

ly inlaid ; such a piece of diversified mosaic, such a tasselled pavement without cement ; here a bit of black stone, and there a bit of white ; patriots and courtiers ; king's friends and republicans ; whigs and tories ; treacherous friends and enemies ; that it was indeed a very curious show, but utterly unsafe to touch, and unsure to stand on." But Lord Sydenham's acute discernment distinguished between the former and present state of things ; he knew that a difference of opinion or of party under the former constitution of Upper and Lower Canada, did not necessarily or fairly involve a similar difference under the new constitution of United Canada ; he possessed the requisite energy and patriotism to act upon his own convictions, and commenced the illustration of his advice to obliterate the differences of the past, by selecting his advisers and public officers according to individual fitness and merit, irrespective of former personal opinions or party connections. Few administrations of government in any country have acted so harmoniously and cordially on so great a number of important measures as the new administration formed by Lord Sydenham."

Now, what did the *Reform press* of Upper Canada say of a government thus constituted, and a government thus conducted "without reference to party considerations ?" In passages which I have heretofore quoted, Mr. Hincks has pronounced such a government, incompatible with representative institutions and such appears, is the doctrine of the present organs of the Toronto Association. But what did Mr. Hincks say in his *Examiner*, the last week in September, 1841 ? He said "The principle of Responsible Government has been fully recognised. The members of the administration, all of whom were heads of departments, distinctively avowed on the floor of the house, their responsibility to Parliament for the measures of Government. They acted together in perfect harmony and concert in regard to those measures, and although there were occasional deviations from British practice, yet that practice was always acknowledged as their rule, and a more strict adherence to it in future may be anticipated.—Whatever political differences there may have been in the house it was felt by every one that there was an administration, and that its existence depended on a parliamentary majority. Were we to pause here we feel that we should have said enough to prove that the name of Lord Sydenham should ever be held in grateful remembrance by the people of Canada. But we are bound further to acknowledge, that we are indebted to the energy and practical talents of his Lordship for the most important measures of last session, more particularly for the magnificent scheme of public improvements, and the favourable arrangements relative to our debt.—It is not, in all probability, at the present moment that full justice will be done to the administrations of Lord Sydenham, although, as far as the press is an indication of public opinion, there has never, we believe, been a

more general expression of regret for the loss of any public man. Widely extended, however, as is that feeling, it will we are assured, be much more so after the lapse of a few years. The existing political asperities will then have entirely subsided, and Lord Sydenham will only be remembered as the founder of our constitution, and as the individual who brought into practical operation that sound British *Responsible Government* by means of which alone the connexion between the colony and the parent state can be preserved."

In this passage, (the most material sentences of which I have italicised,) Mr. Hincks declares that Lord Sydenham "brought into practical operation the sound British principle of Responsible Government," that his Lordship was actually the "founder of our constitution," and is entitled as such, to the lasting gratitude of the people ; Mr. Hincks, also, in the language of praise represents Lord Sydenham not only as entertaining opinions of his own, but as acting an efficient part in the measures of the administration. Now why does Mr. Hincks denounce Sir Charles Metcalfe for doing what he praises Lord Sydenham for doing ? If Lord Sydenham "brought into practical operation the sound British principle of Responsible Government," and yet his government was non-party, not merely in respect to its administration, but in respect to its very composition, why is Sir Charles Metcalfe proclaimed as an enemy to the "representative system of government," merely because he insists upon impartiality in appointments to office ? Was there ever more gross inconsistency, self-contradiction, and injustice, than is thus exhibited in the former and present conduct of Mr. Hincks ?

Nor is Mr. Hincks alone in an unbiassed testimony in favour of Sir Charles Metcalfe. The sturdy and scolding *Kingston Herald* has been wont to bear the same testimony in his better days. Of Lord Sydenham's policy he said—"As a statesman, he was undoubtedly, wise and prudent ; for, however some, who have heretofore basked in favour, may complain of neglect to them and of promoting others whom they looked upon with prejudice, yet sure we are, nothing else could have secured peace ; and peace secured, this noble province needs but time to be prosperous and happy."

Why then does the *Kingston Herald* make war upon Sir C. Metcalfe for avowing a policy, which the *Herald* says, in Lord Sydenham, was wise and prudent and secured peace ?

The *London Canada Inquirer* also—now so fierce against Sir Charles Metcalfe and his defenders—has recommended Lord Sydenham's example to his Excellency's imitation :—"His (Lord Sydenham's) views of the government of Canada, were formed on shrewd observation and deep reflection, and whoever his successor may be we are confident they cannot adopt a better chart for their guidance, than may be gleaned from the course he has taken, and the instructions he may have left.

A system of views will not

The chart has been adopted in accordance with the opinion of the majority of the House of Commons. That same Imperial Government? Why less liberal Government? Why party government? Justice governs.

To complete Upper Canada's ciferous Harbinger, the *Inquirer*, the *Reformer*, in favour of government. thy condition press spoke ham's Report on the government. Lord Sydenham's sagacity in his hitherto conservative practice, in government, talogue of before to all that believe, not in the Great principle, so liberal by the British necessary in affairs, still direct attention successful approach was on the occasion of the fact bigotted ; and other by those deration of d them to active apathy,—Lord contend with rear in this himself could dom and justice are now universal who opposed few indeed—ficult to justify. Every section to do him honor let it be known serve tranqu agricultural country, and py people, th be continued.

Now what Charles Metcalfe's non-party respect to Upper beyond that to Lower C "Journal & lency almost I have ma