

General avers and maintains all that the people of Canada understand by Responsible Government; the past and present actions of the late Counsellors prove all that the Governor General has alleged respecting them. If they have no other object in view than what they have above explained, they have no cause for war with the British Government. Their being at war with the British Government, proves that they have some ulterior object in view.

A few words in reply to objections. It has been objected that his Excellency had observed, shortly after his arrival in Canada, an "antagonism" between him and his late advisers on the principle upon which the patronage of the Crown should be distributed, and that he never disclosed it until the interviews which took place on Friday and Saturday the 24th and 25th of November. This is most honorable to his Excellency, and is one of the circumstances of his public life that will enhance his reputation in the estimation of the future historian. Few British monarchs have been so considerate of the feelings and influence of their advisers as not to let it be known when their feelings were hostile to the policy recommended by those advisers. Even "good Queen Anne" did not hesitate to let it be known that she regarded the advisers whom she disliked as her "enemies," nor did the Georges, First, Second, Third, and Fourth, conceal their "antagonism" with certain advisers and ministries, to whom personally, or to whose policy they were opposed. It was notorious throughout the nation that there was an "antagonism" between William IV and his advisers, from 1832 to 1837, that he availed himself of the opportunity that presented itself, in 1834, to get rid of them; that though they were restored, and continued in office until his death, yet that during the three first years of his life especially, his "antagonism" with them was inveterate, and the papers teemed with "public rumours," and even examples of it. In England, such as "antagonism" or even "public rumours" of it, has never been considered a sufficient ground of ministerial resignation, or even of public complaint.

As long as a minister's advice, as to acts, is so far assented to by the Crown as to enable him to retain the confidence of Parliament, he continues in office and counsels the affairs of the nation, whatever may be the personal feelings of the Sovereign, or the "public rumours" of his feelings. But did Sir Charles Metcalfe subject his late advisers to such a disadvantage? Suppose that he had avowed this "antagonism" against conducting the government upon party principles, as to the distribution of patronage shortly after he had arrived in Canada, would it not have given a great advantage to their opponents? Did not the late Counsellors make use of his Excellency's name in every form to strengthen themselves and weaken their adversaries? When then did his Excellency acknowledge and avow this "antagonism?"—Only when the late Counsellors, not content

with advising him on acts and measures, announced to him formally the principle of party government in the distribution of patronage, and demanded of him to enter into a stipulation, or, as Mr. Hincks expresses it, "come to an understanding on certain points," that he would not in future make "appointments prejudicial to their influence." His Excellency refused to come to such an understanding; and then, and not till then, did he express his "antagonism" to the principles of party patronage, which he had observed governing their recommendations to office from his first arrival in the Province, but to which his formal assent was then for the first time demanded. Hitherto, without discussing or alluding to the party principle which he had noticed influencing their advice as to patronage, he had considered each case on its merits, and sought to meet the wishes and support the influence of his advisers, as far as possible, both in abstaining from and in making appointments. But when the principle—the newly avowed, the false and unchristian principle—was brought before him for his sanction, that the prerogative might be bound to the ear of party, he avowed his "antagonism" to the principle, and asserted, on behalf of his Sovereign and her Canadian subjects, the prerogative of justice and impartiality to all classes and parties.

With what commanding dignity an authority to the conscience and soul of uncorrupted man, does this parental and divine principle, this principle avowed and contended for by Reformers in Canada during the last twenty years—contrast with the selfish, the ignoble and ignominious principle laid down by Mr. Hincks as the fundamental principle of (his) representative government, when in reference to this very antagonism, he says in his third letter to the London Morning Chronicle, "I admit the good intentions of the Governor, but I am firmly persuaded that no representative government can be conducted unless on party principles." Where the principles of a government are party, their party must be the first interest in the state, and where party is the first interest in the state, he Lord have mercy upon all who are not of the dominant party, and away with the prerogative. This doctrine is the very antipodes of constitutional monarchy—does not even attain to the virtue of republicanism—and is the very essence of oligarchy and democracy—the democracy of Athens when ostracism was in the ascendant—the democracy of England when Cromwell seized the crown—the oligarchy of Athens when the Thirty Tyrants ruled—the oligarchy of England when the Earl of Leicester and twenty-three others got the prerogative in their own hands, by exacting a "stipulation" to that effect from the feeble Henry III. It is the doctrine of "might gives right." But of this government "on party principles," more in another number.

It has also been objected, that his Excellency did not act courteously towards his late Counsellors, and that he sought to undermine and destroy their influence. The last part of

this objection in the remainder of the letter receives a most satisfactory reply. Towards his late advisers at the time of their appointment, and of their first letter to him, he was most courteous and considerate.

"The only colleagues of his Excellency, is of courtesy up to the last."

And if there was such to his gratitude, feeling, no mercy ever to Council with.

Then, as to undermining late advisers, he has ordered: 1. He Canada to keep "antagonism" whatever down to the 2. When the dress from his Excellency's great annoy.

in Canada, the protection of his confidence in return for individuals."

the charge may, but even nor General sought to re-

tion of a eye replied, that Charles Metcalfe neither the Governor.

pher."—3. He cised the partying extent late advisers their power direct public.

Baldwin, the elevation of the generated father His Excellency of several Councilors, Captain Em-

tically returned not merely of has an undomg the mo-

cency's adrule his Ex-tronage of the influence of in which he have been t-