

the house, in a
er, the duties re-
the members of
ed them to their
words used:

Executive Coun-
all affairs relating
municate to them
our instruction,
med to be requir-
ers from time to
ut for our service

e more intelli-
an was here em-
minded, that these
this country by
also the hearer of
on this Province,
put in operation,
ed to him after
assed the British
statesman who
sure to maturity.
inciple now con-
statesmen were
the Constitution
nor Simcoe was
hem in their de-
so wicked and
ution of such a
stantly repels it.

the Instructions
st quoted, were
nce of Governor
uch for the most
ould have been
ent man believ-
councillors were un-
by the King,
ved his commis-
vernor of Upper

al] would pause
and calmly, but
ers to consider
ed to present it
made upon the
est violent—one
er,—and he is
uge the Consti-
tute's subjects
to surrender
the Executive

Council!—but upon a candid examination, will any one say that he could have acted differently from what he has done? Clearly not. Were he now to adopt the views contained in the report of the Committee, he must place himself in direct opposition to the commands of the Sovereign, contained in his Royal Instructions, and which every preceding Governor has been bound by. The real state of the question is this,—it is with the King that the house is coming into collision, and not with his representative. If Sir Francis Head be wrong, the error did not originate with him—the King on his throne is the party this attack must affect—it is against his royal authority that this house is now contending, and to be successful they must compel him to surrender, as unconstitutional, the powers he has exercised without dispute, ever since and long before Upper Canada became a portion of his dominions. For his own part, he [the Sol. Gen.] earnestly prayed that for the safety, peace, and tranquillity of the country, the attempt now made by the house might fail:—in its success he sincerely believed the highest interests of the Colony would be sacrificed; but he had too much confidence in the wisdom and integrity of Government to suffer himself for a moment to imagine that a scheme so certain to bring destruction on our most valued institutions could succeed—something more than blustering language, and insulting resolutions, and abusive reports, must be resorted to, to obtain so important a change in the system of our government as that contended for by the majority of the house. With the British nation, hard names, and violent conduct would avail but little; on the contrary, such proceedings would effectually counteract the result sought for, especially when they betrayed themselves, as in the present instance, in public documents emanating from a Legislative body, whose acts should be marked with dignity, forbearance, and calm reasoning. There were few men whose political sentiments he more cordially detested than those of Mr. Joseph Hume, of "baneful domination" memory; but let the Report under discussion be laid before that gentleman, and he was satisfied that it would be treated with contempt even by him, for its rudeness and its entire destitution of dignity and argument. The house might, if it pleased, destroy the prosperity of the country, and spread embarrassment through all classes of the community, by refus-

sing supplies, but what would this avail? The King upon his throne must be attacked and overcome, before his right to issue and enforce those Instructions could be invalidated. [Hear, hear, and applause.]

From what he had stated it was evident that the powers of the Executive Council were limited by the King, and that their very existence was dependent upon his pleasure. It had been stated that the Council ought to be responsible not to the Crown, but to the people, and that if such were not actually the case it ought to be so. This he would deny in the most distinct and unqualified manner, and he defied any man in Upper Canada, or in the whole world, to maintain such a position. It was not so;—it ought not to be so. [Hear.] Suppose that the Council should be compelled to retire whenever a House of Assembly, (no matter what its political character) should say it was not worthy of confidence, the right of the King to appoint the advisers of the Governor would in such case be at once destroyed. It might be said the house did not wish to dictate what particular persons should compose the Council;—but such an assertion would be mere evasion. If the house were at liberty to remove the Councillors, by declaring their want of confidence in them, they could repeat their declarations until they obtained the particular persons they desired, and this would be virtually appointing them. Where, under such a state of things, would be the King's authority? The moment the House had power to say who should compose the Executive Council, that moment the king's office and authority would be annulled, and the power and patronage of the Crown, within the Colony, would be transferred to the House of Assembly. [Hear, hear.] The hon. and learned gentleman (Dr. Morrison) might smile as he observed he did, but he knew it could not be otherwise; and no single argument could be brought to bear against this plain and obvious truth. In favor of the new theory of responsibility to the House of Assembly, it had been asked, how will you get rid of the consequences of any improper acts of the Governor, seeing that his removal will not make reparation to injured individuals, or restore the lives of any who may have been victims of his unadvised tyranny? But he (the Sol. Gen.) would ask how, so far as the consequences of improper acts are concerned, would the matter be amended by making the Council