

any hour he pleases. What is done from spontaneous choice cannot be a hardship.—But suppose those officers were to experience inconvenience as well as mortification from their royal master doing acts without their advice, and were to apprise him of it and inform him that on the occurrence of similar acts—this would be right and constitutional; but for them in addition to demand of this an engagement or understanding that he would do nothing without their advice, and even nothing contrary to it when given, would be becoming dictators or stipulators to, instead of advisers to, the Crown—would be going out of their own province and invading that of the Crown—would be insulting its dignity, invading its freedom, and reducing it to a “tool.”

In these remarks I have supposed a case as strong as that which the late councillors have alleged against Sir Charles Metcalfe; and even in such a case, it will be seen that they have not acted constitutionally. But be it recollected that his Excellency denies ever having made an appointment without the knowledge of one or more of his advisers. In a despatch to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated December 26, 1843, his Excellency says, “that he did not recollect of a single instance in which he had made an appointment without being previously made acquainted with their sentiments on the subject.”

But let us now consider his Excellency's own words on the subject of Responsible Government—words most explicit, yet most shamefully perverted and misrepresented by his accusers. Not seeking to shield himself under the reserve of prerogative, his Excellency has unequivocally stated his sentiments from the first day of the dispute. In his protest against the late Councillors' intended explanation, he says—“*The Governor General subscribes entirely to the Resolutions of the Legislative Assembly of the 3rd September, 1841, and considers any other system of Government but that which recognises responsibility to the people, and to the Representative Assembly, as impracticable in this Province.*”

This was as much as Lord Sydenham, who wrote those resolutions, ever said—as much as Sir Charles Bagot ever said. Such a declaration from the Crown is all that it could say to any nation or people on such a subject. The late Councillors themselves, in their intended explanation, admit that “*His Excellency disavowed any intention of altering the course of administration of public affairs which he found on his arrival in Canada.*”

Yet have they, notwithstanding, held him up to the public as an enemy of Responsible Government, and as seeking to subvert the constitutional liberties of the people of Canada! Sir C. Metcalfe has in some instances given even a detailed exposition of his views of Responsible Government. I will select and examine the paper which has been the subject of the most unfair and unjust criticism. I refer to his reply to the address of the Gore District.

One phrase of a long paragraph of this re-

ply has been the subject of columns of criticisms in the *Banner* and *Globe* and *Examiner* newspapers, and by Mr. Baldwin and others, whilst they have not so much as alluded to a word of all the rest of the entire paragraph (every word of which I beg the reader to weigh) is as follows: “But if you mean that the government should be administered according to the well understood wishes and interests of the people; that the resolutions of September 1841, should be faithfully adhered to; that it should be competent to the council to offer advice on all occasions, whether as to patronage or otherwise; and that the Governor should receive it with the attention due to his constitutional advisers; and consult with them on all cases of adequate importance; that there should be a cordial co-operation and sympathy between him and them; that the Council should be responsible to the Provincial Parliament and the people; and that when the acts of the Governor are such as they do not choose to be responsible for, they shall be at liberty to resign; then I entirely agree with you, and see no impracticability in carrying on Responsible Government in a colony on that footing, provided that the respective parties engaged in the undertaking be guided by moderation, honest purpose, common sense, and equitable minds, devoid of party spirit.”

Now, after much reflection and careful examination it is my firm belief that the above paragraph contains not only the essentials of responsible government, but a more full, more explicit, more detailed, more practical recognition of that system than is contained either in the naked Resolutions of September, 1841, or in Lord Durham's Report, or even in both documents taken together. Nothing but the most downright party interest, and party feeling, and party criticism, could give it a different interpretation. Well therefore have the Toronto Associationists and their city organs kept out of sight every part of that paragraph except a single phrase; well have they snatched that phrase from its natural connection, and perverted it from its legitimate meaning. The first article of their creed is *party*; and therefore truth and reason, and justice must succumb to party. But suppose the system of interpretation adopted in this instance by Messrs. Baldwin, Hincks, Brown and others, were adopted in interpreting even the inspired Scriptures themselves, what might not those sacred writings be made to say? Suppose even a verse—much more a phrase—were torn from the context, and interpreted irrespectively of that context, what sort of a bible would we have? What sort of doctrines would it teach, or rather would it not teach? Yet such is the principle of interpretation practiced by the accusers of His Excellency in respect to this reply—all others of his replies on which it may not be necessary in this argument for me to dwell.

Let the reader candidly consider what the Governor General *does* say and *does not* say in the above quoted paragraph.

It will be observed that he refers through-