contended he had a right to do, although a member of the Executive Government of this Province. But neither himself, nor either of the hon. members of Government who had spoken yesterday, had a right to state what were, or what were not, the views of the Government to which they belonged; although each had a right to express his personal opinion. This must be obvious, for it would be highly improper for the Government of this Colony to express an opinion on the conduct of the Governor General.—Having made these promises he would come at once to the subject of debate, which he understood to be this:—whether the Governor General be sustained in holding in his own hands the prerogative of the Crown delegated to him, or whether it should be given up to the Council. (Cries of "yes!" that's it!) He was surprised at the speech which an hon. member had delivered there yesterday. He would not have thought it possible that any hon. member in that house could have called in question the veracity of an highly honorable and distinguished gentleman—one who had always been distinguished for his integrity—who had grown grey in his country's service—and had been selected and approved of by all parties—he (Mr. H.) had not thought it possible that any hon. member on that floor could have said he did not believe him! Could hon. members for a moment believe that he would state what was not true? ("No!" from the supporters of the address.) He (Sir Charles Metcalfe) had resisted the demands of his Council to deliver up Her Majesty's prerogative into their hands, and he (Mr. Hazen) had no doubt but Her Majesty's Government would sustain him in the position he had taken—and should be rejoiced to find it so. Should, however, Her Majesty's Government order him to accede to their arrogant demands, he (Mr. H.) should regret it extremly, but—acquiesce. If therefore honorable members were prepared to say that the patronage of the Crown shall be wrested from the hands of the Queen's Representative, to be used for the basest purposes—*the very meanest and detestable purposes*—if they wished to see this state of things introduced into all the British North American Colonies, then they would vote against the address. But if they wished to see British Monarchical Institutions upheld, and the Governors of the Provinces not to become mere tools in the hands of designing men for party purposes, then they must support the address. He (Mr. H.) should feel himself to be a *traitor* to his country were he to advise the patronage of the Crown to be given up to electioneering partizans, as a reward for their support;—withholding it from good men and scattering it among demagogues! Every officer throughout the country would then be a political demagogue!—This he was aware was strong language, and he would not deny but that he felt warm upon the subject.—If called upon as a member of the Provincial Government to give his advice on the bestowal of an office, he hoped he should always be honest enough to say "select that man who is most fit, and most worthy, to fill the office." He should be *ashamed* to go back to his constituents and say that *he*, forsooth, had advised the Lieut. Governor to appoint to an office a person who was either worthless or unfit, simply because he had assisted him (Mr. H.), or that he expected assistence from him, at an election. He said that last year when he accepted a seat in the Executive Government there were hon. members in that House who looked on him with suspicion as though he had deserted his principles; but he claimed the right to judge for himself, and on accepting a seat in the Executive he did it on his own responsibility—he was thrown on his own resources, and thought he could do good to the country by accepting the offer held out to him. But he deserted no principles, neither did he in becoming a member of the Executive recognize it as a party government.—It had been asked how could he sit at the Council board with those who differed from him in politics? His reply was that he did not believe an exclusive party government necessary in this Province, and he claimed the liberty to judge for himself.—He would now repeat that no member on that floor was authorized to express the opinions of Government, but he (Mr. H.) would never consent to give up the patronage of the Crown for party purposes.

