

In order to reach a sound conclusion in the matter, a variety of subordinate points, involved in its issue, must be duly considered and determined in connexion with the main subject.

First:—Whether the system of Responsible Government established in this Province, is, in so far as relates to its local affairs, identical with the practical working of the British Constitution in the Mother Country, and the responsibility of Ministers to the majority of the House of Commons.

Secondly:—What was the real cause of the quarrel between His Excellency Sir Charles Metcalfe and the Ex-Ministers; and whether, divested of all subtilities, and paltry quibblings as to form, it was not as to the right to be consulted on all appointments to office, claimed by the ministry, and denied by the Governor General.

Thirdly:—Whether the ministry were constitutionally justified in setting up this right, and the Governor General wrong in resisting it,—or vice versa.

Fourthly:—Whether the mere assertion of the right to be consulted, set up—rightly or wrongly—by the late ministry, implied a design on their part to subvert the authority of the British Crown in the Province; and whether the manner of asserting it, or their conduct—or that of their adherents, since the resignation, was indicative of any treasonable purpose, or of any other object or design whatever, than the mere enunciation of a constitutional right, which they conscientiously believed themselves to possess; and whether the course pursued by them in this matter, was not perfectly compatible with the most profound loyalty to their Sovereign;—and whether the Governor General was justified in charging them publicly and repeatedly with disaffection, disloyalty, and a desire to overthrow the authority of Great Britain in Canada.

Fifthly and lastly:—Whether,—the ministers being justified in resigning their offices,—ought now to be sus-