutions declared its desire to see that Union effected:

PROCEEDINGS OF THE VERMONT LEGISLATURE, 1849.

NO. 29.—RESOLUTIONS RELATING TO THE ANNEXATION OF CANADA TO THE UNITED STATES. WHEREAS, by the original articles of the confederation adopted by the States of this Union, it was provided that "Canada, acceding to this confederation and joining in the measures of these United States, shall be admitted into and entitled to all the advantages of this Union:"

AND WHEREAS, recent occurrences in the said Province of Canada indicate a strong and growing desire on the part of the people thereof to avail themselves of the advantages of the foregoing offer, and to apply for admission among the sovereign States of this Union;

THEREFORE, *Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives*, That, believing the admission of Canada into this Union to be a measure intimately connected with the permanent prosperity and glory of both countries, the government of the State of Vermont is earnestly desirous to see such reunion effected, without a violation, on the

part of the United States, of the amicable relations existing with the British Government, or of the law of nations.

Resolved, The peaceful annexation of Canada to the United States, with the consent of the British Government and of the people of Canada, and upon just and honorable terms, is an object in the highest degree desirable to the people of the United States. It would open a wide and fertile field to the enterprise and the industry of the American people; it would extend the boundaries and increase the power of our country; it would enlist a brave, industrious and intelligent people under the flag of our nation; it would spread wide the liberal principles of republican government, and promote the preponderance of free institutions in this Union. We therefore trust that our national government, in the spirit of peace and of courtesy to both the British Government and the people of Canada, will adopt all proper and honorable means to secure the annexation of Canada to the United States.

We were always persuaded that the People of Great Britain would consent to allow the separation which we desired,—without which consent we would consider it neither practicable nor desirable—provided that separation were demanded by the majority of the People of Canada; but we know that many of our fellow Colonists thought otherwise, and were therefore waiting for the judgment of the People of Great Britain before committing themselves to our movement. We can now confidently call on such persons to dismiss all considerations of that nature, and to apply themselves only to the comparison of our present position, with that which we must expect to occupy as a sovereign State of the North American Union. If the change be beneficial, nothing prevents its accomplishment. *YOU HAVE ONLY TO WILL IT.* Motives for the change were set forth in considerable detail in the original Address to the People of Canada. Nothing has since occurred to make that statement less true. After all the vain attempts to show that a few expressions were exaggerated, or to disprove some isolated assertions, that representation of our condition remains unshaken. The belief in the more rapid progress of the United States than of Canada, does not, indeed, depend upon the evidences of any body of men who may address you to-day. The contrast is matter of daily, and to us of mortifying, observation. It has been related and deplored by every British traveller who has compared the two borders. All well informed men, even in England, have repeatedly heard it, and read of it. It is past all honest doubt or denial. We here adduce the evidence, of some witnesses—of men uninfluenced by prejudice except what is in favour of British Rule.

From the London Daily News.

To all who are acquainted with Canada, or have read the publications respecting it which have appeared for a series of years back, this (the Manifesto) is quite intelligible. The contrast between the United States side of the boundary line and the Canadian has been the subject of frequent remark. A cool and dispassionate

man of business, who visited Canada about a month ago, expresses himself, on this subject, in a letter that now lies before us, as follows:

"I had often read of the contrast presented between the American and Canadian shores [of the St. Lawrence], but I could not have comprehended it in all its fulness unless I had witnessed it with my own eyes. On the one side all is life, activity, and prosperity; on the other it is like the stillness of death. Montreal is a very fine city, more like a European town than anything I have yet seen on the American Continent; but here the universal complaint is, that their trade is gone. The mercantile classes seemed to me to be unanimous in favour of annexation; and one cannot wonder at it, when you find a merely nominal line separating them from the prosperity of their neighbours."

(From Lord Durham's Report.)