Mr. Barberie said that not having had an opportunity of expressing any opinion on the address before them when in debate yesterday, and being one of the Committee appointed to prepare that address, he was desirous of making a few observations. The draft of the address was prepared and submitted to the Commitee by an hon. member whose masterly hand may be traced on the Journals of this House for the last fifteen years and upwards (Mr. Partelow) and adopted by the Committee unanimously. He (Mr. B.) thought the subject had taken a much wider range than was either called for or could be justified by anything growing out of the address itself. The hon. and learned member for York (Mr. Wilmot) considered it necessary to enter into the history of Canadian politics for a long period back, and had unhesitatingly made some round and bold assertions on the misgovernment of that Colony. First he says that the Canadian rebellion was brought on by gross and palpable misgovernment, and quotes the late Lord Durham as an authority—his Lordship had said so in his report. In one sense he (Mr. B.) would agree that no man was better qualified to give that opinion than the late Lord Durham, and had he ascribed it to the true cause, he (Mr. B.) would agree that Canada certainly had been drawn into a rebellion by misgovernment, and by the very system of misgovernmen that the late Lord Durham had advocated and acted upon—and what was that? It was the very system that the hon. and learned member himself had denounced yesterday in his place, and which he called the conciliatory system:—"That will never do," he says—"conciliate your enemies, and they enemies to the Government—the Government that does so must for ever fail." So he (Mr. B.) thought, and so it has been proved; and if the Government of Canada, under the late Whig Administration, had not commenced that game of conciliating the greatest rebels in Canada, by giving them office and honor, and placing them in power, there never would, in his opinion, have been a rebellion; and the late Lord Durham followed up that policy so fatal to British interests; and so did his successors, by elevating to offices of the highest trust and honor in the colony, persons who had been foremost in the late rebellion, for whose bodies heavy rewards had been offered by the Government—that was conciliation with a vengeance—that was, indeed, rewarding the enemies of the Government, and that too at the expense of those loyal Canadians and those of British origin, who had but a few months before laid down their lives and their all, to save Canada from the grasp of that rebellious faction—but thank Heaven, Sir Charles Metcalfe had made the present noble stand, and which stand he trusted, not only New Brunswick, but every colony in British America, would rally round and support. In that sense of misgovernment he fully and heartily concurred, but when the hon. and learned member (Mr. Wilmot) asserted that a line of proscription was drawn, and that the Canadians were not allowed to participate in the distribution of patronage and in the participation of office and honor, equally (provided they were qualified, and were loyal men and true) with those of British origin and birth, then he (Mr. B.) was at issue with the hon. and learned member, and was prepared to shew that his premises were false, for it was a notorious fact, that at the time he spoke of, the highest offices in the Colony were shared equally alike with the loyal Canadians, from the Judges of the land, down to the lowest offices under government, without reference to origin or birth—and so it should be, and so it will be again, so Sir Charles Metcalfe says it shall be under his administration. Was that the course under the late administration? No; the patronage of the Crown was used for party purposes, and that to support and bolster up a faction—yes, and a rebellious faction too (for the very name of a man who had been loyal and true to his Queen and country, was sufficient to turn him out of his office, and place some demagogue in his stead, who had been foremost in the late rebellion)—this, to be sure, was to conciliate—fine policy, to hold out a premium for disaffection and rebellion! So much for misgovernment, of which the hon. and learned member has dwelt upon.—In the second place, the hon. and learned member asserted, boldly and broadly—and he (Mr. B.) would confess that it was with pain and regret that he heard him—that he *did not believe* the the statement put forth by the Governor General, that it was *Jesuitical*, and that he chose rather to believe and give credence to the statement of Messrs. Baldwin, Lafontaine & Co.—did he hear such language from the lips of an Executive Councillor—that he did not believe the statement of the Governor General, that it was Jesuitical—a man of his high standing selected by both Whig and Tory for his integrity, ability, firmness and honesty of purpose and unswerving principles in situations the most trying, where he had signalized himself as worthy of the high station to which he had been called and who has never deviated from his honest course.—To contrast such a high character and place him in the scale of integrity and credence with such men as his Excellency's late advisers, men, who to cover their own base and vile purposes, would cunningly and insidiously endeavour to screen themselves in the eyes of the public and to throw the odium on the Governor General.—Shame! he (Mr B.) would cry shame! and would repeat that it was with pain he heard such an expression on the floor of the Legislative hall of the loyal people of New Brunswick, and he (Mr. B.) did hope and believe that the hon. member was the only exception; for he doubted if another man could be found in the whole Province, be he high or low, rich or poor, gentle or simple, from the Schoodic to the Upsalquitche that could use such language towards the distinguished individual, who has thus been assailed by the hon. and learned member for York. The third ground the hon. and learned member had taken, was, that the Legislature of this Province had no right to notice or regard the doings of Canada; that it was uncalled for, that the Governor General had no right to interfere with the local affairs of the Province, he never did interfere with the local affairs of this Province and no one ever dreamed that he would—but that it should be our duty, nevertheless, to express our approbation of the stand he has taken in supporting and