

ons of the Gov-
ed by him) in a
relative to their
king irrelevant
as, "public ru-
ers fell into the
ove mentioned
e upon a state-
ty, and there-
any evidence,
tioned fallacy.
ts," they are
of fallacy. To
s I now invite

at it was impos-
l to make ap-
e principle of
ong as he had
etary, and as
keeper of the
have also ad-
d that he had
le; and now,
atement separ-
ticular of his
that the late
Governor-Gen-
make no ap-
ment, with-
ce." "The
e would make
allege to the
Governor-Gen-
consultation;
t, (denied, be-
cy,) adopts a
m, "on the
ulted on ap-
ir whole case.
ve exposed—
established,

nds exceeds
Responsible
that no step
appointment,
first to con-
Responsible
interpretation
the last num-
rities, which
quires, that
nister.

anded what
Crown have
since the es-
ernment in
aduce an
g asked the
assurance
or-General.
l speeches,
they have
single pre-
cedure.—
prove no-

implied the
General do-

nied as a fact, and what involved the degra-
dation of his character and office. Suppose
Mr. Reader, that you were living on terms of
friendly and confidential intercourse with a
neighbour, and had been so living for a long
time; and that that neighbour should come
to you, and ask you to enter into an agreement
or explicit understanding with him, that you
would neither slander nor defraud him; what
would you think of his proposal or demand?
Would you accede to it? or would you tell him
that if your past conduct did not afford him
sufficient assurance of your integrity and hon-
esty, you had no security to give: and be-
cause you would not agree to such an insult-
ing and degrading proposal, would he be jus-
tified in representing you as a calumniator
and a rogue? So, the late Councillors go to
the Governor General and making a demand
or proposal that he would agree to what he
declares "he has hitherto pursued without
deviation," and because he refuses to comply
with their demand or proposal, they represent
him as adverse to the system of Responsible
Government, and ask a vote of the house and
of the country to support them for such "ad-
vocacy of that principle."

But, let the reader take a well-known fact,
instead of a supposition, as an illustration.—
There is, perhaps, not an old resident in Can-
ada who does not well remember the celebra-
ted ALIEN BILL—a bill which required all per-
sons who had settled in Canada since 1783, to
take the oath of allegiance with twelve
months, on pain of forfeiting their privileges
as British subjects. What was the people's
interpretation of the demand or proposal con-
tained in that bill? Would they accede to it?
They were told that no good subject would
object to taking the oath of allegiance to his
Sovereign as often as it might be required—
that it was necessary on several accounts.—
Did they believe such reasoning? Did they
not declare, with an ardour and an enthusias-
tic determination which defies description,
that they would never take an oath which im-
plied that they were all aliens to a govern-
ment to which they had already sworn and
long professed allegiance—that they would
never submit to such a degradation of their
character and rights? Did they not make
their voice heard across the Atlantic, to the
disallowance of the bill? And is Sir Charles
Metcalfe to be denounced or honored for act-
ing upon the same principle? He is called
upon to express, in a peculiar and unprece-
dented form, his allegiance to a system which
he avows he "has hitherto pursued without
deviation, and to which it is fully his intention
to adhere;" and his refusal thus to degrade
his character and office, is interpreted as prac-
tical hostility to that system of Government.
How did the opponents of the alien bill like such
an interpretation of their refusal to comply
with the "stipulations" of that measure? It
is by such a fallacy and such a proceeding
that the late Councillors have sought to per-
suade the people of Canada that the Governor
General is an enemy of the established system
of Canadian Government, and that they are

its patriotic defenders! Whereas, in resist-
ing such a causeless and unprecedented de-
mand, he consulted what is due to the charac-
ter and rights of the Sovereign, as much as did
those who resisted the causeless and unpre-
cedented demand involved in the Alien Bill
consult what was due to the character and
rights of the subject.

Then as to the "actual and prominent cir-
cumstances which led to their resignation,"
which His Excellency says his late advisers
had entirely omitted. He says, they demand-
ed "that the lists of candidates should, in
every instance, be laid before the Council."
They say nothing about this demand in their
explanation. Did they make it? Mr. Hincks
in his reply to Mr. Viger's pamphlet, confess-
es that they did make this demand. He says
"The reference to the list of candidates was
called for. The object was that these lists
should be deposited with the responsible Se-
cretary of the Province, and not with the Pri-
vate Secretary to the Governor." Is there
anything in the resolutions of September,
1841, which authorizes such a demand? Can
a precedent for it be found in British history?
Is the name of any individual the rightful prop-
erty of the Council, unless that individual
chose to make it so? Is the Governor-Gen-
eral any more than any other man of honour,
at liberty to make use of the name and com-
munications of an individual, to any greater
extent than may be authorised by that indi-
vidual? And may not many an individual, for
many reasons, not wish to have his name
brought under the notice of the Council at all
except by the sanction of the Governor-Gen-
eral? May not many individual desire that
his name may not be brought before the Coun-
cil, or under the notice of the Governor, un-
less recommended by a certain Councillor, to
whom he may address a private and confiden-
tial communication? Whatever may be said
of the convenience of such a practice, it is not
a *sine qua non* in Responsible Government;
and that such a demand could not be acceded
to without the sacrifice of individual rights ap-
art from any considerations of Prerogative.
Here is a demand which, beyond doubt,
"called upon the Head of the Government to
enter into a stipulation as to the terms upon
which a provincial ministry may deem it pru-
dent either to accept or continue in office"—
a demand which the House disclaimed in a
negative form, in the words just quoted. This
demand also pointed to the assumption on
which I dwelt in the preceding number, that
the late Councillors wished to cut off all the
communication between the Governor-Gen-
eral and any individual in the Province except
through themselves; thus making the Crown
a "tool," and infringing on individual rights.
As the statement of such a demand did not an-
swer their purpose, they omitted it in their
"explanation."

Again His Excellency says that "He ap-
pealed to the number of appointments made
by him on the recommendation of the Council,
or the members of it in their departmental ca-
pacity, and to instances in which he had ab-