

ative Council ;
bill with a pro-
vidence of one
y wished to act
regard to the

stant and exclu-
ment of Speak-
which has not
appointment ha-
legislative Coun-
divan informed
planation and
that his Excel-
him the names
stable to them
some names was
man whom his
to appoint.—
ore than a fort-
during which
expressed to his
on the subject.
in office ; thus
ellency and to
what he had
it to the Coun-
atisfactory and
ers, as soon as
his Excellency
eding to which
equiescing and
other example
alleled in con-
alled by those
councillors, that I
per of this argu-

the Governor
iterated times
to the influence
s the appoint-
of the Peace in
their great case,
to his Excel-
Now, although
r appointment
at question at
ers have select-
le against the
ave no objec-
on this single
judge between
eral. What I
case is derived
istry, and from
District of the
church Presby-
ntiments, who
other of Mr.
gston, on her
vacant office in
only surviving
ughters were
essaries of life.
ival applicant
by the late
itous circum-
well had come
District with

considerable property,—had been the principal founder of one of the settlements of that district,—has like many of his generous countrymen, exhausted his means, and become embarrassed in his circumstances—was appointed sheriff of that district, and died in debt; that his eldest son succeeded his deceased father in the office, and to him the family looked for support; that son died also, leaving a younger brother nearly of age, and nearly through his legal studies, as the only earthly prop of his mother and support of his sisters. That mother, not contented with having transmitted a written application, came it person to Kingston to lay her case before the Governor General. Her son was not a member of any secret society, and too young to be regarded as a political character. Here then were the cases of two candidates laid before the Governor General—both equally well qualified for the office applied for. In behalf of the one pleaded *political party purpose*—the “principle of government on party principles”—in behalf of the other, pleaded the wants of the widow and the fatherless. Which plea was the more likely to affect the tender and generous breast of Sir Charles Metcalfe?—To which plea was he the more likely to listen, to the tears of the destitute widow, or the ex-Councillors’ relentless doctrine of party patronage?

The case is above reasoning. Humanity is rather disposed to weep over the shrivelling and heartless selfishness of party, than to defend his Excellency in such a case—to execrate a system of policy that extinguishes every feeling of individual generosity, rather than vindicate an act which ought to call down a country’s spontaneous blessings upon the head of its author. If HE whose example is not beneath the imitation of parties, any more than of Governors, went with orphan sisters at Bethany, and raised the son of the widow of Nain, that he might support and comfort his mother, is Sir Charles Metcalfe to be pilloried and ostracised as the enemy of Canada for acting *against* the advice of party, in order to confer upon a widow’s son a “trifling appointment,” that he might minister both to his mother, and his sisters? I believe there is a HEART as well as a head in Canada; and I mistake the sympathies of that heart if they do not embrace that man as the friend of the country and the just guardian of constitutional rights, who prefers exercising the prerogative of the crown for the relief of the widow and the fatherless, rather than prostitute it at the demon-shrine of party patronage.

Reader, was your mother that widow, and you her only son and support, and was you qualified for that situation, what would you think of the Governor who would exercise the lawful prerogative to enable you to support her, and what would you think of the system of government that would proscribe you because you were not of the dominant party?

Upon the appointment therefore even of Mr. Powell—the case of the late Councillors—I

fearlessly appeal to the justice of patriotism, the humanity of honest men of all parties in Canada, to support his Excellency and her Majesty’s government against the crusade of the late Councillors, and against the *unprincipled* principle of exclusive patronage.

Thus much, then upon the views of the Governor General—professedly and practically—on the system of Responsible Government, as enunciated in the House of Assembly’s resolutions of September, 1841.

I might here dismiss the subject, confident of an honest country’s decision upon it. But I will add an illustration from British practice—all the late Councillors say that they desire. I will give then, instead of the alleged unconstitutional practice of Sir Charles Metcalfe, the acknowledged constitutional practice of George the Third of blessed memory. The reader may easily judge, as he attentively peruses and weighs the facts, whether there would not have been a revolution in England had the late Councillors been Ministers, and had they George the Third as head of the Government, instead of Sir Charles Metcalfe. I give those facts not as to what ought to be, but to show what *has been British practice*; and with these facts, and the elucidation of the principle, as suggested by them, I will conclude the present number, feeling that the importance of the subject is an ample apology for the length of the following extract from Lord Brougham’s Historical Sketches of Statements,—Article George 3:—

“George 3 was impressed with a lofty feeling of his prerogative, and a firm determination to maintain, perhaps extend it. At all events, he was resolved not to be a mere name, nor a cipher in public affairs; and, whether from a sense of the obligations imposed upon him by his station, or from a desire to enjoy all its powers and privileges, he certainly, while his reason remained entire, but especially during the early period of his reign, interfered in the affairs of government more than any prince who ever sat upon the throne of this country since our monarchy was distinctly admitted to be a limited one, and its executive functions were distributed among responsible ministers. The correspondence which he carried on with his confidential servants during the ten most critical years of his life, lies before us, and it proves that his attention was ever awake to all occurrences of the government. Not a step was taken in foreign, colonial, or domestic affairs, that he did not form his opinion upon it, and exercise his influence over it. The instructions to ambassadors, the orders to governors, the movements of forces down to the marching of a single battalion in the districts of this country.—The appointments to all offices in church and state, not only the giving away of judgeships, bishoprics, regiments, but the subordinate promotions, lay and clerical; all these form the topics of his letters; on all his opinions are pronounced decisively; on all his will is declared pre-emptorily. In one letter he decides the appointment of a Scotch pulane judge; in another the march of a troop from