

the country, except through them? If so, then in this respect also, as well as in others that I have stated, they claim to be supreme, and make his Excellency subordinate.

And this is not all. They thereby deprive every man in Canada of all epistolary communication with the Governor-General, except through themselves. If even a stray letter should happen to find its way to the government house, without stopping for examination as to its orthodoxy, at the Secretary's office, it would have to go there for acknowledgment, and consequently for censorship. Here again their supremacy would appear, both over the Governor and over every man—and every man's business in the country. And this usurpation on the one hand and degradation on the other of every man in Canada as well as the Governor-General, is dignified with the absurd name of "Responsible Government," and viceregal non-recognition of it is called an invasion of constitutional liberty!

Nor even is this all. The chairman of the Toronto Association, at a meeting held 25th March, exclaimed against persons not supporters of the administration having interviews with the Governor-General, and against any but the "leading members of the majority of the Legislature" advising with his Excellency; and concluded by declaring that "he maintained that no person had a right to be consulted by the Crown but the administration." It has been seen that the right of epistolary communication between the Governor-General and any inhabitants of Canada, except through the Counsellors, has been denied. The right of personal intercourse between them is now interdicted except through the same channel. Thus the Governor-General, like the Grand Lama of India, may be worshipped, but he must be approached by the permission of the priests who have him in custody, and give forth answers of their dictation; or, like an inmate of the Kingston Penitentiary, communication neither verbally nor by writing with any person, except by the permission and through the medium of his keepers. If this does not imply an oligarchy—and an oligarchy of the worst kind, over both the Crown and the people—I know not what an oligarchy means.

Mr. BLACK—an able and constitutional lawyer of Quebec, and representative of that city—argued in favor of the Governor's receiving the advice of the Council upon the same ground that a judge should hear both sides of a case. Mr. Black said that the Governor would receive abundant information from various quarters on one side of a case—especially one involving an appointment—his Council could give him the necessary information, on the other side. But the doctrine of the late Counsellors would preclude and prohibit his Excellency from receiving any information, either verbally or written, except what they might please to lay before him. He would thus of necessity, and there-

fore in fact, be a "tool" in the hands of his advisers.

But even all this does not reach the full demands of the Toronto Association statesmen. They require that the Governor-General shall consult his advisers only after a certain mode. The Chairman of that Association says, "He maintained that the mode of consultation ought to be, by the heads of departments going to the Governor, and saying what the country wanted, and what they recommended to be done. Not by the Governor going to the heads of departments, and telling them what he wanted to be done. (Loud cheers.) He (Mr. Boulton) had been a hundred times in Downing-street, during the reign of several Sovereigns, but he had never known an instance of a King going there and giving directions as to what he wanted done.—(Laughter.) No, the Minister goes to the Sovereign and says, I propose to appoint such a person to office, and then the question is, shall he be appointed by the Crown or not."

Now, I have also been in Downing-street during the reign of successive Sovereigns, and although I have never seen the Sovereign come there and give directions as to what he wanted to be done: I have known something still more shocking to the non-prerogative men of the Toronto Association. I have frequently known the King to send to Downing-street, and command heads of departments to go to the Palace, in order that he might tell them what he wanted. I once had an appointment to meet a head of department in Downing-street, and when I arrived at the appointed time, I was told that the King had commanded his Lordship down to Brighton—sixty miles from London! I recollect of hearing it as a public rumour in Kingston last autumn, that the Governor-General very seldom came down to the Council Chamber—in our Canadian Downing-street—but that the heads of departments were under the disagreeable necessity of going all the way to the Government House—upwards of a mile—whenever they wished to "tell him what they wanted to be done." But had the Governor-General commanded them to go sixty miles, to learn what he wanted them to do, what a death-blow would have been given to Responsible Government, and what an address would have come forth from the Toronto Association!

Why, Lord JOHN RUSSELL himself—the practical and profound statesman, the patriarch of civil liberty—is but a novice compared with these giant expositors of the Toronto Association—he is a more hopeless heretic in their political creed than Sir Charles Metcalfe himself. In the late debate on the state of Ireland, Lord John Russell referred to her Majesty and her instructions in the following words: The Sovereign I have served—and a Sovereign more anxious for the benefit and happiness of the Irish people, it would be impossible to serve. Never did I RECEIVE, when I was in the office of Secretary of State for the Home

Department, THE SOVEREIGN'S equal regard for Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. I never received advice as of giving "receiving" and of receiving respect to any aspect to the presentment of all I

The truth is, all parties, as regard for the rights of the Sovereign, the Sovereign's political opponents, he must not "leaders of the Government House can send for of sixty miles go to a minister to a minister press a warrant, but those who and the length be the interest. And this was Government's calves will not impeached a constitution back (to use Irving amid ciation,) "island, where he will write that is ever in those who dishappiness of on the rights unfortunately Cheers.]

There are referred to in the lords, which was the next number the proposition ly, "That the are fully sustained and a Messrs. Sullivan (Editor of the

I will conclude with a few remarks. I have judged Metcalfe out given their own words, application, most obvious ples of true in and that on be unproved

The second