

6. I have shown by the most rigid examination of statements and words, which cannot be mistaken, and can no longer be perverted, that Sir Charles Metcalfe has from the beginning fully and entirely recognized the Resolutions of 1841 (pp. 84—92 ;) to which fundamental part of my argument Legion does not deign to glance, but contents himself with reiterating, without the shadow of evidence, disproved assertions.

7. I have proved by the official and collective testimony of the late Counsellors themselves, that Sir Charles Metcalfe's avowed principles of administering the patronage of the Crown, are precisely the same with those which they professed during Sir Charles Bagot's administration (p. 110 ;) to which Legion makes not the slightest reference, but supplies this deficiency by the transcendentalism of his speculations and the vehemence of his abuse against the Governor-General.

8. I have proved from the declarations of the Earl of Durham, Lord Sydenham, and Sir Charles Bagot, that they avowed the very same principles of administration, with those which are insisted upon by Sir Charles Metcalfe (pp. 109, 110 ;) but Legion condescends not even to look down upon these ugly things, yet lauds Lord Durham, does not venture to attack Lord Sydenham, loudly eulogizes Sir Charles Bagot, and loudly abuses Sir Charles Metcalfe.

9. I have proved by the testimony of the *London Inquirer*, *Hamilton Journal & Express*, *Toronto Examiner*, and *Kingston Herald*, that the views of the administration of the Government held by Sir Charles Metcalfe, are the same with those which were professed by the Reformers of Upper Canada in 1841, as well as by the late Counsellors in 1842 (pp. 105—110 ;) these vulgar facts are too offensive to the refined taste of Legion to admit of his noticing them—the very “shade of their virus” appears to have operated upon him as a dose of ipecacuanha, and to have induced another copious discharge of scurrillity against His Excellency.

I might easily double the number of examples on collateral and minor points. I may notice them hereafter. The above are sufficient at present. Now, on these nine important facts—embracing every material point in the present discussion—my positions and witnesses and arguments remain as completely untouched, and as entirely unnoticed, as if Legion had not written a line. And I would leave the subject to the judgment of the public without adding another paragraph, was not Legion regarded as the strength of the Toronto Association, and did not that Association seek to make up in persevering misrepresentations and calumny, what they want in justice, reason and truth. Having noticed the principal omissions of Legion, I will in subsequent papers adduce and expose his misrepresentations and false statements—the materials with which the Toronto Association build up and cement their party.

I will conclude the present paper with two remarks. Legion and the Association organs have dwelt long and loud upon the fact that Sir Charles Metcalfe has governed several months without completing his Council.—I answer, that this fact has nothing whatever to do with the original questions of difference between His Excellency and his late Counsellors. If their proceedings were unprecedented and unconstitutional (as has been abundantly proved,) they are answerable for all the consequences which have followed, or may follow. If they had resigned on *facts*, as have all resigning British ministers for a hundred and fifty years, Sir Charles Metcalfe could have formed a new council in less time than did Sir Charles Bagot; and had they conducted themselves at the time of, and subsequent to their