

tions of this
its repose,
element from
against crazier
Glebe and
bers for Lau-
to meet Bal-
Nay, Sir,
the law at
from Kings,
ies and your
en to teach
get the Civil
their ranks
corps of Sea-
is thus dispo-
but known,
measures, or
the entire con-
no measures;
and with non-
now not how I
y comparing
wise advised,
ng would not
an, I feel my-
ortion of this
ch I find the
ually prosper-
anced, loudly
e remarks ad-
ntleman from
tation of the
excellency will
ility to future
time force to
l the hon. and
it is sadly deli-
on Constitu-
ody of autho-
vidences which
ishes from the

Monarch are not
tion. While
of the Cabinet,
the Prince can
Tudors and the
Sovereign pre-
attachment was
y, and other acts
the transition
t of the Sove-
not a rare or im-
The revolution
and we shall li-

e, and that pro-
s self vindication
in my ears. To
nor my duty—
ack which person-
ecedent, British
ument and my
do so—first pre-
of the learned
e of the passages
atters of taste
e no time to dis-
Member has been
o other and more
determine. We
Government, that
and a British sub-

get, shall be proscribed from all hopes of service to his country, because he has become personally offensive to the Queen's Representative. I shall examine the constitutional grounds of this sentence or exclusion—and I shall do so with the calmness and the candor which suits the gravity of the subject.

Let me ask, Mr. Chairman, in our survey of British history—since the first dawn of Constitutional principle—do we find it ever recognized as opinion, or tolerated as precedent, that personal dissatisfaction to the prejudices or passions of the Sovereign, should constitute an obstacle to the offices of the State.

I do not, as I have already said, refer to the times of the Tudors, or the Stuarts—though even a few years after the Restoration, during the reign of a wayward and wilful Monarch as our throne has ever held, and ten years before the epoch of the Revolution, I can detect the first dawn of those meliorating changes of our Constitution (in reference to this very topic)—a dawn, tho' dim and not very encouraging, yet it has enabled me to catch a glimpse of the principle—of the light which has descended with vivifying vestiges through each successive track of time to the present. Even, sir, at the period I've spoken of, we are told by Sir William Temple, that Lord Halifax, (the name is somewhat appropriate), though vehemently objected to and the object of strong dislike, was imposed upon the Government of Charles, and this at an era when principles were not developed—ere the Revolution had given the form to the Constitution which we claim as our inheritance.

After the Revolution, the Earl of Oxford continued as the Minister of Queen Anne—though personally odious, as Swift writes, and 'receiving daily fresh instances of neglect and displeasure'—and yet she dared not refuse his services because they were required by the Public. After the accession of the dynasty of Hanover, Pulteney, though offensive to the Sovereign, was borne by the tide of popular confidence into the Councils of the Monarch. In the reign of second George, the senior Pitt, odious to the King, against the violent prejudices of that Prince ministered the Sovereign policy of the realm. Louisburg, (for which London was illuminated), fell, Quebec capitulated, and the mighty possessions of India were won for a Monarch who would scarcely admit to an audience the Minister who achieved the triumphs. Of Lord Temple, the colleague of this same Mr. Pitt, and who was First Lord of the Admiralty, we learn that while the King disliked Pitt, he absolutely hated Temple; and Temple, (as unfortunately is sometimes the consequence) was at times grossly impertinent to the Sovereign. On appearing at the palace, in his office of the Admiralty, to report the sentence of Admiral Byng, he is said to have intimated that Byng's conduct at Minorca was fully as defensible as His Majesty's had been at Oudenarde—implying, as McAuley writes, 'if the one deserved to be shot, the other ought to have been hanged'—yet Temple withstood the hostility of high place.

