

Chancellor So-

ished the Crown and negotiation there could not a difference be. s to the grounds frequently no dif- planation. This g. When they of preparing the it "necessary," to give such d tell best upon ry; (how far it in the sequel;) ment, not with at in the face of n protest against a proceeding story of Respon- the world. his proceeding consequences in-

esting from the gative, and the ed, and safety? ed the Crown use of facts"— u—can they al- rogative much

authority of the a party as well an they prove t as a "tool" y purposes? their right to do their "explana- of the Crown, orted the right all other acts, or protested? e right to deal n as they plea- tments or acts own solemn ight to dispose t. The greater d not say that age?

s facts but as sjects for se- t which they d.

s involved in gs? Does it e only safe- f the last wea- cter? Sup- ader, and the ion of 7 or 8 blic matters; reader stood ir association d draw up a ose differen- creable sen- er, which he

wholly disclaimed; yet they persist and publish, and reiterate. The reader might thus be beaten by numbers, and party exertions; but would such a proceeding be just before God, or before man? In that case an individual would be ruined; but in the present case, more than the life of a Governor—his character—is involved. If his confidential advisers can become his accusers—against his own solemn protests—then is the oath of secrecy a mockery, and the prerogative a bauble; then in point of fact (and no forms of phraseology can make it otherwise) is the Governor subordinate, and the Council supreme, and his character may at any time be made a foot ball for their gratification. He may come to Canada with a most angelic reputation of fifty years growing brilliancy; and in twelve months, it may be, invested with the attributes of the worst Asiatic despot, and at length, assailed by his confidants, sink down pierced with more wounds than those under which Cæsar fell.

And what have we witnessed in Canada during the last few months, and what do we now see but a practical illustration of the truth of these remarks? The voluminous speeches of the "Toronto Reform Association," are so many witnesses of the melancholy reality which I have imagined.

Within the last few days, I have read an "Address to the people of Canada, by the Reform Association, adopted at a general meeting, held at Toronto, the 16th day of May, 1844," and said to have been written by one of the late Counsellors. After reading this most calumnious address, I asked myself, if this address be true, what is the *real* character of Sir Charles Metcalfe—the man in all past life lauded more for sincerity, love of liberty, and justice, than any other Governor in the British Empire? If this address be true, the world has been deceived in Sir Charles; for he has, after all, proved to be an enemy to the British Constitution—a tyrant—a hypocrite—a deceiver—a liar—a more outrageous invader of Constitutional rights than Charles the First, and a more daring despot than James the Second—and were he a Sovereign, instead of a Governor, would forfeit his Crown, if not his head!

And whence the *authority* for these awful charges and denunciations? We answer, his Excellency's late confidential and constitutional advisers. And this address and the kindred speeches of members of the same Association, are the early results of disclosures which those advisers declared they made under the authority of the Governor-General! Disclosures against every part of which, affecting his own sentiments and conduct, he, with a martyr-like firmness and Aristidean integrity, most earnestly protests. And those disclosures, or rather, accusations, and these speeches, and this address, are the *first fruits* of their working of the system of Responsible Government—those who *claim* to be the *only* workers of it. What may not the *last fruits* be?

And this, too, in the face of the facts that

the British principle of Responsible Government requires the sanction of her one minister to render any act of the Crown valid; that the Resolutions of the House of Assembly of September, 1841, on Responsible Government have recognised no more than a *plurality* of advisers of the Crown, and not a Government of Heads of Departments; that Sir Charles Metcalfe has half as many advisers as British Sovereigns have had for the whole of the Empire; that those advisers are responsible for all his acts; that the late Counsellors have declared so; yet the Sovereign is thus treated in the person of his Excellency! And why? The *advisers* of the Crown are too small a game—to *advise* the Crown is too small a prize. The *patronage* of the Crown is the *magnum bonum* sought. It cannot be obtained until the Crown is made a "tool." The Crown cannot be made a tool until it becomes powerless. It cannot become powerless until it is rendered hateful. Hence this address of the Toronto Association—sound in the assertion of general principles, but fallacious in its application of them, and false and abominable in the statement of facts, as I shall by and by show.

Now had the late Counsellors adopted the fair and constitutional course either before or at the time of their resignation, this state of things could not have existed. Had they submitted their statements and recommendations to Sir Charles Metcalfe, in writing, no misunderstanding or discrepancy of representation could have occurred respecting them, and no misinterpretation in the explanation of ministers—no protest from the Governor-General against it.

But, then, their ulterior policy would have been defeated. What we have defined as "a case of facts," would have confined them to their own sentiments, and advices, and demands; and upon *them* the issue would have been taken. The prerogative of the Crown would have remained unquestioned and inviolate. They could not have impeached it as they pleased—they could not have turned attention from themselves to the Crown—they could not have done, as Diogenes Laertius said that Aristotle sometimes did, *not* the part of a cuttle-fish, which darkens the water around, that it may escape the danger—they could not have made Sir Charles the virtual defendant in the case, instead of themselves; they could not have *transferred* themselves from the *policy* to the *principle* of Responsible Government; they could not have omitted (as I shall prove in the next number by two of themselves, they did,) the cardinal point of difference between the Crown and them. Hence they avoided "the case of facts," as at that juncture, an inconvenient element of Responsible Government, and made out a case both for themselves and the Governor General, and affixed his authority to it, and put his case, as stated by himself, into their pocket—never hinted that such a thing was in existence, but claimed the privileges of the prerogative for the very impeachment of the Crown itself, as well as for party