

adequate importance," offer their resignation. It is clear then, that the whole question of "cases of adequate importance," is ultimately and essentially in the hands of the Councillors themselves, and only in an initiatory and subordinate degree in the hands of His Excellency.

This memorable phrase, therefore—"cases of adequate importance"—respecting which so much disreputable criticism has been employed, and so many scandalous attacks have been made upon the Governor General, is the mere mention of a fact in the working of responsible government, which, as seen above, the late Councillors themselves have admitted, and which every man of common understanding must admit who knows anything of the practical operations of that machinery. But party selfishness and spirit—as it does not hesitate to stretch forth the hand and lay hold of the forbidden fruit of prerogative power—will seize upon any phrase however just, and wrest it from any connexion however essential to its meaning, and place upon it any construction however arbitrary and unjust, in order to advance the interests of the great Diana of party.

Thus much then on the ever-to-be-remembered phrase, "cases of adequate importance," of which I hope we may hear no more until all other "cases of adequate importance" shall have been disposed of. Let the reader with me pause, and ponder upon the import of each of the other phrases in Sir Charles Metcalfe's reply to the Gore District Council. I repeat them again—"that the government should be administered according to the well understood wishes and interests of the people;—That the Resolutions of September, 1841, should be faithfully adhered to;—that it should be competent to the Council to offer advice on all occasions, whether as to patronage or otherwise;—and that the Governor should receive it with the attention due to his constitutional advisers; that there should be a cordial co-operation and sympathy between him and them; THAT THE COUNCIL SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE TO THE PROVINCIAL PARLIAMENT AND THE PEOPLE;—AND THAT WHEN THE ACTS OF THE GOVERNOR ARE SUCH AS THEY DO NOT CHOOSE TO BE RESPONSIBLE FOR, THEY SHOULD BE AT LIBERTY TO RESIGN."

It is impossible for the English language to express a more complete recognition of the system of responsible government than is contained in these phrases? Yet not one of them have the accusers of Sir C. Metcalfe, or any of the orators of the Toronto Association, made the slightest reference, any more than if they were not in existence! Is this doing as they would be done by? Is this fair?—Is this telling the whole truth? Is this acting the part of candid and truth-loving men? Is this acting with a true regard to good government and the best interests of the country?—Or is this not acting with an utter recklessness of every thing except the Moloch of party? Would the reader like to have his words and acts interpreted as those of the representative of the Sovereign have been in-

terpreted by his accusers? No Governor of Canada has ever avowedly attached so much importance to the Council, and so fully stated the necessity of constantly consulting them, as Sir Charles Metcalfe. So much so, that in his reply to the address of the inhabitants of Russell, his Excellency says—"No Governor could dream of administering the government of his Province without constant consultation with his Council. Every Governor must be sensible of the advantage that he would derive from the aid, advice and information of councillors and heads of departments, in whom he can place confidence. But that is not the question at issue. If it were or if it had been, the country would not have been troubled with the present dispute. The demand of the party now obstructing her Majesty's government is, that the Governor, who is responsible to his Sovereign and the British nation for the welfare of Canada is with respect to the government of this country to be a nonentity, or in other words a tool of any party that may acquire a temporary ascendancy. To this I could not and never can submit. This was the meaning of the stipulations demanded of me, and which my duty to the Crown rendered compliance with impossible."

My conclusion therefore is, "That Sir Charles Metcalfe's statement of his views of Responsible Government, involve all that is contained in the resolutions of the House of Assembly September 3, 1841, and that the criticisms of Messrs. Baldwin, Hincks, and others, on certain of his Excellency's replies are unfair and unjust."

Now, let the reader mark the professed object and real conduct of the leaders of the Toronto Association. In their late address to the people of Canada, they define their object to be as follows:—

"Our object is, that the Governor General should have advisers—that these should have the confidence of the people's Representatives—that they should be strictly responsible for all the acts of the Executive Government while they continue to hold office."

Such is the *professed* object of the Toronto Association. Now has the Governor General denied this? Has he not asserted it in most explicit terms? Why then are the Toronto Associationists at war with him? I answer because their *real* object is as different from their *professed* object as night is from day.—They dare not state their real object in words. Their professed object before the people, is Responsible Government in as moderate terms as Sir Charles Metcalfe has employed. Their real object—as interpreted by their stipulating demands upon the Governor General—is Responsible Government in a sense that would make the Crown a "tool" in the hands of a party; or in a sense, as the Imperial Government emphatically declare, would make "Canada an independent republic." Hence the moderation of their acts, as at war with the Governor General and Her Majesty's Government. Actions speak louder than words. The words of the Associationists prove what I have stated, that the Governor