

instance in the history of England, since the revolution of 1688, of the Crown and its advisers being at issue before the nation on a statement of facts. It is incompatible with the first principles of Responsible Government. The exhibition of such a scene in Canada should, therefore, speak with a thunder-like voice to the entire population, that something is radically and essentially wrong in the proceedings of the late Councillors—that whatever may have been the merits or demerits of their administration in other respects, they have in their proceedings with the Representative of the Sovereign, inflicted a more serious wound upon the character of the system of Responsible Government in a colony than has ever yet been experienced in the history of Canada—not even excepting the stopping of the supplies by the U. C. House of Assembly in 1836. And had not the conclusion, authorised by the unconstitutional proceedings of the late Councillors, been paralyzed by the British and constitutional mode in which Mr. Howe and two of his colleagues proceeded in their resignations in Nova Scotia, it is difficult to foretell what might have been the fate of the very system of Responsible Government itself in Canada. To place that unrivalled system upon a safe British foundation is one primary object with me in this discussion. To write for or against any party in the Province is alien to my feelings, as well as unworthy of my character.—I have never written for or against the appointment of any man or party to office. It is of no consequence to me what man or party is in power. All I have to do is with the fundamental principles and constitutional spirit of our government. And when those principles and that spirit are violated by any party, or even any Governor, I will not hesitate to do, as I have done throughout my public life, remonstrate against what is constitutionally wrong, politically dangerous, and morally unjust.

The anomaly to which I have referred has been strongly felt by the late Councillors.—Hence they have manifested no small degree of ingenuity and zeal to conceal and suppress it—to represent that the difference between the statement of the Governor General and their own was trivial—that the two statements harmonized in every essential particular.—And their own attestation on this ground to the "Protest!" of Sir Charles Metcalfe, is my first proof of the correctness of his statements. Sir Charles Metcalfe denies the correctness of their statements; they acknowledge the correctness of his. The two parties do not assent to the statements of the late Councillors; the two parties do assent to the statements of the Governor General. His statements, therefore, are the only *real constitutional* "case of facts" before the country.—What I thus assert I will now prove.

Mr. Baldwin, in his speech before the Toronto Association, 25th March, uttered the following words, as given in the official report; "Again it has been said that there had been a discrepancy between the statements of

Mr. Lafontaine's note, and that of the Head of the Government; but a careful perusal of those documents will show, that no discrepancy exists as to the facts alleged in that note."

Mr. Hincks, in his reply to Mr. Viger's pamphlet, referring to the statements of the Governor General and his late Councillors, says—"there is no difference with regard to facts;" and adds afterwards—"there is an *apparent*, although no real difference between the Governor General and the late Ministry with regard to the "stipulation" which never could have existed had there been a responsible minister in Parliament during the discussion, as was fully expected when the explanations were made. *As to other points there is no dispute.*"

These admissions of Messrs. Baldwin and Hincks, are proof demonstrative of the correctness of Sir Charles Metcalfe's statement of FACTS. Indeed, Mr. Hincks admits that there is no *real* difference between Sir Chas. Metcalfe and his late Councillors as to the "stipulation" which has been so lustily denied by the Toronto Associationists and their organs; and that "as to the other points there is no dispute."

Messrs. Baldwin and Hinks' alleged *harmony* between the statement of facts by the Governor General and his late advisers is not the question now under consideration.—Of that every reader can judge who has perused the preceding (third) number of my present argument. In their statement of facts, they made several allegations against the Governor General which I have shewn were not only denied by his Excellency, but were unproved and unfounded. They now tell us very gravely that there was no difference between their facts and those of Sir C. Metcalfe! It is thus that they not only contradict themselves, but become the unintentional and conclusive witnesses of the integrity of his Excellency's FACTS.

Their very attempt to claim company with his Excellency in their statement of facts, is not only a refutation of their charges against him—not only a testimony to his statement of facts—but argues their own conviction of the fatal consequences to the *constitutionality* of their whole explanatory proceedings, did any discrepancy exist between their facts and those of the Governor General. The existence of that discrepancy I have shown in a variety of particulars—and those particulars, too, of fundamental importance. The late Councillors, therefore, stand condemned, themselves being judges.

Both Messrs. Baldwin and Hincks have attempted to make a distinction between the "facts alleged" in the statements of Sir C. Metcalfe and his late advisers and their respective *views* and *explanations* and *arguments*. Mr. Baldwin says—"There is indeed much difference in the views of the respective parties, but that was what led to the disruption—the Head of the Government protesting against 'the explanation,' not against the existence of any fact stated by Mr.

Lafontaine—
cellency's ex-
that the ans-
Councillors,
nations bein-
ments made
colleagues.

Now, I w
senre—nay,
what the "e
of the late ad
of facts; and
"explanation"
but a denial
late adviser
that they ru
yet they tell
planation, is
stated by the
Mr. Hincks
ments," we
tion of the l
of syllogism
planation of
Metcalfe pro
played in th
explanation
isms—they
isms—that
tempt to enl

Mr. Baldu
views of th
disruption."
no disruption
difference o
the question
first, what s
lency cons
make? I h
of these a
them to m
made, and
authority is
queces. Th
statement
shewn in th
ther prove
is his Ex
have adduc
as witness
of FACTS.

Were I a
in a court
the whole
the jury o
I will pro
Metcalfe's
those of hi
general sta
ing words

"The G
the explan
pose to of
tively the
ces which
conveying
of his sen
no founda
less his rel
of the Pre