

they of this principle entitles them to the confidence of this House, being in strict accordance with the principles embraced in the Resolutions adopted by this House on the 3rd September, 1841.

It will thus be seen that the late advisers presented their claim to the confidence of the House, not upon the recommendations which they had made of certain persons to office, but upon the "question of their right to be consulted," not upon their advocacy of a certain kind or line of policy, but upon their alleged advocacy of a certain principle, which His Excellency (the other party in the "case of facts") avers was never a subject of dispute.

Now, before examining minutely the several facts embraced in his Excellency's statement, I must make a remark or two on the fallacy of the kind of omissions which the Governor-General alleges against the explanations of his late advisers. A good writer on historical investigation remarks, that "a statement of facts is fallacious when any of the alleged facts are not true—when it includes facts not relating to the subject—and when important facts are omitted. This last error is more frequently exemplified in those cases in which facts are collected on one side of a question, or in support of a particular doctrine. To the same class we may likewise add those instances in which statements are received as facts, which are not facts, but opinions."

Into every one of these four kinds of fallacies have the late Councillors fallen in their "explanation." They drag in certain alleged "opinions" of the Governor-General, which he denies, and which, did they exist, have no more to do with the working of the system of Responsible Government than the color of his Excellency's hair. The system of Responsible Government requires that every appointment to office should be made through a responsible minister. While there is a responsible minister who keeps the seal of state—while every commission must be stamped by that seal, and consequently endorsed by this minister—there is Responsible Government, whatever may be the opinions of the Sovereign or Governor as to its excellence or folly. The system of Responsible Government is no more depending upon the opinion or will of the Sovereign than it is upon the light of the moon, or the opinion of any other individual in the realm. Sir F. Head denied that any other individual but himself was responsible for any act of his government, and affirmed that he was responsible to the Imperial authority alone. Here was the denial of local Responsible Government. Sir Charles Metcalfe affirms throughout that his advisers are responsible to the representatives of the people of Canada for every act of his government relating to the internal affairs of the Province, and that those advisers should possess the confidence of Parliament. Here is the essence of Responsible Government, whatever may be the Governor-General's or any other man's opinion as to its virtues or vices. In this lug-

ging in certain alleged opinions of the Governor-General (but disclaimed by him) in a professed statement of facts relative to their own proceedings, and in making irrelevant statements about those opinions, "public rumors" &c., the late Councillors fell into the second and fourth of the above mentioned fallacies. In resting their case upon a statement denied by the other party, and therefore unsupported as a fact by any evidence, they are guilty of the first mentioned fallacy. In "omitting important facts," they are chargeable with the third kind of fallacy. To the two last mentioned fallacies I now invite the reader's attention.

I have heretofore proved, that it was impossible for the Governor-General to make appointments in violation of the principle of Responsible Government, as long as he had a Responsible Provincial Secretary, and as long as that Secretary was the keeper of the Public Seal of the Province. I have also adduced His Excellency's denial that he had ever deviated from that principle; and now, (considering each part of his statement separately,) in reference to that particular of his statement in which he says, that the late Councillors "demanded of the Governor-General, that he should agree to make no appointment, and no offer of appointment, without previously taking the advice." "The Governor-General replied that he would make no such stipulation." They allege to the House of Assembly, that the Governor-General has denied them the right of consultation; and the house, on that statement, (denied, be it remembered, by His Excellency,) adopts a resolution of confidence in them, "on the question of their right to be consulted on appointments to office." This is their whole case. Let the fallaciousness of it now be exposed—the statements of His Excellency established, and his conduct justified.

In the first place, their demands exceed what is required in the practice of Responsible Government. They demand that no step shall be taken in regard to an appointment, without His Excellency agreeing first to consult his "Council," whereas, Responsible Government, (according to the interpretation of Mr. Hincks, which I quoted in the last number, and according to other authorities, which I shall give in another place,) requires, that he shall consult a *Responsible Minister*.

In the second place, they demanded what no Ministers, or Minister, of the Crown have ever demanded of the Sovereign since the establishment of Responsible Government in England, in 1688. They cannot adduce an instance of a Minister ever having asked the Sovereign to give such a pledge or assurance as they demanded of the Governor-General. Indeed, in all their statements and speeches, and declamation on this subject, they have not, to my knowledge, adduced a single precedent in justification of such a procedure.—They assert many things, but they prove nothing.

In the third place, their demand implied the confession of what the Governor-General do-

nied as a
dation of
Mr. Read
friendly
neighbour
time; and
to you, an
or explicit
would nei
would you
Would you
that if you
sufficient
nasty, you
cause you
ing and de
tified in r
and a rog
the Govern
or proposa
declares
deviation,"
with their
him as adv
Governmen
of the coun
vocacy of t

But, let
instead of a
There is, pe
ada who do
ted ALLEN
sons who h
take the c
months, on
as British
interpretat
tained in th
They were
object to tal
Sovereign
that it was
Did they be
not declare,
tic determin
that they w
plied that th
ment to whi
long profess
never submit
character an
their voice h
disallowanc
Metcalfe to
upon the
ing upon to
dented form,
he avows he
deviation, an
to adhere;"
his character
tical hostility
How did the
an interpreta
with the "st
is by such a
that the late
suade the peo
General is an
of Canadian