

Hear the explanatory
Scotland passed his ad-
note of re-
Council-
used to his
error. He
weight of
him for the
oke in the
courtesy—
al remem-
uncillor he
ment, and
The res-
but he had
ituents—to
would now
so that his
He would
ment up to
act also he

at the late
standing or
etcalfe as to
fact can be
duce testi-
y made did
eral alleged
own should
the purchase
s is clearly
each of the
tion, which
maintained
uld consult
administra-
of the major-
be his rule
us included
e hands of
e explanato-
of the state-
which I have
very policy
the point of
his late ad-
onage. He
Excellency's
ice of giving
me political
rment; he
of different
e last twenty
the admin-
ars, and yet
at time, he
e seen any
n power pa-
s, if the pro-
no doubt it
s a piece of
van (and the
at did so in
y avows the
his colleagues
Metcalfe that
cted, "as far

as regards appointment to office." Had his Excellency agreed to that principle, would it not have been virtually surrendering the patronage of the Crown into the hands of the Council for party purposes? There is an old historical inaccuracy in Mr. Sullivan's remarks which I must correct. There has been but one party in power in Upper Canada during the last twenty years, until the last three or four years. The policy of that party in regard especially to appointments to office, has been the subject of complaint and remonstrance by the U. C. House of Assembly and the people in every variety of representation, and has been alleged by many as one occasion of the insurrection in 1837. Yet Mr. Sullivan and his colleagues repudiate the hitherto acknowledged reform doctrine of "equal justice to all classes," and denounce Sir Charles Metcalfe as an enemy to Responsible Government for maintaining it, and they now avow the old high ultra doctrine of party denominations and party exclusiveness, as the examples of their policy in appointments to office. But more on this subject in another place.

In a passage quoted in a former part of this paper, it has been seen that Mr. Hincks had admitted that the late Council did require a "stipulation" of Sir Charles Metcalfe in some acceptance of that term, though Mr. Boulton's resolution condemns a required stipulation or expressed understanding in any sense of the term. Let Mr. Hincks explain himself, and be my witness more at length. He says—"The system previously pursued by the Governor had been very unsatisfactory, and was calculated to destroy the political influence of the ministry, and they were compelled to remonstrate, and come to an understanding with his Excellency on certain points. Almost the only point on which there is even an apparent misunderstanding between the Governor-General and the ex-ministers, is that regarding the "stipulation." That, however, would long since have cleared up had there been a responsible minister in Parliament. We believe there is no real difference between them. The ministry have never denied that they gave the Governor General to understand that they could not afford him any assistance in the administration if the system of making appointments prejudicial to their influence was to be continued. This may be termed requiring a "stipulation." We deny that it is so. Will any one pretend that if at the present time, it being perfectly well known to every one that the Governor has avowed his determination not to be influenced in any way by party considerations, his Excellency were to invite Mr. Viger to form an administration, he might not with perfect propriety ask his Excellency whether such were his views as to his mode of administering the government, as if so, it would be out of his power to render him any assistance? There surely would be no "stipulation" in all this, and we could very easily find plenty of English precedents for "stipulations" of this kind. Now, in our judgement, Mr. Viger, if called upon, as we have suppo-

sed, would have not only been justified in taking such a course, but he would neglect his duty to the country if he failed to do so.— If then a gentleman called on to form an administration would be justified in coming to an understanding with the head of the Government as to the views of public policy, surely the members of an administration are equally warranted in doing so, especially after a change in the head of the government, and when they have reason to think there is a wide difference between him and them as to the policy to be pursued. As to the other points their is no dispute." [Reply to M. Viger, p. 11.]

In this extract, Mr. Hincks has admitted the whole fact in language that cannot be misunderstood; and in the passage I have italicised, he contradicts the whole doctrine of Mr. Boulton's resolution adopted by the House of Assembly, and substantially asserts what the Governor General resisted and what the House disclaimed. Mr. Hincks says he "could very easily find plenty of English precedents for the kind of "stipulation" which the late advisers demanded of the Governor General. I defy him to find one. Sir Robert Peel neither in 1839 nor in 1841, demanded any "such stipulation" of her Majesty—all he knew or asked to know of her "views of public policy," was from her acts, in acting or not acting upon his advice. According to the doctrine of the late Councillors, as stated by Mr. Hincks, the Sovereign must explain his political creed at the formation of every new ministry, and of course, at the very outset, must square by explicit "understanding," "his views of public policy" with theirs as to the mode of administering the government, or they would inform him, that "it would be out of their power to render him any assistance!" What a Proteus would the Sovereign thus become under a succession of ministries; and what a degradation would thus be stamped upon the very name of royalty.— And how does such a doctrine appear when compared with Mr. Boulton's resolution?

Again, Mr. Hincks says that the late Councillors went to his Excellency not only to "remonstrate" (that was their right and duty, if they deemed it necessary) but to "come to an understanding on certain points." It is also clear that one of those "points" relative "to the policy to be pursued" was, as to whether he would "come to an understanding" with them not to "make appointments prejudicial to their influence." What is such an "understanding" but a "stipulation?" And what is the effect of it but "the surrender of the patronage of the Crown to the Council for the purchase of parliamentary support?" This is the doctrinal demand of the late Councillors (Mr. Hincks being witness); this is the allegation of the Governor General; and the former proves the truth of the latter.— This is what I undertook to establish.

Under the operation of such a "stipulation" or "understanding," the Councillors could say concerning each of eleven candidates out of twelve for any office, "If your Excellency appoint such a one, you will prejudice our in-