

of Sir F. Head ; who shouted the jail, Botany Bay, and the gallows, in the counsels of Sir George Arthur ; who shouted moderation, under Lord Sydenham, and equal justice under Sir Charles Bagot : who proscribed all Reformers from 1837 to 1839 ; who would proscribe all Conservatives in 1844 ; who exclaimed the Church Establishment inviolate, under Sir F. Head ; who exclaimed the English Wesleyans, but not the Wesleyans of the Methodist Church in Canada, under Sir George Arthur ; who exclaimed no Church Establishment, under Lord Sydenham : who preached long and loud, no union with Lower Canada, under Sir George Arthur ; who preached longer and louder still, glorious union with Lower Canada, under Lord Sydenham : who wrote editorial strong and eloquent in *The Church*, in 1839, that Lord Durham's responsible government was only another phrase for republican independence ; who writes with equal eloquence, in 1844, that Lord Durham's responsible government practically republicanized, is essential to British monarchical connection—the same as Mackenzie had "*Victoria I. and Reform*" on his banners, when he came down Yonge-street to attack Toronto. *Legion* is therefore an appropriate personification of the Toronto Association ; a proper representative of their principles ; a becoming champion of their cause ; a suitable tool for their purposes. In this light alone I regard his letters ; in no other should I deem them worthy of notice.

*Legion* fights in a manner worthy of his cause, as did Mackenzie and his followers at Gallows-hill ; he flies from the main army of my arguments, and from his hiding-places of sophistry and misrepresentation, he valorously assails my incidental observations and isolated remarks. Throughout his more than ten onsets, he has not so much as once ventured to look my chief positions in the face, but skulked from the real battle-field, and bravely brandishes his weapons where no enemy opposes. He witticizes instead of adducing proofs, and theorizes and declaims, instead of attempting to overthrow the evidence I have adduced on the distinctly stated questions at issue. For example—

1. I have proved by the testimony of certain of the late Counsellors themselves, that they did demand a "stipulation" from His Excellency—(pp. 62—67 ; ) respecting which testimony *Legion* says not one word.

2. I have proved by the same testimony that the demand of the late Counsellors did involve the surrender of the Prerogative of the Crown, as alleged by Sir Charles Metcalfe—(pp. 68—72 ; ) respecting which *Legion* says not one word.

3. I have proved by the same testimony that the real question of antagonism between Sir Charles Metcalfe and his late Counsellors was not the, nor any principle of responsible government, but the distribution of patronage for one party to the exclusion of all others—(p. 79 ; ) on which vital point also, *Legion* is profoundly silent.

4. I have proved by the same testimony that the real question of antagonism was not stated by Mr. Baldwin to the Assembly, nor decided upon by it—(pp. 74—79 ; ) which cardinal question likewise is not even noticed by *Legion*.

5. I have proved by the same testimony the statements contained in Sir Charles Metcalfe's *Protest*, in contradistinction and in contradiction to the parliamentary explanation of the late Counsellors—(pp. 53—72 ; ) on which *Legion* is also as he well may be, entirely speechless, though abounding in unsupported and refuted assertions against His Excellency.