Under such circumstances, there is little stimulus to industry or enterprise, and their effect is aggravated by the striking contrast presented by such of the United States as border upon this Province, where all is activity and progress. * * * * I allude to the striking contrast which is presented by the American and British sides of the frontier line, in respect of every sign of productive industry, increasing wealth, and progressive civilization. By describing one side and reversing the picture the other would also be described. On the American side all is activity and bustle. * * * * On the British side of the line, with the exception of a few favoured spots, where some approach to American prosperity is apparent, all seems waste and desolate. * * * * Throughout the course of these pages, I have constantly had occasion to refer to this contrast. I have not hesitated to do so, though no man's just pride in his country, and firm attachment to its institutions, can be more deeply shocked by the mortifying admission of inferiority. * * * * The contrast which I have described is the theme of every traveller who visits these countries, and who observes on one side of the line the abundance, and on the other the scarcity of every sign of material prosperity, which thriving agriculture and flourishing cities indicate, and of that civilization which schools and churches testify even to the outward senses.

From Dr. Dixon's Tour in America.

I found the country full of complaints and dissatisfaction from one end to the other. The people everywhere, and of all shades of politics, spoke the same language. Their fortunes were wrecked, their commerce destroyed; their agriculture, the sinews of the colony, enfeebled, ruined. * * * * *

On the enactment of Lord Stanley's bill respecting the admission of Canada flour into this country, a vast outlay in building mills took place which mills had just begun to work profitably; but the new policy effectually crushed this trade. I myself saw one of these mills, belonging to one of our friends,—a new building of great size, and which must have cost many thousand pounds in its erection,—standing still. This I understood was generally the case. * * * * In the present state of things, cast off by the mother country, and left to their own resources, with the United States just by their side, possessing vast political power and influence; a growing credit, and monetary resources; a prodigious mercantile and commercial navy; an active, industrious and virtuous people; a government capable, in all respects, and equally disposed, to foster, pro-

tect, and strengthen all its possessions ;—we say, with all these things staring them in the face, the policy of this country has made it the plain, palpable interest of the Canadians to seek for annexation. This is as clear as any problem in Euclid.

From a letter by the Great Apostle of Temperance, Father Chiniquy, addressed to the Mélanges Religieux of October 19th, 1849, on his return from the United States.

I do not exaggerate when I say that there are not less than 200,000 Canadians in the United State, and unless efficacious means are taken to stop this frightful emigration before ten years, two hundred thousand more of our compatriots, will have carried to the American Union their arms, their intelligence and their hearts. It is no part of my present plan to examine the causes of this deplorable emigration ; but it must be always true, that when a people en masse quits its country, it is because that unfortunate country is struck with some hideous plague—is devoured by some cancer. * * * * * God has placed in the heart of man love for his country, and when a man turns his back upon his country, and with the eye moistened by tears bids it an eternal adieu, it is because something essential has been wanting to him in that country. It is because he has wanted bread, room, or just liberty. I leave others to say which of the three has been deficient in Canada. All that I can assure you of is, that in the United States these three essential elements of the life of nations are found in abundance.

or is the decline in prosperity caused by the reversal of the protective policy of the mother country, by any means less evident than when the former address was issued. We need go into no proofs of this allegation ; they have been recently proclaimed by those who are opposed to the course we desire to adopt.

Under these circumstances ; encouraged by Great Britain and the United States to act with freedom, in the exercise of an enlightened judgement, do you see any other probable means of escape from a position of acknowledged inferiority than that which has been set before you by the advocates of annexation ? Those who have protested against the Address to the People of Canada, have declared their belief that the evils of which we complain, and which they recognize, might be removed by judicious legislation. They are now told that Great Britain can do nothing to restore our past advantages.

Thus says the *London Times* on this subject :

"It must be admitted that the latter have grievances, though not all equally oppressive nor all of the same origin. They have been planted and thriven under protective laws. Those laws are now abrogated ; and abrogated—as the people of Canada have the sense to see—without a chance of re-enactment. So far they suffer, in common with all our colonies, the effects of a bad and obsolete colonial system. The change, however, is made. The colonists know that what has been done will not be undone, and that the grain crops of Western Canada must compete in the markets of England with the grain crops of the United States, of Poland, and of

the whole world. They are suffering from the revulsion."

