

of the Head
ful personal of
at no discre-
egee in that

Mr. Viger's
ments of the
Councillors,
with regard to
there is an
ence between
late Ministry
which ne-
re been a re-
ent during the
ed when the
other points

Baldwin and
e of the cor-
s statement
s admits that
en Sir Chas.
ors as to the
no lustily de-
ists and their
other points

alleged har-
f facts by the
e advisers is
consideration.—
who has pe-
number of my
statement of
ations against
have shewn
excellency, but
They now
was no differ-
those of Sir
they not only
ome the unin-
esses of the in-
rs

company with
nt of facts, is
charges against
his statement
conviction of
stitutionality
ceedings, did
their facts and
l. The exist-
e shown in a
e particulars,
ce. The late
condemned,

Hincks have
n between the
ents of Sir C.
s and their re-
s and argu-
There is in-
ews of the re-
what led to the
overnment pro-
tion," not a-
stated by Mr.

Lafontaine—we also protest against His Excellency's explanation." Mr. Hincks says, that the answer of his Excellency to the ex-Councillors, "is not a protest against explanations being made, but against the arguments made use of by Mr. Lafontaine and his colleagues."

Now, I would ask any man of common sense—nay, any boy that can read English—what the "explanations" and "arguments" of the late advisers consisted of but a *statement of facts*; and what a "protest" against that "explanation" and those "arguments" was, but a denial of that statement of facts? The late advisers have asserted long and loud, that they resigned upon certain facts, and yet they tell us that a protest against their explanation, is not a protest against any fact stated by them! From the sense in which Mr. Hincks appears to use the word "arguments," we are left to infer that the explanation of the late advisers consisted in a string of syllogisms (curious materials for the explanation of facts!), and that Sir Charles Metcalfe protested against the materials employed in the explanation, but not against an explanation being made. It is by such solecisms—they do not rise to the rank of sophisms—that the accusers of Sir Charles attempt to enlist the public against him.

Mr. Baldwin says, the "difference in the views of the respective parties led to the disruption." No one doubts this. Of course no disruption would have taken place had no difference of views existed. But that is not the question. The three-fold question is, first, what statement of views did his Excellency consent that his late advisers should make? I have shewn in the second number of these articles, that he did not authorise them to make the statement which they made, and that their doing so without such authority is fraught with dangerous consequences. The second question is, what their statement of allegation proved? I have shewn in the third number, that it was neither proved, nor true. The third question is, is his Excellency's statement correct? I have adduced Messrs. Baldwin and Hincks as witnesses to the unexceptionable accuracy of facts.

Were I addressing the jury of twelve men in a court of justice, I might confidently rest the whole case here; but addressing, as I am, the jury of the country through the press, I will proceed further, and notice Sir Charles Metcalfe's statements in detail, as I have those of his late advisers. His Excellency's general statement is contained in the following words:—

"The Governor General protests against the explanation which those gentlemen propose to offer to Parliament, as omitting entirely the actual and prominent circumstances which led to their resignation, and as conveying to Parliament a misapprehension of his sentiments and intentions which have no foundation in any part of his conduct, unless his refusal to make a virtual surrender of the Prerogative of the Crown to the Coun-

cil for party purposes, and his anxiety to do justice to those who were injured by the arrangements attending the Union, can be regarded as warranting such a representation, and which is calculated to injure him without just cause, in the opinion of the Parliament and people, on whose confidence he places his sole reliance for the successful administration of the Government."

I have already examined the late advisers' representation of his Excellency's "sentiments and intentions" in several respects. His Excellency's statement that they had "omitted the actual and prominent circumstances which led to their resignation," has never, as far as I have read their speeches and writings, been denied by any one of them. On this most important point they have been profoundly silent; and well they might be, as will soon appear.

Let us now consider "the actual and prominent circumstances which led to their resignation," as stated by the Governor General. His Excellency says—"On Friday, Mr. Lafontaine and Mr. Baldwin came to the Government House, and after some other matters of business, and some preliminary remarks as to the course of their proceeding, demanded of the Governor General that he should agree to make no appointment, and no offer of an appointment without previously taking the advice of the council; that the list of candidates should in every instance be laid before the Council; that they should recommend any others at discretion; and that the Governor General in deciding, after taking their advice, should not make any appointment prejudicial to their influence." This demand, as a whole, the Governor General interpreted as implying "that the patronage of the Crown should be surrendered to the Council for the purchase of parliamentary support." To this demand, "The Governor General replied, that he would not take any such stipulation, and could not degrade the character of his office, nor violate his duty, by such a surrender of the prerogative of the Crown." His Excellency's facts are admitted by Messrs. Baldwin and Hincks—though they do not like his interpretation of those facts, namely, that they involve "the surrender of the patronage of the Crown to the Council for the purchase of parliamentary support? But how many of those facts did the late Councillors state in their parliamentary "explanations"? They stated only one, and omitted the others, which his Excellency declares were "the circumstances which led to their resignation," that they stated but one of these facts in their explanation, is clear not only from an examination of it, but from the resolution of the House of Assembly founded upon it, which expressed "the deep regret felt by this House at the retirement of certain members of the Provincial Administration, on the question of their right to be consulted on what this House unhesitatingly avows to be the prerogative of the Crown—appointments to office, and further to assure his Excellency that their advo-