maintaining the prerogative of the Crown. He (Mr. B.) could not conceive how any one could oppose or deny it: did not this house in 1838 pass a unanimous vote of thanks to Sir Francis Bond Head and the gallant militia of Upper Canada for their able, promp, and energetic suppression of the insurrection that took place at Toronto. Yes, and who were the persons who planned, and concocted, and matured that rebellion. Were they not some if not all of the late Executive advisers of the Governor General? Messrs. Hincks, Baldwin, Lafontaine and Co. if they were not convicted they were at least more than suspected, they were the bosom friends and secret advisers of the Rebel McKenzie! and these are the persons who would thus wrest the prerogative of the Crown from the Queen's representative and use it for party purposes to reward their allies on that occasion. Are these the men, whose artful and cunning tale, the learned and hon. member would credit in preference to the Queen's representative? Are these the men, that the learned and hon. member feels himself complimented by being ranked amongst? "Yes," said the hon. and learned member, when he (Mr. B.) used the mataphor "birds of feathers," I feel highly complimented to be ranked with such men, that he (Mr. B.) had paid him (Mr. Wilmot) a high compliment indeed, that he felt highly complimented and was only sorry it was not in his power to return him (Mr. B.) the compliment. for that his (Mr. B's.) parliamentary career had not been such as to entitle him to take his stand with such high talent."—He (Mr. B.) thanked God that it had not been such indeed, if the same principle were to actuate and guide his motives as has been expressed by the learned and hon. member for York, and his kindred spirits, Messrs. Baldwin Lafontaine and Co. He (Mr. B.) would rather jog on in plain and humble mediocrity and enjoy his own honest principles, and convictions, than rank himself with the learned and honorable member for York, with all his talent and eloquence, Executive honors, or self conceit; he therefore left him in the full enjoyment of his assumed compliment; he hoped however that his talents might yet be applied to a better use. (Here Mr. Wilmot entered the house). Mr. Barberie continued, he was happy to see the learned and hon. member in his place, he supposed his absence had been caused by his (Mr. W's.) taking a dose of Holloway's pills, which the learned member had recommended yesterday as in the general panacea for every disease (political diesase he supposed he meant) and if so, he (Mr. B.) hoped the pills had purged him at least of the anti-British feeling he had expressed yesterday on the floor of the House. It was not his (Mr. B.'s) intention to name any one of the late Executive advisers to the Governor General, but to have left them alone, not in their glory, but in their retirement; but as the hon. and learned member had thrown down the gauntlet for his kindred spirit and friend, Mr. Baldwin, and had named him, as well as others, and had courted reputation, "Mr. Baldwin" said he "on whose political career not a blot has been made, or stain remains, that he defied even suspicion"—he had indeed almost assumed the sublime language of that eloquent poet, who in writing on the Duke of Wellington the greatest man of the present age, said—

"But oh, there is not one dishonoring blot
On the wreath that encircles thy Wellington's name."

There is not a blot indeed on the wreath that encircles Mr. Baldwin's name, that wreath is already too black to be blotted—nay crimsoned in the blood of the best British and loyal subjects of Canada; he who was the bosom friend of the rebel McKenzie, he who councilled with and afterwards bestowed offices of honor, and profit, and trust, upon the heads of the murderers who dipped their hands in the blood of the loyal and gallant Moodie, who fell on the night of that memorable Rebellion, suppressed by the prompt and energetic conduct of Sir Francis Bond Head and the gallant Militia of Upper Canada. This is the Mr. Baldwin who under his own beautiful system of Responsible Government, could not find a constituency in the whole length and breadth of Canada West, where he was known, that would return him, nor of Canada East either; again and again was he defeated, until by the influence of that miserable faction one man was at last found (who represented one of the most remote counties on the St. Lawrence, inhabited by a few French fishermen) to resign in his favour; this is the learned and honorable member's champion, this is the man to be believed in preference to the Governor General. He (Mr. B.) would also read as a part of his speech an account of the said Mr. Baldwin and his associates, from a letter written by Mr. Isaac Buchannan, (here the hon. member read from a Canada paper, which went to prove that Messrs. Baldwin, Lafontaine, and Co. were devoid of truth, and that they had used and demanded to use the patronage of the Crown for their own private ends and party purposes.) This Mr. Buchannan was a Responsible Government man, and a reformer too, and he read from his letter for the edification of such honoroble members as called themselves reformers; he hoped they were good reformers and good Responsible Government men according to Mr. Buchannan's way of explaining it. The honorable and learned member had told them that there was no extraordinary demand made by the Executive Council on the Governor General; no doubt he would tell us that. Why? Because he had already said that he did not believe the Jesuitical statement of the Governor General, and has laid much stress on the right of his Excellency to consent and advise with his Council. Let any one read the Governor General's statement, and what does their demand amount to but a virtual surrender of the patronage and prerogative of the Crown for party purposes. That the Governor General in deciding *after their advice should* NOT make any appointment prejudicial to their interest. Well might they say that an antagonism existed between the Governor General and his Executive Council: from his first assuming the Government his Excellency said that British rule was well nigh prostrate, that old and faithful servants of the Crown had been turned out of their offices to make way for traitors and rebels, and thus the prerogative of the Crown used for party and faction:—

Faction's art will never cease,
Its seeds are thickly sown,
And cunning men who should support
Would overthrow the Throne.
