

stained from referring appointments on their opponents, as furnishing proofs of the consideration which he had evinced towards the Council in the distribution of the Crown."—Here the Governor General states several important facts. Messrs. Baldwin and Hincks admit his statements of facts. Yet not one of these facts is even alluded to in their "explanation." No; such facts were rather inconvenient, as well as stubborn things, in their explanation. They did not therefore, consider them (to use Mr. Hincks' words) "necessary for their complete justification." From these facts it appears:—1st. That the principle on which the patronage of the Crown ought to be distributed, was a prominent topic of discussion between His Excellency and his late Advisers; whether it should be confined to one party, (the old exclusive councillors,) or whether, as Mr. Howe, of Nova Scotia, declares good, without reference to party." But this vitally important question—the very essence of the first "antagonism" between the Governor General and his late Councillors, as I shall hereafter prove—out of their own mouths—this question, on which they now dwell with the strongest emphasis—the question so largely debated between the Governor General and them—they did not even mention it in their explanation—they kept it entirely out—it was not necessary for their complete justification"—it might have caused their complete condemnation." 2d. It also appears from His Excellency's statement, that he had evinced the utmost regard to their recommendations of the council in making, and in abstaining from making appointments; the instances in which his own judgment compelled him to dissent from their advice appear to have been "few and far between;"—yet all this did not satisfy the demands of party ambition, so long as a Mordecai, not paying the desired homage, could now and then find admittance to some subordinate clerkship—the whole hated race of opponents and rivals must be excoriated from all hope of a morsel at the hands of the Executive, not only by the constitutional checks of advice and resignation, but by the unconstitutional bondage of the throne, in the form of a "stipulation" or understanding, that the influence of one party (and that party being judge) should be the rule of Royal action,—thus pulling from its head the crown of its own free agency, and then told that it might exercise a discretion, within, of course, the limits of its own enslaving engagement to the contrary, as I shall hereafter demonstrate. But these facts not being "necessary for the complete justification" of the late Councillors, although essential to a "case of facts," were altogether omitted by them in their explanation. 3rd.—Lastly, it is clear from His Excellency's admitted statement of facts, that there were two methods of making appointments to office—that these two methods were pursued with the concurrence of the late councillors, the one "on occasions of adequate importance," by the recommendation of the council—and the other, not "on occasions of adequate im-

portance," by the recommendation of individual members of the council, in their departmental capacity:—a distinction which was made by Sir Charles Metcalfe, in his reply to the address of the Gore District Council—a distinction which has ever since been the opposition watchword of the Toronto Association party—yet a distinction on which the late Councillors themselves acted.

His Excellency states, likewise, the following facts:—"He at the same time objected, as he always had done, to the exclusive distribution of patronage with party views, and maintained the principle, that office ought, in every instance, to be given to the man best qualified to render efficient services to the State; and where there was no such pre-eminence, asserted his right to exercise his discretion." These facts be it remembered are admitted by Messrs. Baldwin and Hincks. Let the reader consider their import. They plainly imply that "the exclusive distribution of patronage with party views" had been demanded;—"for His Excellency *objected*" to it—which he could not have done, had there been no demand. Of this demand, also, the late Advisers, in their explanations, gave the House no information. This statement, likewise, as one already quoted, clearly shows, that the principle on which the patronage of the Crown should be distributed, was a leading, if not the leading topic of discussion between the Governor-General and his late Councillors,—on which they observed a death-like silence in their explanation, speaking only of their right of consultation which the Governor-General says he never denied.

His Excellency states furthermore, that "Three or more distinct propositions were made to him, over and over again, sometimes in different terms, but always aiming at the same purpose, which, in his opinion, if accomplished, would have been a virtual surrender into the hands of the Council of the prerogative of the Crown." This is another fact admitted by Messrs. Baldwin and Hincks, but of which nothing was said in the explanation. Mr. Hincks in his reply to Mr. Viger, quoted this paragraph, and founds on it the following singular conclusion:—"Nothing can more clearly show that the ministers were not very tenacious about the adoption of their own suggestions." It appears from these words of Mr. Hincks, that the late advisers had the amazing liberality to propose three distinct propositions, and even in different terms, provided they could accomplish the self-same purpose of obtaining "a virtual surrender into the hands of the Council of the prerogative of the Crown."

I next solicit the reader's attention to the facts contained in the following paragraph of the Governor General's answer to his late Councillors:—"In the course of the conversations, which both on Friday and Saturday followed the explicit demand by the Council regarding the patronage of the Crown, that demand being based on the construction put by some of the gentlemen on the meaning of Responsible Government, different opinions were

elicited
define
a subj
opinion
the G
sation
that he
of the
which
lithert
which
I beg
stated
be it re
by Mes
fact refe
the thin
place
cussion
mand m
tronage
that tha
tion pu
meaning
shall her
a fact
a long
hangs, o
Govern
Partly fr
plained
constitut
ral cause
into the
—an ele
pretend
or parcel
with all
always
clothes i
exclusion
bute of (C
and impa
jesty's su
roduction
Metcalfe
the wave
he retain
Sir Charl
in the res
is compat
England,
ment whi
gative of
which ma
—an instr
instead of
completed
to make t
plain and
make four
this new
vernment
"antagon
and his lat
old and lo
It is not
heard of "
tlemen on
vernment;