

months—acts which they now vociferate from Essex to Gaspe—these very acts for condemning which they now demand the support of the Province,—yes, those identical acts, (and the reservation of the Secret Societies' Bill among the rest,) would have been whitewashed—would have been assumed as constitutional—would have been defended as worthy of the support of the Province, had the Governor-General only “come (to use the Examiner's words) to some understanding, to the principle upon which the government was to be conducted as far as regards appointments to office!”

Now, does not this single fact prove to a demonstration, that they violated the last part of Mr. Boulton's resolution? Into the pit which they dug for another, have they not fallen themselves? And I appeal to the honest reader of any party, whether their resigning or not resigning can change the nature of the Governor-General's acts which were performed before they resigned? And whether they are not, in all honor, and consistency, and truth, and decency, bound to defend those acts out of office as well as in office? Their continuance in office was (to use a figure in Mr. Boulton's Toronto Association speech,) an endorsement of every note in the shape of a government act,—during the period of their incumbency they were the only endorsers known in the law of Responsible Government—as long as they remained in the emoluments of office, they excluded all other endorsers; and, it appears by their own confession, that they would have continued to have endorsed every note of the Governor General's past acts, had he consented to have endorsed their notes, (which they presented to him,) of “some understanding as the principle upon which the Government was to be conducted as far as regards appointments to office.” And, because he would not endorse in advance for them, they have repudiated what, by their continuance in office, they had endorsed for him.—Every note of his Excellency's acts would have been as good as the Bank of Responsibility itself, had he consented to endorse the “stipulation” note for them: but his refusal to do so has made him a heretic in theory and a despot in practice, and that too for months while they were his voluntary and paid endorsers!! Now, statute-law will not allow an endorser to repudiate his name from a discounted note, whatever may become of the drawer of it; nor will responsible law allow advisers of the Crown to repudiate notes which have been discounted, while they voluntarily continued in the office, and received the pay of constitutional endorsers. They are not, indeed, liable to imprisonment; but repudiators of all countries will receive, as they have always received, the repudiation of the moral world.

In what a humiliating contrast does this proceeding of the late Councillors stand to the conduct of every English statesman who has ever retired from the councils of his Sovereign! How painfully does it contrast with the honourable and constitutional conduct of

the ex-Councillors in Nova Scotia! Hear the commencement of Mr. Howe's explanatory speech, as reported in the Nova-Scotia papers:—“Mr. Howe rose and opened his address to the house by reading his note of resignation of the offices of Executive Councillor and Collector of Excise, addressed to his Excellency the Lieutenant Governor. He therefore stood relieved from the weight of responsibility which had rested on him for the last three years and a half. He spoke in the highest terms of Lord Falkland's courtesy—it would always live in his grateful remembrance. He conceived while a Councillor he was bound to support the government, and regard the interests of the country. The responsibility was great and weighty; but he had other responsibilities—to his constituents—to the country—to this house. He would now endeavour to discharge his duty, so that his position would be understood. He would support Lord Falkland's Government up to the time of his resignation—that act also he was ready to defend.”

Thus far, then, as to the fact that the late Councillors demanded an understanding or “stipulation” from Sir Charles Metcalfe as to his future conduct. I think this fact can be no longer doubted. I will now adduce testimony to show that the demand they made did involve what the Governor General alleged—that the patronage of the Crown should be surrendered to the Council for the purchase of parliamentary support.” This is clearly implied in the passage in the speech of the chairman of the Toronto Association, which I quoted in the last number. He maintained that the Governor General should consult with no other parties than the “administration,” or “the leading members of the majority”—and that their advice should be his rule of action. Thus excluded and thus included he could only be a “tool” in the hands of his keepers. Mr. Sullivan, in his explanatory speech, while he denies some of the statements of Sir Charles Metcalfe, which I have shown to be true, defends the very policy which his Excellency says was the point of “antagonism” between him and his late advisers—the distribution of patronage. He says. “As to that part of His Excellency's letter which mentioned the injustice of giving office only to persons of the same political opinions with the existing government; he said he had watched the course of different administrations in Canada for the last twenty years: he had been a member of the administration for the last eight years, and yet during the whole length of that time, he did not remember ever to have seen any of the many different parties in power patronising their enemies: in fact, if the proposition were made, he had no doubt it would have been laughed at as a piece of childish folly.” Here Mr. Sullivan (and the only one of the late advisers that did so in explanation) admits and publicly avows the “principles” on which he and his colleagues had contended with Sir Charles Metcalfe that the government should be conducted, “as far

as regards ap-
Excellency ap-
not have been
troung of the
Council for the
historical in-
marks which
but one party
ring the last
or four years
gard especially
been the sub-
stance by the
the people in
and has been
sion of the
Sullivan and
ther to acknow-
justice to all
les Metcalfe
vernment for
avow the old
nominations
examples of
office. But
place.

In a passage
paper, it has
admitted that
“stipulation”
acceptation of
resolution of
expressed un-
term. Let it
be my wish
“The system
vernor had be-
calculated to
the ministry
monstrate, and
his Excellency
only point of
misunderstand-
neral and the
the “stipula-
long since he
responsible
lieve there
The ministry
the Govern-
could not a
ministration
ments preju-
continued.
“stipulation”
any one pro-
being perfe-
the Govern-
not to be in-
siderations
Viger to fo-
with perfec-
ther such w
ministering
be out of his
tances? T
tion” in al-
plenty of
tions” of t
Mr. Viger