They sought to bind this good old man,
That they might rule alone,
And for the will of England's Queen
To substitute their own.

But thank God, Sir Charles Metcalfe was not the traitor to sign the death warrant of British connexion. In conclusion as he had occupied much more time than he intended, (but he had been drawn to it by the remarks and the violent and extreme language used by the learned and honorable member for York,) he hoped the address would be carried by a large majority the Country wished it, every constituency in the Province wished it, and he was only astonished that there had been any opposition offered.

Mr. Fisher considered this a very useless discussion, and one which never ought to have taken place in that House. But since it was before them, as he never hesitated to give his opinions on a subject, he should do so now; although he never wished to obtrude his opinions where they were uncalled for.—He had not been present to hear all the debate, and was sorry that he was obliged to be absent. He had heard the tirade of the hon. member for Restigouche, however, and hoped he was satisfied with himself; he hoped the hon. and learned member's speech would be read from one end of the Province to the other—but no further.—He (Mr. Fisher) was prepared to vote against the address on the ground that it was inexpedient. The hon. and learned member for Northumberland had expressed himself as the advocate of responsible government on the old plan; while the hon. member for Charlotte (Mr. Brown) had declared for the new plan; but why did not the hon. members who drafted the address come out boldly and define their position? Why had they not stated in the address that they approved of this or that form of government? The address was so loosely worded that he could drive a ten-horse team through it! Why did they not put it in plain terms, and say "we do not agree with the Governor General's opinion on the resolutions passed in the Canadian House of Assembly, September, 1841?—But he thought they had business enough of their own, and whether this was a dispute about responsible government, or any other matter, why meddle with it?—they had better mind their own business; and he did not think the people of Canada would thank them for thus interfering with their concerns.—But was he to be called upon to express an opinion in contradiction to the voice of an overwhelming majority of the people of Canada! If this was the decision of the House—if they passed this address—they might with equal propriety interfere with the affairs of Nova Scotia.—As to responsible government, he (Mr. F.) thought they had it then; it had already been acted upon when the change was made in the Executive Council last year. Hon. members might object to that change, but if it be not satisfactory let them dissolve that body again! If a re-organization of the Council once took place in consequence of the action of that House, the same thing would occur again. Knowing this to be the case he (Mr. Fisher) felt rather careless about the address then before them; but it was not right for the hon. mover and supporters of the address to put the abstract question, as it was in direct contravention to their own act. He (Mr. F.) considered that Sir Charles Metcalfe had abandoned the position he first assumed—that there was a material difference in his first letter on the subject and the reply to the District council of Gore. But he would ask hon. members if it were proper for the Governor General to appoint men to office without consulting his Council? One of the men thus appointed said that "he did not thank a rebel Executive Council for his office, he had received his appointment from a higher source!" He (Mr. F.) would ask if it were proper that subordinate officers should have the power thus to taunt the Governor's advisers? Was it not right that offices should be filled by men in whom the Government could place confidence, and among whom there was a unanimity of feeling and action? Would not the supporters of the address do so if they were in power? But he (Mr. Fisher) believed Sir Charles Metcalfe had pledged himself to do this when he promised to govern Canada in accordance with the resolutions of September, 1841. (Mr. Barberie.—Where could he find the friends of Mr. Baldwin—McKenzie and others?) He (Mr. F.) would take Mr. Sullivan then; the pet of his learned friend's pet—Sir Francis Bond Head!—Hon. members liked responsibility they said, but it was responsibility to the Governor, not to the people. Why, an officer in Mahomedan countries acknowledged a responsibility to his conscience and to his God when he cut people's heads off! but the mischief was that neither his conscience, nor any other feeling, prevented him from committing acts of tyranny, and oppressing the people,—He would repeat that the Governor General had acceded from his first position; he (Sir Charles) had first spoken of responsible government as "a new and undefined theory, about which there was a diversity of opinion;" but only a few weeks after he came out in his reply to the council of Gore with a full definition of responsible government!—and what he (Mr. F.) considered a very fair and proper definition too. As to the appointments Sir Charles had made, he justified himself on one occasion, by saying that the young man had a widowed mother and sister. (Mr. End—and a very good reason too, if he was qualified; and the office was worth but £60 a year). Hon. members say that the Governor must act according to Royal Instructions, but he should like to koow if the Royal Instructions commanded him to make such appointments as this! The fact was that in all minor appointments made by a Governor of a Colony Her Majesty's Government cared not who was selected provided the business of the different departments was well done; but there was a party in the colonies upon whose tongues the "Royal Instructions" seemed ever to remain, and on every occasion they tried to force it upon their opponents.