

to gain what the other is anxious to keep. If a measure be good, it is of no importance to the nation from whom it proceeds; yet will it be esteemed by the opposition a point of honour not to let it pass without throwing every obstruction in its way. If we listen to the minister for the time being, the nation is always flourishing and happy; if we hearken to the opposition, it is a chance if it be not on the brink of destruction. In an assembly convened to deliberate on the affairs of a nation, how disgusting to hear members perpetually talk of their connections, and their resolution to act with a particular set of men; when, if they have happened by chance votes to according to their convictions rather than their party, half their speeches are made up of apologies for a conduct so new and unexpected! When they see men united who agree in nothing but their hostility to the minister, the people fall at first into engagement and irresolution; till perceiving political debate is a mere scramble for profit and power, they endeavour to become as corrupt as their betters. It is not in that roar of faction which deafens the ear and sickens the heart, the still voice of liberty is heard. *She turns from the disgusting scene, and regards these struggles as the pangs and convulsions in which she is doomed to expire.*

IV. THE DUTY OF THE PEOPLE.—A few remarks on this subject, and I have done. The interests of the people, and their duty, are of course, identical. What their real interests are, may, I trust, be easily inferred from the previous discussion.

1. In the first place, it is not the interests of the people to resist Her Majesty or Her Majesty's Representative in Canada.—The interests and happiness of man require government; there can be no government without authority; that authority must be lodged somewhere; that authority involves a tribunal of ultimate appeal in all questions of dispute between any parties in the state. In regard to allegations against the head of the Canadian executive, the Imperial authority is the supreme and ultimate tribunal of appeal, as stated in the House of Assembly's Resolutions of September, 1841, which declare: "That the head of the executive government of the Province being within the limits of his government the representative of the Sovereign, is responsible to the Imperial authority alone." In all cases of litigation the unsuccessful as well as successful party must abide by the decision of the legally constituted tribunal of judgement in such cases. To resist such a decision is to renounce the authority of the tribunal which made it. Is it the interests of the people of Canada to resist the decision which the Imperial authority has pronounced in favour of Sir Charles Metcalfe, and condemnatory of the allegations of his accusers? Are the people of Canada prepared to sustain a resistance if commenced? If not, ought they to commence it? This is the alternative—to resist or submit. And this is the point at which the question has now arrived. The

chairman of the Toronto Association himself (in a printed letter) thus explains the responsibility of the Governor General, and thus anticipates the present position of the question at issue: "The Governor General fills a two fold capacity; first that of representative or deputy to the Sovereign, for the exercise of those prerogatives of Royalty, with which he may be entrusted, and which by reason of the personal absence of the Sovereign, can only be performed by deputy; and secondly, and emphatically, that of the minister of the crown in the colony, personally to watch over and control the local administration of public affairs, and see that the colonial authorities do not infringe upon Imperial rights or interests. In both these capacities he is responsible to the crown, and obnoxious to impeachment in Parliament, should he fail in the important functions thus confided to him." "In an independent state, the Sovereign is under greater restraint than the Governor of a Colony, but the difference is one of degree; not of character. In either case, where a difference arises, it becomes at once a question whether the difference be of sufficient importance to enter upon the conflict which must necessarily arise, where two parties firmly adhere to their respective determinations. In an independent state, such pertinacity may bring about revolution and the dethronement of the Sovereign. In a colony it may lead to a state of perpetual and continual irritation, which may end in the ultimate ratio of all human affairs." That is, a resort to arms.

This is strictly constitutional doctrine. It admits all that is involved in my argument on this point in the preceding number. It admits that the Governor has more power in the colony than the Sovereign has in England, because of his greater responsibility, and because he combines in himself the power of the minister with the prerogative of the Sovereign. But how has the practice of the author of this quotation and of his fellow Associationists of Toronto contradicted his theory? In theory they here admit—though two months afterwards they and Mr. Blake contradict it—that the Governor General is responsible to the Imperial authority alone; they prefer certain charges against him for maladministration; but instead of bringing those charges with the alleged proofs of them before the Imperial authority for adjudication, they bring them before the Canadian public. Their theory before the formation of the Toronto Association admitted colonial connexion with England; their practice, and theory also through Mr. Blake, since the formation of that association, asserts independence of England. And, as stated by the chairman of the Toronto Association himself, "it now becomes at once a question whether the difference be of sufficient importance to enter upon the conflict which must necessarily arise?" The Imperial authority has substantially decided; the only other tribunal of appeal is the God of battles—the chances of war. Do the people of Canada regard the