

oundation of indivi-
il, in their depart-
action which was
alfe, in his reply to
istrict Council—a
since been the op-
Toronto Associa-
on which the
acted.

ewise, the follow-
time objected, as
exclusive distribu-
y views, and main-
ice ought, in eve-
the man best qual-
ices to the State;
ch pre-eminence,
his discretion,"
ed are admitted by
s. Let the read-
they plainly imply
ation of patronage
and demanded;" for
to it—which he
here been no de-
no, the late Advi-
ave the House no
ent, likewise, as
y shows, that the
age of the Crown
leading, if not the
between the Gov-
Councillors,—on
h-like si. once in
only of their right
overnor-General

urthermore, that
propositions were
again, sometimes
s aiming at the
pinion, if accom-
virtual surrender
of the preroga-
another fact ad-
and Hincks, but
the explanation.
r. Viger, quoted
it the following
ing can more
s were not very
of their own sug-
these words of
ers had the a-
ree distinct pro-
t terms, provi-
self-same pur-
surrender into
prerogative of

attention to the
g paragraph of
er to his late
f the conversa-
d Saturday fol-
ic Council re-
rown, that de-
struction put by
meaning of Re-
opinions were

elicited on the abstract theory of that still un-
defined question, as applicable to a colony,—
a subject on which considerable difference of
opinion is known every where to prevail; but
the Governor General, during these conver-
sations, protested against its being supposed
that he is practically adverse to the working
of the system of Responsible Government
which has been here established, which he has
hitherto pursued without deviation, and to
which it is fully his intention to adhere."

I beg the reader to mark distinctly the facts
stated in the paragraph thus quoted—facts,
be it recollected, which have been admitted
by Messrs. Baldwin and Hincks. The first
fact referred to by the Governor General for
the third time (and which he says in another
place "became the principle topic of dis-
cussion" on Saturday,) is "the explicit de-
mand made by the Council regarding the pa-
tronage of the Crown." The second fact is,
that that demand was "based on the construc-
tion put by some of the gentlemen on the
meaning of Responsible Government." I
shall hereafter show, that in this first mention-
ed fact is involved all the mystery which for
a long time hung, and to some extent still
hangs, over the questions at issue between the
Governor General and his late Councillors.
Partly from a "pressure from without," ex-
plained in Mr. Parke's letter to one of his
constituents, and partly from other conjectur-
al causes, they have introduced a new element
into the system of Responsible Government
—an element which I will prove they did not
pretend twelve months ago formed any part
or parcel of it—an element which invests it
with all the danger which its opponents have
always ascribed to it—an element which
clothes it with the character of old high party
exclusion and domination, instead of the attri-
bute of (to use Lord Durham's words) "equal
and impartial justice to all classes of her Ma-
jesty's subjects"—an element against the in-
troduction and surges of which Sir Charles
Metcalfe has set his face with the firmness of
the wave-beaten rocks of his native Isle, while
he retains all that was ever acknowledged by
Sir Charles Bagot, all that was contemplated
in the resolutions of September, 1841, or that
is compatible with the safety of the Crown in
England, of its supremacy in Canada—an ele-
ment which plucks from the Crown its prerog-
ative of patronage without its own consent;
which makes it a "tool" instead of an unpire
—an instrument instead of an agent—a slave
instead of a Sovereign. Before I shall have
completed the present discussion, I purpose
to make the all important fact here alleged, as
plain and unquestionable as that two and two
make four. It will then be seen that it was
this new element, and not Responsible Go-
vernment proper which formed the point of
"antagonism" between Sir Charles Metcalfe
and his late advisers—the new wheel in the
old and long worked machinery.

It is not surprising, therefore, when an un-
heard of "demand, based by some of the gen-
tlemen on the meaning of Responsible Go-
vernment;" was made, that the Governor-

General should speak of "the abstract theory
of that still undefined question, as applicable to
a colony"—a remark which though guarded
by His Excellency in a way that cannot by
any decent criticism be tortured into a suspi-
cion that "he is practically adverse to the
working of the system of Responsible Govern-
ment which has been here established, which
he has hitherto pursued without deviation,
and to which it is fully his intention to ad-
here"—has nevertheless been seized upon by
the speechifying portion of the late advisers
and the Toronto Associationists, and inter-
woven with the entire texture of their "still un-
defined" vocabulary—though Mr. WILLIAM
HUME BLAKE, Professor of Law, and cham-
pion of the Toronto Association, declared in
memorable Warren Hastings' speech, that Re-
sponsible Government itself is not only an
undefined, but an undefinable question. Yet
the unqualified declaration of Mr. Blake is
perfect orthodoxy, because he is of the party;
but the qualified remark of Sir Charles Met-
calfe, made in a particular connexion and in
reference to a peculiar interpretation, is abso-
lute heresy, because he is not of the party!—
Such is the spirit of party—a creature too
multitudinous in its members to admit of the
moral influence of individual responsibility,
and too heterogenous in its materials to war-
rant the hope of consistency.

Such then are the facts of Sir Charles
Metcalfe's statement, which are admitted by
Messrs. Baldwin and Hincks, and denied by
none of their colleagues. I will now examine
the most important, and the only disputed
fact alleged by His Excellency. He says that
the late Councillors "demanded that the Go-
vernor-General should agree that in deciding,
after taking their advice, he would not make
any appointment prejudicial to their influence."
The Governor-General considered this as
equivalent to agreeing "that the patronage
of the Crown should be surrendered to the Coun-
cil for the purchase of parliamentary support,"
and replied, "that he would not make any such
stipulation, and could not degrade the charac-
ter of his office, nor violate his duty by such a
surrender of the prerogative of the Crown."

It should be remarked that Sir Charles Met-
calfe does not call this demand a "stipulation"
in the legal, or if you please parliamentary
sense of that term, but in a moral sense, as an
understanding between man and man—in a
sense which he had defined by the preceding
statement. He says "such stipulation,"
"such a surrender of the prerogative of the
Crown."

That is a simple statement of the question.
Many of the warmest supporters of the late
Councillors have declared, that if it could be
shown that they required any such "stipula-
tion" or understanding with His Excellency
as to his future course of proceeding, they
violated their duty, they infringed the prerog-
ative, and ought not to be sustained. Let us
now see whether it is not as clear as the day
that they did demand such an understanding,
or what is equivalent between man and man
to a stipulation. In discussing this question,