—As hon. members appeared disposed to question the *loyalty* of all who differed with the Governor General, he would ask them if they ever heard of a gentleman named Prince—Colonel Prince? This Col. Prince he believed would not be charged with disloyalty, for he acted a very conspicious part in the late struggle; and though he [Mr. F.] did not wish to censure his conduct at that time, he had been struck with the remarkable *sang froid* with which he had worded one of his despatches to Sir Francis Bond Head, wherein he stated that "he had despatched three." This Col. Prince had recently stated in the Canadian House of Assembly that there was no material contradiction in the explanations of the two contending parties, but merely a difference of opinion, and had by his vote in that body supported the late ministry; and would hon. members ask him [Mr. F.] to give the lie to this old English gentleman! No one contended that the Governor should not make appointments, but that he must ask advice. The speech of the hon. and learned member for Northumberland was founded on fallacy; he had assumed that a party government and responsible government were synonymous terms, and that the latter could not exist but with the former. He [Mr. F.] contended that such was not necessarily the case. The people of this Province wanted a government wherein those in authority should be held responsible to the people, to establish which their fathers came to this country. This was the practice at home, where the ministers were the advisers of Her Majesty, and responsible for their advice to the people. They wanted to place the Executive Councils in these Colonies, as the constituted advisers of Her Majesty's Representatives, on the same footing. Did this involve a necessity for a party government? Was it necessary they should have a party government in England? Let them suppose that Sir Robert Peel should find it necessary to call Lord John Russell to the Councils of Her Majesty, that would be a *coalition* government; and such things had been in England, and the like might come to pass again. Admit that in Canada the Governor General had been required to fill up offices with men possessing the same political principles; in so doing he would rely upon the people; but he thought his hon. and learned friend [Mr. Street] would allow that wherever the responsibility might be Sir Charles Metcalfe was now carrying on the government in opposition to the House of Assembly. Where was Mr Daley when the House took into consideration the resignation of his colleagues? It was his [Mr. F.'s] opinion that he feigned sickness, and dared not face them in the House of Assembly. As for the debates which had taken place in that House during the last two days, the future historian might fill his pages with them—he believed hon. members had grown out of their wits!—He supposed the offering of the address to Sir Charles Metcalfe was a thing which was already settled by the majority of that House, but still he should oppose it. Could he (Mr. F.) applaud the Governor General for suppressing a Bill which had passed both Houses of the Canadian Legislature? Roman Catholics said they were oppressed by the members of secret societies? and did they not cry out for protection from one end of the Province to the other, until they were compelled to say that if they were not protected by government they would protect themselves? Then when a Bill was brought in by a Minister of the Crown, and passed both Houses of the Legislature the Governor General withheld his assent! If the Bill had not been brought in by a member of government he might have excused himself, but he should have stated his objections to the Bill before it was taken down to the House, or else have passed it. It was a measure which the country required, and was passed in the House of Assembly by a division of 42 to 13. If ever there was a measure which the Governor ought to pass, it was that Bill.—With respect to the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. End) he (Mr. F.) thought he had fallen into a dilemma: he had objected to members of the Executive holding seats in that House lest they corrupt hon. members, and then he had stated that they lost their influence in that House the moment they accepted seats in the Council.—But he must conclude, for his voice had failed him—he was too hoarse to speak longer.

Mr. Hanington said he did not see the necessity of this address, but since it was before the House they must take some action on it. As to responsible government he did not think it necessary to argue the question then, but he thought the system was already introduced into this Province, and that the change in the Executive Council last year was a consequence of it. But as for himself he did not care what the government was called, provided it was a good government.—He did not like some expressions he had heard the preceding day, and thought they were uncalled for.

Mr. Gilbert said it appeared to him that the dispute had been narrowed down very much in Canada, but what they (the members of that House) had to do with it he did not know. Were they (the people of Canada) not capable of settling their own business? He was not opposed to the Governor General, but they had got nothing whereon to ground an opinion—nothing in connexion with the dispute to judge as to which was in the right. If hon. members wished to argue on reponsible government, he (Mr. G.) thought it was introduced in 1843, and if they would look back to that period they would find it fully carried out. It was like a ghost, they could hear of it, and knew it was before them, but could not see it.

