

must, in consequence be made subservient to its support."

Now, as to England, I shall presently adduce fact against assertion. But the operations of the party-patronage system must be vastly more marked and more baneful in Canada, than it is here exhibited to be in the United States as our examples. The population is much smaller here than there; and the number of offices larger, in proportion, and they were greatly multiplied by the late advisers, and proposed to be multiplied to a much greater extent. The violence & personality of party are increased in proportion to the smallness of the population, and the amount of patronage to be distributed for party purposes. This system, once the rule of government in Canada, and all hope is extinguished that the Janus temple of social war will ever be shut, or social peace ever be enjoyed. Between the rising youth of Canada and all promotion there is an impassable gulf, however "splendid their talents," or shining their virtues, or high their attainments, unless they can provide, and prove the possession of the additional requisite bridge of political partisanship interest. And this apple of discord—this premium for partisanship—this offshoot of the worst species of democracy—this extinguisher of inobtrusive virtue and intelligence—this system of political and moral corruption—this blood-sucker of the religious and moral feeling of the country; is dignified as the "essence of responsible government" and all who do not fall down and worship this golden image of party idolatry, are to be cast into the furnace of party proscription and execration, heated seven times hotter than it was wont in former days! Such a system will prove CURRAN—the gem of Irish intellect—an idiot. He said "I have known tumult and disorder to make many a rich man poor; but I never knew it to make a poor man rich." This newly advocated system of responsible government will indeed make a rich country poor but it is the patent though unprincipled way to make poor political partisans rich. Under its operation cunning will be the desideratum for the public man, and moral principle will die, and with it will crumble the whole constitution of government; for, as the learned Schlegel, in his admirable lectures on the philosophy of history, remarks—"At no time has a political constitution or mode of government been devised, which could permanently supply the place of principle." May the Ruler of Nations avert such a calamity from Canada!

For Sir Charles Metcalfe to be a party to such a system—much more the stipulated tool of it—would not only be violating the commands of his Sovereign, and the still higher commands of the King of Kings, and withholding every verdant germ of Canadian excellence and hope, with the *simoon* blast of the evils above deprecated; but would be setting the seal of condemnation to his own appointment as Governor General of British North America. In the late debate on Canadian affairs in the British House of Commons, Mr.

Buller said that Sir Charles Metcalfe belonged to "the ranks of the opponents of Her Majesty's present government;" Lord Stanley said Sir Charles "was not a supporter of the present Ministry;" Sir Robert Peel said that Sir Charles was not even personally known to a single member of the present Government, until after his recommendation to Her Majesty as Governor General of Canada. The emoluments of that office are larger than those of Secretary of State for the Colonies. The Ministry in England have many needy and office-seeking dependants and friends—noble and otherwise—to whom such an office would be an invaluable boon, and who, no doubt, regarded themselves as having strong political claims "for services rendered." And, had Her Majesty's Advisers acted upon the new and detestable article incorporated into the political creed of the late Advisers of the Governor General to regard their opponents as "enemies," and fill up "all vacant offices with men of their own party," then would Sir Charles Metcalfe not have been (as Mr. Buller expressed it) taken from the ranks of their opponents. He desired not the office: he desired and needed not its emoluments; the office needed him; Her Majesty's Ministers resolving (as Sir Robert Peel has more than once avowed, and as Lord John Russell declared, after the passing of the Municipal Corporation Bill,) to recommend persons to office according to their fitness and merits, advised the appointment of one of their "opponents" in the person of Sir Charles Metcalfe. This is British responsible Government, as practiced by Her Majesty's Ministers in the very appointment of the present Head of the Canadian Executive, and this is the true responsible government for Canada. Sir Charles Metcalfe's peculiar fitness for the situation of Governor General of Canada, was asserted even by Mr. Hume, and eulogized in the strongest terms by the late Councillors themselves, at the commencement of the late Session of the Legislature, after they had had several months' confidential intercourse with His Excellency. But having changed their doctrine of Government, they have in a corresponding ratio amazingly changed their language in regard to Sir Charles Metcalfe, and have done but little else in their speeches for months past, than attempt to falsify the words they themselves had employed in Parliament during the discussion of the answer to the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the Session. This is only another addition to the catalogue of their inconsistencies and self-contradictions which I have heretofore pointed out: whilst Sir Charles Metcalfe, true to the principles sanctioned by Her Majesty and her advisers in his own appointment, true to the equal rights and privileges of all classes of Her Majesty's subjects in Canada, continues to maintain what the late Councillors advised Sir Charles Bagot to declare to the Johnstown District Council, "that the distribution of the patronage of the Executive Government shall be confined to no particular section or party, religious or political."

That the purposes—administrative and no doubt. The corruption, an administration beacons of wisdom. The profane swearer, guilty of it; of patronage where it was mit of denial crown did in trine itself; his celebrated trine of the l has his price tested. Dr. Philosophy, according to of the subject. are perfect o be asserted l comes in the of law." In rights," he where the q best qualified yet if he be cannot seize dress at law Wherever t ponding obl prefer the b be grateful my children in all these right is im "imperfect, language of however, s that it leads less guilt in gation, tha groundless perfect or in violence im force it. P tiality," "di station in li or livelihood grievously in others, a greater cri out of a lib kerchief; t an imperfec In this r didates for to their qu correspond have the d ments upon gration whi dren; and other princ ty and inj