

represent Gov-
of Canada.
of the autho-
and the re-
neral to the
nexus with
imputations
of England,
own, amidst
of the then
ciation? Is
ada respect
e the confi-
lengthen the
and Cana-
ons speak a
erstood, and
mistaken.—
from me to
interpret the

ere, which I
at the pro-
Councillors,
unpreceden-
ive of legal
not intended
on between
the present
governor Gen-
by some
injuriously if

rring to ano-
with the pro-
ors and the
s. The re-
and remon-
cillors even
g any sort of
into Reform-
attendance
r attendance
ulates them
atronages in
es, as form-
of Canadian
(in addition
n the preced-
repudiated
m has been
Toronto As-
poch in our
enviable one
ngs of popu-
larian positi-
own and the
r. Roebuck's
ising to find
executing the
to see him
ive Council,
uitable a man
ight in such a
so strange a
us kind and
posed upon
a "stool pi-
as a "tool"
onest heart

could not sympathise with the spirit and anti-
colonial-connexion doctrine cherished by the
Toronto Associationists, and so explicitly
avowed by Mr. Blake. On afterwards meet-
ing with Mr. Ferguson's speech in the *Kings-
ton Chronicle*, my first impressions were con-
firmed.—The animus of the Association is
wanting in that speech. It indicates large
mistakes as to many of the circumstances in-
volved in the question of difference between
Sir C. Metcalfe and his late Councillors, but
it abounds in appropriate expressions in regard
to the Sovereign and her representative, and
bows constitutionally to Imperial authority.
Mr. Ferguson said—"The reformers of Cana-
da will not be goaded into unconstitutional
acts. They await in confidence the award of
the British Government and of the British Par-
liament—and I do verily believe, for one, they
will reap their reward. (Hear.)"

The Toronto Associationists having already
received the "award of the British Govern-
ment," and virtually of the British Parlia-
ment, and with Mr. Ferguson, "I do verily
believe for one, they will reap their reward."
Mr. Ferguson and other good subjects, who
have been unwittingly drawn into the Toron-
to Association will doubtless be satisfied with
and support the "award" of the imperial au-
thority—though the journals of the Associa-
tion kick against both the "award" itself and
the authority which has made it. It is plea-
sing however, to observe that such are not
the sentiments, and such is not the spirit of
reformers in other British Provinces. The
"award" is declared to be all that the reform-
ers ought to desire—all that the reformers of
Nova Scotia ever asked for. The Hon. Jo-
seph Howe has the following remarks in the
Nova Scotian, on the late debate in the Impe-
rial Parliament:—

Imperial Parliament Debate.—When the
packet arrived, there was a great deal of ex-
ultation over Charles Willmer's report of the
Debate on Canadian affairs, in which it was
supposed that Lord Stanley had negatived the
principle of Responsible Government, as un-
derstood and acted upon in this Province.—
We thought it strange that this should be the
case, and sat down to a full report in the *Ti-
mes*, with some forebodings of mischief—some
anticipation of a recurrence to the antiquated
errors, and the intolerant spirit of which these
Colonies, in former times, had so much rea-
son to complain. As we advanced, we were
agreeably surprised to find Lord Stanley
reading Lord Durham's report, and Lord John
Russell's Despatches, and boldly avowing his
concurrence in the principles, as acted upon
in Nova Scotia for the last four years. What
he objects to is:

"1st. The restriction of the prerogative
in all internal affairs, and

"2d. The demand of a stipulation from a
Governor, as to the mode in which he should
in all cases, exercise the prerogative in the
distribution of patronage.

"No attempt has ever been made, in Nova-
scotia, to do either of these things to which
Lord Stanley objects.

"The whole tone of this debate is excellent
—the sentiments throughout will be regarded
with satisfaction by those who seek, and have
ever sought, nothing more than the practical
application of the principles of responsibility,
with entire security to public liberty, and the
vigorous exercise of all the royal prerogative-
ties."

It now only remains for me to recapitulate
the several instances in which the late Coun-
cillors have departed from British usage.

1. It was contrary to British usage for them
to remain in office twenty-four hours, much
less weeks or months after the head of the
Executive had performed acts or made ap-
pointments which they did not chose to justifi-
fy before Parliament and before the country.

2. It was contrary to British usage for
them to complain of and condemn a policy or
acts to which they had become voluntary parties
by their voluntarily continuing in office.

3. It was contrary to British usage for
them to go to the Sovereign to discuss the
principles and debate policy, instead of ten-
dering their resignations for his past acts.

4. It was contrary to British usage for
them to demand of the Sovereign, an exposi-
tion of his intended future policy, much more
to demand from him an understanding or en-
gagement that his policy should be such as
"would not be prejudicial to their influence."

5. It was contrary to British usage for
them to carry on such a negotiation with the
Sovereign without furnishing him with their
propositions and demands in writing. Lord
Stanley's apprehensions on account of their
not having been compelled to do so, have been
fully realized.

6. It was contrary to British usage for
them to resign on account of any alleged theo-
ries or opinions entertained by the Sove-
reign, instead of resigning upon his specific
act or acts.

7. Finally, it was contrary to British
usage for them to come before Parliament
with an explanation of the grounds of their
resignation, without having the concurrence
of the Sovereign in the facts of that explana-
tion, much more to give an explanation in the
teeth of the protest of the Sovereign, to im-
peach the principles of the Sovereign, and
subsequently to get up political organizations
against him.

I have thus finished the painful part of my
task. I shall not leave the evils which I
have pointed out without proposing a remedy
and the interests and duty of the people re-
specting it, will be the subject of my next and
concluding number.

NUMBER IX.

It now remains for me to shew, "That it
is the duty and the interest of the people of
Canada to maintain those views which they
have always professed, and which Sir Char-
les Metcalfe has most explicitly and fully
avowed."

What views the people of Canada have pro-
fessed and Sir C. Metcalfe has avowed, I have
shown in the preceding part of this discussion