

transmitted the whole to Her Majesty, so that she might examine and weigh every word and reason, and that there might be no misconception on any point, though the whole case was a very simple one. Then Her Majesty replies in writing, as follows:

"Buckingham Palace, May 10, 1839.

"The Queen having considered the proposal made to her yesterday by Sir Robert Peel, to remove the ladies of her bed-chamber, cannot consent to adopt a course which she conceives to be contrary to usage, and which is repugnant to her feelings."

Sir Robert Peel then applied in writing for permission to explain his conduct to Parliament. Lord Melbourne was commanded by Her Majesty to convey her compliance with Sir Robert's request. His Lordship wrote a note to Sir Robert to that effect. Here then was the whole negotiation between Her Majesty and Sir Robert Peel in writing—consisting of four papers—all of which were read in the parliamentary explanation, stating Sir Robert's proposal and the reasons for it on the one side, and Her Majesty's refusal and the two reasons for it on the other, and the permission of Her Majesty to have the whole laid before Parliament. And be it observed, that Sir Robert communicated his Sovereign's sentiments in *her own words*, by reading her own note. And after Sir Robert Peel had completed his explanation, Lord John Russell, who had been taken back into Her Majesty's Counsels, concluded his reply by saying, that he "had not the slightest ground to complain of the statement made by Sir Robert Peel."

Such then is the British practice of Responsible Government—a practice which the late Counsellors have said was the *ultimatum* of their demand for Canada. Have they adhered to it? Have they respected it in any one particular? They had a long personal interview with His Excellency the Governor General on Friday, in which they stated their views and heard His Excellency's objections. They proposed another interview the following day, on the same subject. Now would it not have been not only according to British usage, but courteous and fair towards His Excellency for them, in the meantime, to have committed to paper their remonstrances and proposals, and transmitted them to him, so that he might not misunderstand any one of the various points at issue—that he might weigh them, and make up his judgment deliberately upon them? Apart from usage,—apart from his position as the representative of loyalty, was it giving His Excellency any more than fair play for them to have done so?

They then had a second long interview with His Excellency on Saturday, in which all the points of difference were again discussed at great length, and which concluded with a determination on their part to resign. Now, would it have been anything more than respectable, or decent, or fair, for them to have done on Saturday evening what they ought to have done on Friday evening—to have embodied in writing the substance of what they wished His Excellency to understand as

the representations and proposals which they had made in the long conversations which they had had with him, and on which they had desired his decision? But neglecting again to perform this act of courtesy and justice towards His Excellency on Saturday evening, ought they not, in common fairness, when they resolved to tender their resignations on Sunday, to have accompanied these resignations with a full and explicit statement of the grounds of them, and which they desired permission to state to Parliament? Why throughout the whole of this protracted and extraordinary ministerial negotiation, did they not furnish the crown with a single scratch of a pen, that would tangibly, and permanently, and truly, indicate their views and intentions? For such a proceeding they can plead neither British usage nor common justice—though party manœuvring may be pleaded for it, as I will hereafter prove.

Should it be alleged that they have had little or no experience of British practice and usage in such cases, I admit the plea. I admit that public men in Canada are entitled to indulgence in their mode of working the new system. I admit that the late Counsellors appear to disadvantage when compared with Sir Charles Metcalfe, in affairs of Government;—that they have not, like him, been born and educated under the British system of Responsible Government;—that they have not, like him, mingled with British statesmen of all shades for nearly half a century; that they have not, like him, worked different systems of colonial government in both hemispheres; and that their acts are, therefore, entitled to an indulgent interpretation. But do they ask it? Will they allow it? Nay, they ask, they demand approbation: they claim support and reward. They even refuse to come before the country upon the merits of their *policy*—they claim *exclusive* identity with the *principle* of Responsible Government itself, the same as some parties claim *exclusive* identity with loyalty, and apostolicity; they declare that Responsible Government has been assailed and stabbed in their persons, and that that system lives or dies with their victory or defeat; for as Mr. Baldwin expressed it at a public dinner in Toronto, December 28, 1843, "he well knew that no victory could be obtained, on the present occasion, over himself and his late colleagues, as public men, that would not in effect, both by friends and enemies, be treated as a *victory over the principle of Responsible Government itself*."

Now, who can believe this? Who does not know that whatever persons may be in the councils of the Crown, the principle of Responsible Government must and will be acted upon? It requires but little reflection and foresight to perceive, that whatever passions Mr. Baldwin and his colleagues may lash into a tempest for a moment, the illusive and fabulous pretensions on which they have made war upon the Crown, in the person of Sir Charles Metcalfe, will and must issue in their

own conclusions. But of the consequences of this treatment hereafter.

As the stand upon the Government in every step, if not so the late have fallen, ensuing course.

I have necessary necessary facts" for of proceeding, of the a much more with his prove that ed in every dangerous.

In the Mr. Baldwin that "he cy to make to the Ho have come that he them to co nothing a was sincere not a shadow of his s by Mr. V priety of l the whole lency. T not what the fact?

Mr. Baldwin Governor course be preterted, in such comm being com his Excel from the f of the inte him in wr t were no val or dis supposition propriety, stance of Baldwin a liver on an tion which was, of co of facts." Nay, he own word against T tlemen pr Now, Mr