

connexion
try, instead
are taking a
contrary ef-
fide, gentle-
ment Responsi-
by the dis-
of the Go-
ven used, but
e must have
The very ob-
is to control
the Governor
e confidence.
make appoint-
r against the
s, it must be
n understand-
f Responsible
ou imagine for
y set of men
ens are to be
nce? The ven-
ent acting in
itself! And
almost every
e, that the ap-
point reference

ounded in the
it recollected,
councillors, and
inted for wide
ociation. The
ned much that
med for them-
ely the friends
first part of the
that the To-
sely the same
own party, as ex-
ng British con-
party incorp-
at this boasted
was very oddly
d the Associat-
of 1837. I can
authority that a
to Association,
Toronto (refer-
"If we had on-
done anything."
being "desirous
on"—they would
; and yet they
men desirous of
!!!"

ee things should
Councillors and
declare as a fact
p the vacant of-
a party. Truly,
at the Governor
intments against,
," the advice of
-that otherwise,
possible Govern-
course makes the
"of the council;

and this is declared essential to the existence of Responsible Government! 3rdly, They therefore represent, in the third place, Sir C. Metcalfe as an enemy to Responsible Government, because he "declares, in almost every one of his answers to addresses, that appointments are to be made without reference to party considerations."

Such, be it recollected, is the late Councillors' own account of what they mean by *party government*.—It is not merely the selection of the advisers of the Crown from the party of the majority in the Legislature. To this kind of party government Sir C. Metcalfe has not even hinted an objection in any of the documents which he has put forth. It is not pretended that he ever expressed the slightest objection to the composition of the late Council: or that he ever so much as suggested or entertained the idea of dismissing some of them and filling up their places with persons from the ranks of the opposite party. To the administration of the government *through a party*, he has assented as practically and as thoroughly as her Majesty herself. But there is another—a new—and a very different element, which the Upper Canada section of the late Councillors has introduced into their system of the government of party—that is, *governing the party, to the exclusion of a party*. It is this new element which the doctrine of the above quoted passage from Mr. Hincks' address, which has been adopted and republished by the Toronto Reform Association; it is this new element which is the doctrine of Mr. Sullivan, in pronouncing as "childish folly" the idea of bestowing an office upon any other than the supporters of the ruling party; it is this new element which has formed the point of "antagonism" between Sir Charles Metcalfe and his late Councillors, from an early period of his administration; it was this new element which originated the demand for the patronage of the Crown for party purposes, and under the false but plausible pretext that it formed the essence of Responsible Government, as intimated in the above quoted passage from the address adopted by the Toronto Association, and as stated by Sir Charles Metcalfe, when he says that the "demand which was made by the Council regarded the patronage of the Crown, was based on the construction put by some gentlemen on the meaning of Responsible Government."

This is the only solution of the conflicting statements between Sir Charles Metcalfe and his late advisers, which can be given without an absolute impeachment of their integrity.—By Responsible Government they *really* mean this sort of party patronage government—a bastard Responsible Government—whilst his Excellency means by the phrase, the legitimate Responsible Government, which recognizes ministerial responsibility, and at the same time the purest and noblest attribute of the prerogative, to be equally just to all classes; or, as Mr. Howe of Nova Scotia expresses it, "to bestow all offices for the public good, without reference to party."

Now, the question of this kind of party go-

vernment, and the question of the right of the Councillors to be consulted on appointments to office, are as different as night is from day. Which of these questions, then, was the subject of "antagonism" between Sir Charles Metcalfe and his late advisers? Mr. Baldwin, in his explanation, represented the latter, and on the latter the house voted. Sir C. Metcalfe asserts the former; and I think I have above given sufficient reasons to evince the truth of his Excellency's assertion. But I will appeal again to the direct and unequivocal testimony of his accusers, not only so as to their construction of Responsible Government, as meaning party government, but that that party government implies the exercise of the prerogative of patronage for the exclusive benefit of one party, and that this was the primary and real subject of antagonism between the Governor General and his late Councillors. I appeal to the letters of Mr. Hincks to the London *Morning Chronicle*—letters republished and endorsed by the organs of the Toronto Reform Association.—Mr. Hincks gives the following interpretation of Responsible Government, and the following account of the antagonism referred to:—"I have established the fact that the parties to whom I have referred in a former part of this letter, are all pledged to Responsible Government as practised in England—that is, to a *party government*. Sir Charles Metcalfe, on the other hand, is a determined opponent of such a government—as a *reference to facts will prove*. It is admitted on all hands that appointments to office were in several instances made by his Excellency, without any consultation with his Council, and these appointments were in *their opinion, prejudicial to their influence*. I put it to you, Mr. Editor, is it in accordance with British practice, which, according to Lord Durham, should be our guide, that the *patronage of the Crown* should be distributed so as to destroy the political influence of the existing ministry? It is truly absurd to put such a case. It could never be tolerated a moment by any ministry. And yet the present difficulties in Canada, as well as in Nova Scotia, have been caused by an attempt to administer colonial government on principles entirely inconsistent with the representative institutions. Nothing would induce me to misrepresent the views of Sir Charles Metcalfe on this subject. I believe that HIS EXCELLENCY CONSCIENTIOUSLY DISAPPROVES OF PARTY GOVERNMENT, and that from the time of his arrival in Canada, he was determined to overthrow it. Hence his own expression, that "he had observed "an ANTAGONISM" between his Council and himself from the time of his arrival in the country." (*Copied from the Kingston Chronicle, January 31.*)

Here then it is expressly stated that the subject of antagonism between Sir Charles Metcalfe and his late advisers, was the question of *party government in respect to the distribution of the Crown*: whilst Mr. Baldwin described that subject of antagonism to be "the question of the right of the Council to be con-