In this particular, as in every other, the views of those who addressed you in favour of annexation have been fully confirmed.

Is there any brighter nope from another quarter ? Our opponents maintain that present causes of complaint would be removed by the attainment of reciprocal free trade with the United States. It is perhaps too soon to affirm as a positive fact that this advantage cannot be obtained ; but it is quite clear that those who lately vaunted most loudly the benefits to accrue from it, now despair of securing it. They have already begun to depreciate it as something of very inferior utility.

For the social and political disadvantages under which we labour no adequate remedy other than that which we advocate, has ever been proposed. The most able British writers—those best acquainted with the Colony, acknowledge, and at the same time deplore them as inseparable from the Colonial condition, and inevitable while that condition continues.

Our country is of no account in the congress of nations, as individuals we are practically excluded from the honours of the Empire, while men, who have no permanent interest in our welfare acquire riches, and obtain honours on our soil. We have no common objects of national pride and solicitude ; but as citizens of the United States, we should attain a nationality worthy of our highest aspirations.

These sentiments have been so well expressed in a late work, 'The Colonies of England,' by J. A. Roebuck, Esq., M. P., that we here transcribe his language :

"The career that lies between two men, one of whom has been born and lives upon the Southern shore of the St. Lawrence, and the other on the North of that river is a striking example of the observation here made. The one is a citizen of the United States, the other a subject of England, a Canadian Colonist. The one has a country which he can call his own ; a great country already distinguished in arms, in arts and in some degree in literature. In his country's honor and fame the American has a share, and he enters upon his career of life with lofty aspirations, hoping to achieve fame for himself in some of the many paths to renown which his country affords. She has a Senate, an army, a navy, a bar, many powerful and wealthy churches ; her men of science, her physicians, philosophers are all a national brotherhood, giving and receiving distinction. How galling to the poor Colonist is the contrast to this, which his inglorious career affords ! He has no country—the place where he was born, and where he has to linger out his life, unknown to fame, has no history—no past glory, no present renown. What there is of note is England's. Canada is not a Nation ; she is—a Colony—a tiny sphere, the satellite of a mighty star in whose brightness she is lost. Canada has no navy, no army—no literature—no brotherhood of science. If then a Canadian looks for honour in any of these various fields he must seek it as an Englishman ; he must forget and desert his country before he can be known to fame."

If all these substantial arguments in favour of annexation remain unchanged, or have been strengthened by lapse of time, you will certainly not be deterred from pursuing the course indicated as desirable, by the arbitrary commands of those, who assume to be your masters. Those who addressed you were known to be beyond suspicion of seeking personal emolument from the public funds. They employed no force but that of reason—they repudiated every means but that, most lawful—the assent of every constituted authority in the state. They desired to fortify, and where necessary, to create a public opinion in favour of their views, which should be manifested not on paper merely, but in that authoritative way which the constitution has contemplated, in giving to the people the right of electing their legislators. They therefore did not endeavour to obtain all the names which might have been procured to the document they put forth. They were satisfied, when they had enrolled sufficient adherents without solicitation to show that they were not a few deluded men, acting without warrant of wide spread public thought. How have they been replied to? Their opponents have sent agents through the most populous counties immediately adjoining the city unexpectedly favored by the removal of the seat of government. As well there, as in this city, they have employed against us every influence derived from official patronage, and yet how trifling has been their success!

In the absence of argument, persecution has been resorted to by an Executive, affecting to owe its existence to the Popular Will, against such as dared assert the right, not of British subjects merely, but of intellectual beings,—the right of thought and of free discussion.

