

as baneful
Sydenham
Canada is in-
erate coun-
men against
specially Mr.
me 1841, the
rown to the
the history of
Draper and
both Messrs.
osition, and
stration was
mers in Up-
thus evinced
a manifest
ernor-Gener-
us far as pos-
was induced
rate of inter-
of Canada
year. And
been presci-
to the a-
ests of Cana-

third month
with the
at had ever
uced certain
sponsible go-
to secure the
advance the
e, as was evi-
he amended
denham) the
e legislature
than it had
Draper and
plicitly pro-
sibility to the
not been for
of Mr. Blake
sts, the res-
the Imperial
uted in toto,
towards the
are now.—
atronage and
he presiding
; and had the
emselves to-
the same spirit
characterised
es Bagot, and
ngs of Upper
Lord Syden-
d soon have
Upper Cana-
, and as effi-
as Sir Char-
ld now be in
stead of being
a pieces by
wills to immo-
n, and all its
sels and mo-
men, I mean
inciple—just in
execution.—

This subject affords materials for an elaborate essay; but I can proceed no further than these new references. It is not possible that the Home Government can feel encouraged or authorised to recommend investment of incur responsibility on account of Canada, when they see the chief persons in its government employing every means to render the connexion between it and England as nominal as may be; nor can they regard themselves as very decently treated when they are never referred to by Canadian Executive Councilors except in some such insidious terms as those contained in Mr. Baldwin's favourite phrase, "dusty shelves of the colonial office"—a phrase that indicates distrust and hatred; and is calculated to produce them both, and not attachment or respect for the Imperial Government.

And every man in Canada should mark the progress in the sentiments and feelings of these party combinations and proceedings.—Little more than a year ago, the late Counselors would advise the distribution of the patronage of the crown without regard to sectional differences "religious or political."—Now it must be demanded to be distributed with special reference to these differences.—A few years ago, Mr. Hincks and his friends would bow to the decision of a high commissioner even in regard to responsible Government. Now, they resist the Imperial authority, even on deciding on certain facts which the constitution expressly makes it the judge. In January last, the chairman of the Toronto Association admits a two-fold responsibility on the part of the Governor General to the Imperial authority; in March, all responsibility on the part of the Governor General to the Imperial authority is denied under the auspices of the Toronto Association. It is thus that Mackenzie's associations advanced from step to step before 1837. It is thus that the principles of one year are rejected and trampled upon the following year; and no man beginning such a course can tell where he will land. The authors of the French revolution set out with sound principles, but finished their career of party combination and party improvement without any principles. The London Quarterly Review for March, (article "Revolutionary Tribunal,") has the following monitory remarks: "No body goes so far as he who knows not where he is going." Robespierre and Marat's first steps in literature and in public life were by essays and speeches for the total abolition of the punishment of death: they became, within a few months, the most fearful professors of both the theory and practice of judicial murder that ever decimated mankind. The first decree, (in 1789) that the National Assembly passed on the penal code, provided that capital punishment should in no case be followed by confiscation of property. The first decree (in 1793) of the National Convention, on the same subject, was, that in every case confiscation should inexorably follow; and it would be easy to shew that there was not one of the salutary principles of government advanced by the legislators of

1789, which was not by the most contradictory energy trampled under the feet of the legislators of 1793."

5. Finally, I submit whether the people of Western Canada can do better in 1845, in regard both to the representation and the executive council, than they did in 1841? As first minister of the Crown in Canada, Lord Sydenham avowed the principles and objects of his administration, and in her Majesty's name asked the people for their support. They did not range themselves under the banners of Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Draper; but elected members upon the ground of their supporting or opposing the avowed principles and policy of the Governor General; and they selected the best representation that Canada ever had. Let them do the same again. Sir Charles Metcalfe is not less liberal than was Lord Sydenham; nor is he less trust worthy.

In a late reply "To the Pastors and delegates of the congregational Churches of Eastern Canada," his Excellency said—"Being in principle an advocate for those blessings (civil and religious freedom) and opposed to political exaltation of distinction or any church over another, I aim at justice to all. I rely, on those, to whatever denomination they belong, who are loyal to the queen, and attached to the mother country, and who seek the welfare of this colony as an integral portion of the British Empire. I thank you for the assurance of your hearty support in every measure that may appear to you for the divine glory, the public good, and the honour of the Saviour, whom all Christians must recognize and adore, as head of the Church. I do not desire support on other conditions; and I shall not willfully sanction measures of an opposite character."

By giving Lord Sydenham and the persons whom he thought proper to select a fair and generous trial, they obtained responsible government, good measures, and important assistance from the Imperial Parliament—and a change in the administration when it was subsequently desired. Let them give Sir Charles Metcalfe and his advisers the same trial—judging by measures—and they will escape the rocks and shoals on which the constitutional ship is like to founder, and leave the way open for any man or men to be employed in the service of the country, without reference to past differences. If the administration thus formed and granted—what the last administration asked for and were allowed—the common justice of a trial, should not redeem their promises and fulfil the expectations of the country, they can at any time be changed, by a vote of the Legislature. But a league or an attempt to oppose an administration upon other grounds than its measures has always proved suicidal in Canada, however plausible the pretext, and is at variance with the very end as well as the first principles of civil government.

An administration thus formed will not be established upon and incorporated by the party-plunder articles of league confederacy, but upon its merits—its honesty—its justice—its