

sals which they
versations which
on which they
But neglecting
ourtesy and jus-
on Saturday
common fair-
tender their
ve accompanied
ll and explicit
of them, and
on to state to
ut the whole of
ary ministerial
ish the crown
en, that would
and truly, indi-
s? For such a
neither British
-though party
for it, as I will

ey have had lit-
a practice and
the plea. I ad-
are entitled to
orking the new
Councillors ap-
compared with
s of Govern-
-like him, been
British system
-that they have
ish statesmen
century; that
orked different
t in both hem-
are, therefore,
pretation. But
low it? Nay,
robation: they
ey even refuse
on the merits of
usive identity
sible Govern-
parties claim
and apostoli-
sible Govern-
abbed in their
lives or dies
or as Mr. Bald-
ner in Toron-
ell knew that
on the present
his late collea-
ed not in effect,
e treated as a
responsible Gov-

Who does not
be in the
inciple of Re-
d will be acted
reflection and
tever passions
may lash into
usive and fa-
ey have made
erson of Sir
issue in their

own confusion, if not in the misfortune of in-
cautious hundreds exasperated by them, as in
the dismal transactions of 1837 and 1838.—
But of the obvious and legitimate conse-
quences of the present proceedings, I will
treat hereafter.

As the late Councillors, then, take their
stand upon the British practice of Responsi-
ble Government, why have they disregarded
it in every preliminary step of their resigna-
tion and explanation? As one erroneous
step, if untraced, leads to a course of error,
so the late Councillors, commencing wrong,
have fallen into a succession of errors, each
ensuing one more serious than its predeces-
sor.

I have shown that they provided not the
necessary materials; that they took not the
necessary measures to prepare a "case of
facts" for their explanation; that their mode
of proceeding was the reverse, in every re-
spect, of the proceeding of Sir Robert Peel in
a much more simple case of "antagonism,"
with his Sovereign. I will now proceed to
prove that their explanation was unauthoriz-
ed in every respect, and is also fraught with
dangerous consequences.

In the course of his explanation (Nov. 29.)
Mr. Baldwin stated in reply to Mr. Viger,
that "he had the permission of his Excellen-
cy to make the explanation which he offered
to the House, and if he had not, he should
have come down to the House and told them
that he had been refused, and called upon
them to construe everything in his favor and
nothing against him." That Mr. Baldwin
was sincere in making this assertion, I have
not a shadow of doubt. But the very liabili-
ty of his statement to be challenged (as it was
by Mr. Viger,) shows the culpable impro-
priety of his not having reduced to writing
the whole of the negotiation with his Excel-
lency. The present question, however, is
not what Mr. Baldwin thought, but what is
the fact?

Mr. Baldwin's verbal application, and the
Governor General's verbal reply, must of
course be intended, and ought to be inter-
preted, in the ministerial or official sense of
such communications—as preliminary to their
being committed to writing. That such was
his Excellency's understanding, is obvious
from the fact, that he directed the substance
of the intended explanation to be laid before
him in writing. Why did he require this, if
it were not that he might express his ap-
proval or disapproval of it? Upon any other
supposition, his Excellency might, with equal
propriety, have demanded beforehand the sub-
stance of any speech or speeches that Mr.
Baldwin and his colleagues intended to de-
liver on any subject. The written explana-
tion which they laid before his Excellency
was, of course, the intended "case or cases
of facts." Did his Excellency consent to it?
Nay, he more than prohibits it—to use his
own words, "the Governor General protests
against THE explanation which those gen-
tlemen propose to offer to Parliament," &c.
Now, Mr. Baldwin gave in his speech the

substance, almost verbatim, of the explana-
tion which he and his colleagues had laid be-
fore his Excellency. Mr. B. says he had been
authorised by his Excellency to make that
explanation; his Excellency protests against
that explanation; and according to Mr. Hincks,
his Excellency's protest had been received at
least an hour before Mr. Baldwin made ex-
planatory speech.

To make the case, if possible, more plain, I
will suppose that you, Mr. Reader, are a Go-
vernor of a Town, or City, or Province, and
that I come to you as the representative of a
portion of the people whom you govern, to
procure your assent to measures relating to
the roads, schools, or churches; that you do
not accede to any of the proposals or applica-
tions laid before you; that I request your per-
mission to explain to my constituents what
has taken place between us on these subjects;
that you say yes, but desire me to furnish you
in writing with the substance of what I in-
tend to state in explanation to my constitu-
ents; that I do so; that you, on reading it,
perceive that I have given a very different
version of several points from what you think
is correct; that I attribute sentiments and
acts to you which I declare to be inconsistent
with the rights and interests of my constitu-
ents; and that I omit what you conceive to
be the very grounds of dissent from several
requests made to you; that you forthwith
send me a written protest against my intend-
ed explanation, generally, and point out several
particulars which you think are essentially
inaccurate; yet I with your protest and
statement in my pocket, give that identical
explanation against which you protest to my
constituents and then inform them, in con-
clusion, that I have your authority for the ex-
planation which I had made—would you, Mr.
Reader, say that I had treated you justly?—
that my statement was authorized by you?—
that it was true? The exact parallel between
this imaginary case and the real case of the
Governor General and his late Councillors,
can be readily perceived by every reader.

I infer therefore that the explanation given
by the late Councillors, was, both technically
and morally, unauthorized, and was therefore
unparliamentary and unconstitutional.

The only proof that Mr. Baldwin has ever
appealed to that he had authority to make his
explanation, is this "protest" of his Excel-
lency. How far this proves his authority the
reader can judge. But in this reference Mr.
Baldwin blinks the real question, which is
not whether his Excellency intended that Mr.
B. should give an explanation, (this his Ex-
cellency desired as much as his late Coun-
cillors,) but whether he authorized the ex-
planation which Mr. Baldwin gave. Against
that his Excellency protests; and therefore
he could not have authorised it.

Mr. Hincks, in his reply to Mr. Viger's
pamphlet, argues in the following words and
in italics: "It is true that no disclosures can
be made without permission; but whenever a
difference arises between the head of the Go-
vernment and his ministers, parliament and