Fox, it is known, was very unacceptable to George 3d, and in the reign of the 4th of that name—while no lineal heir interposed—while his Successor, William, stood on the very steps of the Throne, he was addressed by Mr Brougham in one of his electric appeals, with the awful apostrophe of "stand forth thou slanderer." Yet the same William ennobled Mr Brougham, and gave to him in charge, as Chancellor of the State, the very conscience which he had devalued. While Lord Denman, who often exceeded the license of a Barrister by recriminations upon George the Fourth, was created Lord Chief Justice of England. Nay, in our own times, when personal dislikes should, if ever, find indulgence—the Reign of a Lady Sovereign—such has not been the case; Her Majesty's youthful sensibilities of gratitude to the courtly Melbourne, would probably prefer him to the more solemn Peel; yet experience testifies the result.

But, sir, we are without examples in these Colonies which may illustrate the order of argument I have chosen?

Sir James Stewart, if I remember aright, in his irritation against Lord Aylmer, then Governor General of British America, so far forgot the dignity of the Queen's Representative, as very significantly to communicate the intendment of a hostile message—yet, sir, do we find any sentence of proscription transmitted to Downing street? No, sir, this doom is reserved for Nova-Scotians. Sir James Stewart has since received the honor of knighthood from his Sovereign, and been elevated to the Chief Justiceship of the Canadas. Nay, even the imputation of treason—even close custody upon the charge—have not prevented Sir Charles Metcalfe from selecting Niger as his Prime Minister; and parading the once proscribed name of Papineau as under the patronage of the Crown—nets on the part of the Governor General so appreciated by the Sovereign that the dignity of the Peerage has been conferred for the success of his services. Is then alleged disaffection to the Sovereignty of the Realm, and gravely imputed charges of sedition, thus in Canada to be forgiven and forgotten, while in Nova Scotia pasquinades are to be rescrib'd, and personal criticisms (even though censurable) to result in the sacrifice of the subject?

Are the rights and hopes of the people held by so frail a tenure, that indiscretion in our words, the levities of a lampoon, are at once to draw down the dark seal upon our destinies? No, sir, ribaldry and ridicule are not the tests of truth, nor are caricatures exact conformities to the canons of fastidious criticism, but they are productions of a birth peculiarly English: who was ever more plentifully assailed by these missiles of the muse than the 4th George? and yet he looked with indifference upon the scratches they inflicted, and ere his death the author of the Twopenny Post Boy was a prisoner of the Prince.

And, Sir, one of Her Majesty's Ministers, the first Captain of the age, never knew the messengers of death to fly more thickly about his head in the last of his victories than the shafts of ludicrous mischief now battle about his ears, even at his homestead of Apsley. Yet it is said old friends seldom recognize more of his good humour—his former animation of countenance, than when seated in the hereditary chamber of the Realm, and amused by these satires. I might further state the manner in which a Colonial dignitary—one, then on the Bench representing his Sovereign—a Judge, now deceased, of a character spotless as the ermine of his office, and endowed with abilities of order eminent and distinguished, treated satirical reflections. Some young Barristers were executing ludicrous caricatures in Court. The foreman of the Jury detected the act, and conceiving the sharp ridicule as reflecting upon himself—complained—the insulting sketch was handed up to the Bench. The grave administrator of the law, after viewing it, saw that the mischief was aimed at himself; when, with his indescrivable and peculiar humour, he replied, 'You're mistaken, Mr Foreman—It is not you, but myself—and really it is very well done, too—very well—Proceed with the trial.' Such was the dignified indifference to these assaults of an unrestrained wit, which on the departed sages of our own Province displayed. Let me not be misapprehended—I am not here to act as an apologist or an advocate of every indiscretion that may find access to the miscellaneous columns of the Press; but to see that penalties, when invoked, shall not be extended beyond the legitimate claims of justice, and that the service of the country shall not suffer by privations and privations repugnant to principle and to precedent. If I remember aright the learned Attorney General during the last Session, favoured us with a passage from the writings of Dean Swift. I have one from the same celebrated author under my hand, not so appropriate; upon the character of a distinguished Statesman; an Earl of the Realm, and a Prime Minister of England (Lord Oxford) 'I was a great favourite of men of wit and learning, particularly of the former, whom he caressed without distinction of party, and regarded the libels published against him, which he frequently read by way of amusement, with a