Fellow Colonists, will you submit to have your free political action suppressed by such means? Are your servants to dictate to you the subjects which may engage your attention and prohibit all others under pain of their interference and censure? We trust not. We feel assured that you will be the more inclined to support those who have been opposed by means which we will not characterise otherwise than as oppressive. We now call on such of you as are favourable to our views to exert yourselves in order that the great object before us may be speedily attained. All agree in believing that annexation is inevitable; a mere question of time. It is our conviction that there can be no settled policy—no established public credit—no cessation of political strife—no prosperity—until we reach the state to which we are destined. Let us then unite to secure it as early as possible.

JOHN REDPATH,
President.
R. MACKAY,
A. H. DORION,
Secretaries.

Montreal, 15th Dec., 1849.

* * The Annexation Association of Montreal begs to thank such portions of the press as have lent them assistance for the able aid they have afforded. The Association, while it recognizes no exposition of its views, except those which shall be signed by its officers, feels a deep debt of gratitude to these who have generously stood up for truth and the people, against the obloquy which have been cast on both.

The above Address was intended by the Annexation Association to exhibit the feeling of the PEOPLE of Great Britain, as far as it could be judged of, by the publications of the influential press of that country. Since the Address was published, the Imperial Government, by a Despatch to Lord Elgin, have declared themselves to be determined to oppose the movement which the Association desires to promote. Of course the ultimate decision will depend, not upon the present, nor indeed on any future opinion of Lord Grey or his colleagues, but upon that of the PEOPLE of Great Britain. In the meantime the Association deem it right to set Lord Grey's Despatch before their fellow countrymen, together with their protest against it.

TO THE PEOPLE OF CANADA—

The Annexation Association of Montreal feel it incumbent on them to address you in reference to the following despatch from Earl Grey, purporting to contain the views of Her Most Gracious Majesty on the question of the peaceable separation of Canada from Great Britain and its Annexation to the United States:—

DOWNING STREET, January 9, 1850.

MY LORD,—I have to acknowledge your despatch of the dates and numbers quoted in the margin No. 114, 19th November, 1849: 127, 3rd December, 1849: 129, 3rd December, 1849: 134, 4th December, 1849. I have laid these despatches before Her Majesty, and also the address of the Warden and Councillors of the Municipal Council of the Gore District—the Lieutenant Colonel and Officers of the Regiment of Dorchester—of the Officers of the 4th Battalion of the Regiment of Yamaska, and of the Inhabitants of the Parish of St. Anne de la Pocatière, and of the Officers of Militia and Lieutenant Colonel commanding Battalion of the Regiment of Quebec, inclosed in the two first of these despatches which her Majesty has been pleased to receive very graciously, and it has afforded Her Majesty great satisfaction to receive these expressions of that loyalty and attachment to the British Crown, which she trusts is generally felt by her Canadian subjects. With regard to the address to the people of Canada in favor of severing the Province from the British dominions for the purpose of annexing it to the United States, which forms the subject of the 3rd of these despatches I have to inform you, that Her Majesty, approves of your having dismissed from Her service those who have signed the document, which is scarcely short of treasonable in its character. Her Majesty confidently relies on the loyalty of the great majority of her Canadian subjects, and she is therefore determined to exert all the authority, which belongs to her, for the purpose of maintaining the connection of Canada with this country; being persuaded that the permanence of the connection is highly advantageous to both. Your Lordship will therefore understand that you are commanded by Her

Majesty to resist to the utmost of your power any attempt which may be made, to bring about the separation of Canada, from the British dominions, and to mark in the strongest manner Her Majesty's displeasure with all those who may directly or indirectly encourage such a design. If any attempt of this kind should take such a form that those who are guilty of it may, according to such advice as you may receive from your law advisers, be made responsible for their conduct in a Court of Justice, you will not fail to take the necessary measures for bringing them to account.

I am, my Lord,

Your most obedt., Servt.,

GREY.

The Right Hon. EARL OF ELGIN.

