

er form one
s practically
stitution."—

h would has
King, Lords
Brown will
say, "King
Commons,"
then the "So-

George Brown
mitted to the
erty of the
not only the
but the mo-
ery Govern-
is less than
d by the Ca-
e prompt to
rs" doctrine
And no won-
wn's newly
against Sir
ke a deadly
the Provin-
he resisted
the "mouth-
ing power,"
d himself to
in practice.
ugh quoted
on orators—
Cabinet en-
ere written,
e have no-
every thing

discussion, I
ore fully ap-
us, and the
r, as the
stitutional

s celebrated
ortest argu-
—The evi-
sposition
es; and his
falsity oc-
most impor-
unrivalled
rument in
r than that
of the pre-
ll not be in
oportion to

propose to
on at issue
R CHARLES
ment of cer-
ir own par-
which Mr.
sembly and
was predica-

The subject of discussion involved in this proposition is as novel as that which was embraced in each of the preceding propositions. It is without example in the hundred and fifty years history of Responsible Government. It is so, simply because the proceeding of the late Councilors is without precedent. This proposition is confessedly a bold, as well as a startling one. But it is no more bold than true, and no less true than important.

In the discussion of this proposition, the first thing necessary is, to ascertain precisely what the question was which Mr. Baldwin stated to the House of Assembly, and on which the vote of the Assembly was predicated. The reservation of the Secret Societies' Bill was a circumstance; but it was not the question. And of that circumstance—explained by His Excellency in a manner which has only been attempted to be cavilled at, but never answered—it may be sufficient to say in the language of the Hon. Joseph Howe, of Nova Scotia, in his letter to Mr. Hincks—"As regards the Bill for suppressing Orange Lodges, it appears to me that circumstances may arise, after a government measure has been introduced, to render its postponement desirable." The Governor General has stated those circumstances—one of which was, that after understanding its provisions in all their bearing (by a full parliamentary discussion,) to an extent that he could not have done from a bare perusal of them, he felt himself prohibited from affixing her Majesty's approbation to a bill (without submitting it to Her Majesty) which went not only to remove and proscribe from office, but to erase from the list of jurors, a class of persons whom Her Majesty had not thus reduced very nearly to the state of aliens and slaves—though still subjects of taxation—in any other colony or portion of the Empire.—Sir Charles Metcalfe has expressed his unqualified disapprobation of Orange Lodges; and the object—the entire and sole object, as I can state by permission from the best authority—of the only private interview that His Excellency ever had with the Grand Master of Orange Lodges in Canada, which took place a few days before the twelfth of last July [as the date of the surreptitiously published letter will shew,] was to prevent any Orange display on that day, that their might be no blood shed, or riot, or renewed cause of religious and political strife—a work of charity or humanity, which by the betrayal of private confidence, and the pilfering of private property, and upon authority that ought not to excite suspicion against any body, has been represented by all the Toronto Associationist organs as a plot too silly for idiotism, and too base for Mackenzie himself. It was the characteristic practice of Mackenzie to publish every private letter he could obtain, and from the most worthless sources, in order to implicate and degrade the most upright and respectable men in the land; and how exactly do the *Globe* and the *Associationist* organs follow in his wake in respect to even the Re-

presentative of the Sovereign. A man who will, in violation of the conventional law of civilized nations, pilfer a letter from the sacred drawer of confidential privacy, in order to injure and destroy character, is not above taking his neighbour's purse—and the receiver is as bad as the thief. These Mackenzie attempts to destroy even the moral integrity of the Governor General, will meet with a Mackenzie reward; and time will shew that Sir Charles is no more a supporter of the Orange Association than he is of the Toronto Association; but he will take other than means unknown to British legislation and government for the discountenance of both. The time may come when it may be felt and bounden duty of the government not to appoint to office, or continue in office, a member of either association. But the "important disclosure" of the private letter itself "discloses" nothing but the writer's opinion of its own recommendations; it attributes nothing to His Excellency which could not have been attributed to him; had a copy of the Toronto Association address been enclosed to him for his perusal.

But to return from the notice of this circumstance to the consideration of the question. This can at once be ascertained from the resolution of the House, voted for the late Councilors themselves. It is as follows: "That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, humbly representing to His Excellency the deep regret felt by this House at the retirement of certain members of the Provincial administration, ON THE QUESTION OF THEIR RIGHT TO BE CONSULTED ON WHAT THE HOUSE UNHESITATINGLY AVOWS TO BE THE PREROGATIVE OF THE CROWN,—appointments to office; and further, to assure His Excellency that their advocacy of THIS PRINCIPLE entitles them to the confidence of this House, being in strict accordance with the principles embraced in the resolutions adopted by this house on the 3d September, 1841."

The subject of inquiry now is, what this the question of "antagonism" between Sir Charles Metcalfe and the late Councilors; or was the PARTY distribution of the patronage of the crown,—or what is usually party government, the real question of "antagonism" between them? The late Councilors allege the former Sir Charles Metcalfe asserts the latter.—In the preceding paper, I have examined the evidence on both sides of the question, and have, I trust, established the truth of His Excellency's statement beyond reasonable contradiction. The present proposition is a corollary, or obvious consequence of the preceding one; and on this ground I might rest it on every just principle of reasoning. But in a question of so great importance, I will adduce additional evidence.

Let it then be recollected, in the first place that in the passage of Mr. Sullivan's explanatory speech I quoted in the last paper, he contended for a party government—that is not being governed by the party of the majority, but the governing for the benefit of the ruling