

ands of his
ch the full
tion states-
vernor-Ge-
only after a
that Assa-
t the mode
the heads of
or, and say-
what they
by the Go-
departments,
to be done.
y) had been
ret, during
but he had
King going
to what he
the Minis-
s, I propose
e, and then
ated by the
yning-street
Sovereigns,
n the Sove-
reigns as to
have known
to the non-
Association.
ing to send
and heads of
in order that
ed. I once
d of depart-
en I arrived
old that the
ip down to
don! I re-
mour in
Governor-
own to the
dian Down-
of depart-
necessity
Government
never they
anted to be
general coun-
learn what
death-blow
ossible Go-
would have
ecision!
himself—the
n, the patri-
novice com-
of the To-
e hopeless
than Sir
late debate
ohn Russell
instructions
Sovereign I
re anxious
of the Irish
serve. Nev-
was in the
the Home

Department, any INSTRUCTIONS FROM THE SOVEREIGN, but such as bespoke an equal regard for all her Irish subjects—for Protestant, for Catholic, and for Presbyterian." Here Lord John Russell speaks of receiving advice from his Sovereign—as well as of giving advice to her—nay, even of "receiving instructions from the Sovereign," and of receiving instructions not merely in respect to an appointment to office, but in respect to the principles and spirit of the government of all Ireland!

The truth is that in England, statesmen of all parties, and the entire nation, cherish some regard for the opinions and wishes and feelings of the Sovereign, and a universal determination to maintain unimpaired the safeguards of the throne. But while in England the Sovereign can even be the guest of the political opponents of the cabinet; in Canada he must not hear opinions from any but the "leaders of the majority," even at the Government House. In England, the Sovereign can send for a minister even at the distance of sixty miles; in Canada, he must not even go to a minister at his department. In England the Sovereign can even give instructions to a minister; in Canada he must not even express a want. Nay, he must know no wants but those which his advisers see fit to express, and the length and breath of their wants will be the interests of themselves and their party. And this we are told is British Responsible Government! And because Sir Charles Metcalfe will not bow down to this, he is to be impeached and ostracised as an enemy to the constitution and people of Canada, and driven back (to use the expressive words of Captain Irving amid the cheers of the Toronto Association,) "into retirement in dear old England, where tyrants have no power," and where "he will writhe under the reproach and remorse that is ever inflicted by a secret monitor on all those who disregard, or wantonly sport with the happiness of their fellow creatures, or trample on the rights and liberties of those they were unfortunately doomed to govern."—[Loud Cheer.]

There are several minor circumstances referred to in the statements of the late Counsellors, which will be noticed when I come, in the next number, to discuss the *concise* of the proposition discussed in this article, namely, "That the statements of his Excellency are fully sustained by the testimony of his accusers and adversaries—especially those of Messrs. Sullivan, Hinks, Boulton, and Brown (Editor of the *Globe* newspaper.)"

I will conclude this number with three general remarks. The reader will have seen, that I have judged the accusers of Sir Charles Metcalfe out of their own mouths. I have given their statements and doctrines in their own words, and examined the import, truth, application, and tendency of them, upon the most obvious and universally received principles of true interpretation and sound evidence; and that on every ground they are shown to be unproved, unjust and unfounded.

The second remark is, that if the Govern-

or-General be placed under the confinement of all the bands and bolts and bars which the Toronto Associationists have forged and insisted upon fastening around him, it can no longer be boasted that no slave lives under the British flag—that the moment he plants his foot on British soil his manacles fall off, and he is a free man. Canada will be an exception. There will be at least one slave in Canada—and that slave will be the nominal Representative of the British Sovereign.

The last remark relates to the duty of members of the House of Assembly. I think it has been made apparent in this and the preceding number, that the whole proceedings of the late Counsellors, in their resignation and charges against the Governor-General were at utter variance with British practice, and that the proceeding of the house therefore was irregular and unprecedented. I submit therefore to every honest and patriotic member of the house, whether it is not his duty to employ his best endeavors to have this whole affair thoroughly investigated; whether a select committee ought not to be appointed to examine the precedents of British parliamentary practice in such cases; whether, if the mode of proceeding be found to have been unparliamentary and dangerous, what has been done ought not to be rescinded, and the late Counsellors be required to prepare "a care of facts" on which the house might safely and justly decide; or whether a select committee ought not to be appointed, with power to send for persons and papers, to inquire into the real causes and circumstances of the late ministerial resignations, and report thereon. The stability of the Throne, the privileges of parliament, the rights of the subject, the peace and welfare of the country, demand the most searching investigation of this whole affair. Justice and truth love the light of noon day; party dreads any other light than the blaze of its own organization. In a calm, determined, impartial legislative inquiry into this whole question, I doubt not but misunderstandings would be corrected, explanations given, and concessions made, which would eminently conduce to promote honorable reconciliations, establish "unity, peace, and concord;" and heal the wounds of our bleeding country.—Johnston has well said, "Discord begins in mutual frailty, and ought to end in mutual forbearance."

NUMBER IV.

The last proposition which I discussed was, "that the late Counsellors have failed to establish the allegations which they had made against His Excellency." The proposition to which I now invite the attention of the reader, is "that the statements of His Excellency are fully sustained by his accusers and adversaries—especially those of Messrs. Sullivan, Hinks, Boulton, and Brown, (Editor of the *Globe* newspaper.)"

The very discussion of two such propositions is an anomaly in the history of Responsible Government. I know not of an