

for them to have decided in favour of the one or the other upon such evidence, or rather such absence of all evidence, was as unprecedented as it was unjust, and was such a decision as no inferior Court in the land would have been disposed or dared to make.

It has been stated that one of the movers of the resolution in question, has said, that he saw the House wavering, and that he pressed it to a vote before the members had time to draw back. It is not surprising that a thorough "party man"—a man who prefers party to justice—should pursue such a course, and exult in its success. Nor is it surprising that the House was "wavering" under such circumstances; it would have been surprising had it been otherwise. As the case was a new one, and as the members of the Assembly could not possibly have acquainted themselves with the minute of British Parliamentary practice in such cases, it is not surprising that they were led on by party to adopt such a course. But it will be surprising if, after a calm review of the whole affair, and a minute investigation of all the facts of the question, they do not waver back to the position of doing justice between man and man—of doing to the Governor General as they would be done by in similar cases—of acting in harmony with the practice of British Responsible Government. It has been said, "to err is human, to forgive divine;" those members of the Assembly who have in this case done what is "human," are not asked to do what is "divine." No crime has been committed; no forgiveness is sought or needed. But they are asked—and I have no doubt but a just and honest country will ultimately require it to be done—to retrace what is "human" so far back to what is "divine" as to do justice to an upright, a generous, and an unjustly implicated man.

Pope has said, for a man to acknowledge his error is only to acknowledge that he is wiser to-day than he was yesterday. What is true of individuals is true of collections of individuals; and I am much mistaken if the members of the House of Assembly—after the lapse of so many days—will not be wiser next session than they were the last. I am also inclined to believe that several, if not all, of the late Counsellors—after their unexpectedly long retirement from the cares and perplexities of office—will be found more judicious, more experienced, better qualified, and more disposed to appreciate and adhere to the British principles and practice of Responsible Government, than they were last session.

But there is another anomaly still in this proceeding—another *prima facie* evidence that the late Counsellors have failed to establish the allegations which they have made against the Governor General. It is the perplexity—the cuttle-fish muddiness—in which they have involved the whole affair. Who in Canada, for weeks after their resignation, could comprehend their real differences with the Governor General? and not a few still unable to define them. The "Toronto Reform Association" has schooled its pupils to

lerably well into the mystery—at least so far as ringing the changes on certain words and phrases, and vociferous denunciations, evince proficiency; but even with such a school of public instruction on the subject, many are unable to perceive anything more than confused and undefined images of East India nabobism and West India negroism—the staple elquence of the Association. Now such obscurity—such confusion—is never witnessed in any question of defined and proved facts. The inference, therefore, is inevitable, that their facts were neither specific nor proved.

That such was the light in which they were viewed, not only by unexperienced Canadian minds, but by the most acute and experienced statesmen, is obvious from a recent letter written by the honble. Joseph Howe, of Nova Scotia, and published in several of the Canadian papers. Mr. Howe was reported to have said in one of his speeches in the Nova Scotia House of Assembly, that "the difficulties in Canada had arisen from a bungling administration." Mr. Howe, in a letter addressed to Mr. Hincks, and dated Halifax, April 29, 1844, explains as follows: "The conflicting statements put forth by the Governor General and his ex-Counsellors, rendered it difficult for some time to judge what the real points at issue were—the facts of the case, upon which alone an opinion could be formed, not being admitted on both sides. It was in reference to this contrariety of statement that I said in answer to some speaker who sought to show that the Canadian and Nova Scotia cases were strictly analogous, that the matter had been so "bungled" in Canada, that it was difficult to say whether such an inference could be fairly drawn. This is all that was said or intended; and the observation was only meant to apply to the then involved state of the controversy, and used without any desire to charge blame upon either of the parties whose opposing statements rendered it difficult at the moment to form a correct decision, and most desirable to keep the simple fact upon which the retirements were based, free from any theoretical dispute about general principles which it did not necessarily involve."

Now, if the acute mind and practised eye of the father of Responsible Government in British North America, could only discover in the Canadian "case of facts," "conflicting statements,"—"opposing statements,"—"a matter so bungled"—"theoretical disputes about general principles," could even he have discovered any *proof* of the allegations against his Excellency? Yet upon this case of "conflicting statements," and a "matter so bungled," do the late Counsellors demand a verdict of the country against Sir Charles Metcalfe as an enemy of Responsible Government! Would the reader, as a jurymen, convict a known pickpocket upon such "bungled" and "opposing statements?" much less the Representative of his Sovereign against his own declarations.

From the foregoing reasoning I infer, there-

fore, that not late Counsellors tofore shown that upon every table practice, their allegation

So much for us now examining their difficulty, together. I will two or three from to be—as stated natory speech—tained a widely duties and responsibilities Council, from ed office"—that Resolutions of

Such is the examine its import and involved in Mr. Baldwin do the high court Sir Charles's "the late Counsellors attaches to the recent" as orthodox assured that Mr. than one questionly adjusted that from it is "w different" as to There are as terms "widely ent intellectual ists now-a-days of ecclesiastical and a fact as which exists between and who is concerned not hold that the opinion constituted between Responsible Government possible Governor Baldwin does not respects Sir Charles the "position," the Executive reader were are holding a treasure of a subject's all inculcating treasures, and that Mr. Metcalfe or Queen that Mr. B. had indicted that widely different and responsible that which was guidance and request and suppose they were to ask the extent the prison taught a view of enjoyed by the Mr. B. should gentlemen, his view court were to referent? And to ply again, "re