

fluence; we must hold your Excellency to your word." He would thus have no discretion, but must either be their "tool," or violate the honor of his word. It is thus that their required "understanding" or "stipulation"—the condition on which they suspended their continuance in office—did imply the supremacy of the Council and the nullity of the Crown. How true then is the statement of the Governor General in his reply to the address of the Goro District Council, that "the resignation of those gentlemen proceeded from my refusing to agree to certain stipulations which it was unconstitutional for them to demand, and a compliance with which was impossible on my part, as, in my judgement, it would have involved a surrender of the patronage to them for party purposes,—an act to which I would never agree. In no other respect was the question of Responsible Government involved in their resignation."

But under the constitutional operation of Responsible Government, the advisers could say to the Crown, in case of any proposed appointment, "we are not prepared to justify it: it is with the Crown to exercise its rights and do its pleasure: but in view of it, we must tender our resignation; and leave others to assume the responsibility of it." It would then be with the crown to consider not merely whether it desired to make such an appointment, but whether it was more anxious to make it than to retain its present advisers; and whether, if other advisers were called to its assistance, they would be sustained by parliament. Thus the Crown would be free: and yet the parliament would have a check upon its acts. This is the constitutional check of Responsible Government. The former was an unconstitutional demand of the late Councillors. This leaves the prerogative inviolate: the former makes it a "nullity." This Sir Charles Metcalfe acknowledges: the former he resists. Ought he not then to be supported?

I have still another witness, although I do not need his testimony. I will give it for the edification of the reader, and as an illustration of my argument. Mr. George Brown, Editor of the *Globe*, and organ of the Toronto Association, thus delivered himself in a speech on the 25th of March:—"The Cabinet Minister of England is no hircling—he is not the head clerk of a public office, whose advice is asked when wanted, to be unheeded when given,—he is not the plastic non-enity condescendingly to be consulted on matters of "adequate importance:" (loud cheers:) but he is the life, the moving power of every wheel in the whole machinery of government—he is the very Government itself. Still the minister does not one single act in his own name, or for his own benefit—all is in the name of the Sovereign. The Cabinet Council as a party or as a power in the state, is perfectly unknown—it is the Executive of the Crown—the mouth-piece of the Sovereign.—Though the ministers alone are responsible, they appear in no shape as a party. The So-

vereign and the Cabinet together form one power in the State—Royalty is practically embodied in the British Constitution."—(Cheers.)

It appears then that the British world has been sadly astray in saying, "King, Lords and Commons." Mr. George Brown will teach them better. They should say, "King and Cabinet together, Lords and Commons." In this partnership of power between the "Sovereign and the Cabinet," Mr. George Brown will teach them how little is permitted to the former, and how much is the property of the latter. The Cabinet Minister is not only the "mouthpiece" of the Executive, but the moving power, the "life," the "very Government itself," and the Sovereign is less than "a tool"—a mere name to be used by the Cabinet Minister to endorse and give prompt to his acts. Such is the "loud cheers" doctrine of the Toronto Associationists. And no wonder, then, that Mr. George Brown's newly imported patriotic ire burst forth against Sir C. Metcalfe, for "trying to strike a deadly blow at the power and efficiency of the Provincial Executive Council," because he resisted their pretensions to be not only the "mouthpiece," but the "life," the "moving power," the "very government itself," and himself to be a name in form, and a nullity in practice. The words of JUNIUS—oddly enough quoted by one of the Toronto Association orators—were never so appropriate in the Cabinet encroaching days in which they were written, as on the present occasion:—"We have nothing to fear from prerogative, but every thing from undue influence."

Before the completion of this discussion, I trust the people of Canada will more fully appreciate the sentiments of JUNIUS, and the conduct of SIR CHARLES METCALFE, as the equal-justice protector of their constitutional rights and public liberties.

NUMBER V.

Dr. Paley's refutation of Hume's celebrated sophism against miracles is the shortest argument in that most admirable work—*The evidences of Christianity*. Dr. Paley's exposition of it does not occupy three pages; and his mathematical demonstration of its falsity occupies less than one page. The most important argument, therefore, in that unrivalled work is the shortest. So, if my argument in this paper should be much shorter than that which I have advanced in each of the preceding papers, its importance will not be in proportion to its length, but in proportion to its brevity.

The fourth proposition which I propose to demonstrate is—"That the question at issue between the late Councillors and SIR CHARLES METCALFE, according to the statement of certain of themselves and others of their own party, on different occasions is not that which Mr. BALDWIN stated to the House of Assembly and on which the vote of the Assembly was predicated."

The subject proposition is embraced in the following terms. It is a bill and fifty years of government. It is a bill of the late government. This bill as well as a statement bold than truth.

In the discussion the first thing new was what the question stated to the vote which the vote was. The Bill was a question. It was explained by Hume. It has only been never answered in the language of Nova Scotia. "As regards the Lodge, it may arise, it has been introduced desirable." It was then those circumstances that after their bearing (session), and done from himself protesting the appro- mitting it to only to rem- but to erase persons who duced very slaves—though any other co- Sir Charles qualified dis- and the ob- I can state the authority—of Excellency of Orange place a few ly [as the d- ed letter will range display no blood sh- religious an- or humanity confidence, perty, and u- excite suspi- represented organs as a base for Ma- racteristic every priva- the most w- cate and de- pectable m- do the GL- follow in h-