The Association have carefully reconsidered their two addresses, and they do not find in them the language of menace or sedition; but a calm dispassionate statement of social evils under which Canada suffers, and a remedy, by constitutional means, suggested for consideration. It is to the People of Canada that these statements have been made, and it is for you to decide whether the remedy proposed, is one that is advantageous or worthy of being referred to the British Nation for their assent. It is impossible for this Association to regard the expression of Earl Grey's opinions as conveying the decision as the British Nation. Even should the British Parliament support his Lordship, we conceive that their action will be premature until the question has been constitutionally brought before them, approved by a majority of the representatives of the Canadian People. The Association deny the right of the Colonial Secretary to offer, by anticipation, the decision of the British Government, on a question that is not constitutionally before them; and they further desire to point out the danger that may hereafter arise, if the principle be once admitted that the Queen's name and authority can be introduced to suppress the lawful discussion of any political question in the Colony. The British people have a proper and constitutional opportunity of expressing their assent or dissent to any colonial measures, and it is a subject of painful surprise to this Association, that Earl Grey should have encroached on the rights of her Majesty's Canadian subjects, in venturing to decide that any question was unfit to be brought by them before their representatives. The Association are necessarily ignorant of the terms in which the Governor General brought their address under the notice of the Colonial Secretary, and how far those terms justify his Lordship in giving a character to their proceedings which they have distinctly denied from the outset. The Association now reiterate that they seek the attainment of their object only with the free and willing consent of Great Britain, that they never will urge the subject by other than calm appeals to the reason and intelligence of their fellow subjects,—first in Canada, afterwards in England,—and that they have no sympathy with any who hold other sentiments than these.

While re-asserting the position the Association have assumed, they feel that the language of

the Colonial Secretary requires from them the discharge of a farther and a higher duty, in denying all right, on his part to punish men for the assertion of opinion.

The free discussion of all subjects is a right inherent in every man under a free form of government, and the power to advocate, by constitutional means and moderate counsels, changes of any description, is the great safeguard against violence and rebellion. The moment an attempt is made to coerce the free expression of public opinion, the most sacred right of the people is attacked, and the ground-work laid for any and every stretch of despotic power. The association ask their fellow citizens whether, in all they have suggested or done, they have not most carefully avoided advocating aught that could in the slightest degree infringe the laws or warrant the interference of Executive Authority. And feeling that their course has been temperate and legal, they deny the right of Earl Grey to use towards them the language of his despatch, or to interfere in their discussion of any subject affecting the interests of Canada. The Association, therefore, entreat their fellow subjects, not to allow any feeling of hostility to the policy of those who now address them, to blind them to the consequences of admitting the position assumed by Lord Grey; but to look only at the great principle involved.

Let the People of Canada, to whom this Association addressed themselves, decide, whether the course of Earl Grey is in accordance with the constitution granted to them, and whether his approval ought to affect the legal discussion of any subject intended to be brought before the Legislature of this Country.

Let them say whether Responsible Government is only a name, or is intended to assure that freedom of opinion, dear to every British subject. To you, then, the people of Canada, we appeal; and we ask whether we shall be compelled to brood in silence over the evils the country labors under, or whether we have the right temperately to discuss those evils and their cure, free from the threat of punishment, and independent alike of the interference and control of any others than those who are constitutionally responsible to you. In conclusion, the Association would remark, that the subject of discussion has been obscured by the mode adopted for checking the expression of public opinion, and this Association in the broad assertion of an undeniable right, maintain that they will not be diverted from the legal and constitutional course which they have adopted, in full reliance that whenever the question is brought before Great Britain, by our responsible ministers, their application will be treated with that respect and consideration which its magnitude and importance demand. In the deliberate adoption of this course, the association conceive that they are defending one of the greatest bulwarks of this country's liberties, and they claim the support of all true friends of Canada, whatever be their views of the policy the association seek to promote.

JOHN REDPATH, *President*.
R. MACKAY, }
A. A. DORION, } *Secretaries*