Mr. S. Z. Earle said there was not a sentiment in the address but what was right! The question was whether they should express their admiration for the Governor General; and he would ask hon. members whether by his late noble conduct in refusing to sacrifice the interests of the Crown, he was deserving their admiration or not. It was his firm belief that if her Majesty's government had acceded to every demand made by the Canadian Executive Councillors, or representatives, and were to fill up all offices in accordance with their dictation, they would soon turn round and endeavour to take all. He considered that passing an address of this nature was an act which should animate they heart of every true British subject, and he hoped that it would not only pass that House, but be carried through triumphantly; and that a similar address would be got up and forwarded from every county in the Province. (hear, hear.) The hon. member for York, (Mr. Wilmot) had asked what danger was to be apprehended? But he (Mr. Earle) would ask what danger might we not apprehend if there was to be a revolution in Canada,—if monarchial institutions were overthrown, and republicanism established in its stead! Would there be no danger to be apprehended if democracy overran the shores of the St. Lawrence? Would there be no danger to be apprehended if republican governments surrounded us, and democracy breathed her poisonous breath upon us from every side! It had been said that the Executive must obey the will of the people, and also that the Governor General has nothing to do with this Province, but he (Mr. E.) could recollect when there was a dispute in this Province about two persons claiming the same situation, which the Governor General was obliged to decide. Some hon members complained of family compacts, but if they wanted protection from family compacts, he (Mr. E.) thought the danger was quite as great from compacts which now existed—compacts for the purpose of pulling down and destroying the constitution under which they were living. If the Executive Council be held responsible to the people, he would ask hon. members what would be the consequence if the people should wish for a separation from the mother country? If this should ever become the wish of the people would not their representatives take their tone from popular opinion, and become tainted with the same rebellious desire? How then would the Executive Council act—a Council wholly responsible to the representatives—would they support the people or the governor? The conclusion was obvious, and if this be responsible government he hoped never to live to see it. (Great applause.)

Mr. J. A. Street said the hon. member for York had quoted incorrectly. (Here the hon. member read an extract from the Journals, by which it appeared that he and Mr. End were the only "nayes" when the question was taken some years ago for sending a delegation to England.) He said that he was proud to see his name recorded in the Journals in a minority of *two* on a matter of such importance; but the hon. and learned member for York (Mr. Wilmot) was actuated by different motives—he succumbed to popular clamour; and this practice of legislators shaping their course according to the popular voice might ultimately lead to a separation from the Mother Country. He gave the hon. and learned member credit for coming out boldly—it was well at all times to know friends from foes, and the hon. member certainly deserved praise for his candor. The hon. member had said that we are working under responsible government now; he (Mr. Street) was inclined to think we *were* in practice, but not in theory. To support this opinion, however, the hon. and learned member had been obliged to fall back upon the Durham scheme. That whole scheme was theoretical and visionary, and could never be reduced to practice, and its promulgation excited the indignation of all honorable and loyal men, and especially the Loyalists of Canada—the men who fought for British supremacy at the time of the late rebellion. In this report of Lord Durham's he had drawn comparisons betwixt British Colonies and the United States, and always in favour of the latter; but he (Mr. S.) did not consider his Lordship the best authority that could be produced; he did not belong to the Conservative party of Great Britain, but had ever gone with those who would, if possible, pull down the throne. (Cries of "No, No.") Yes, yes!—he contended that what he had stated was correct: it was the principle which Papineau and McKenzie contended for—and the same principle the hon. member for York contended for. (Mr. Wilmot—No.) Yes!—It was the power on the part of the House of Assembly to charge the Executive Council whenever that body chose; although they (Papineau, &c.) went a little farther, and wanted to elect the Legislative Council. The party who were struggling to obtain this power were the hon. member's friends—he had eulogized them, and this was the principle upon which the hon. member had fallen back—that the Governor should become the mere tool of the Council—the mere tool of the House of Assembly; for that was the inevitable consequence—*that* could never be denied. The hon. member had said that he did not believe the statement of the Governor General, but he (Mr. S.) believed it, as it stands uncontradicted,—they would make him a mere tool. Was this what hon. members in that House wanted? Why did they not state the whole of their reasons for opposing the address? It was of no use blinking the question there! The men whom the hon. and learned member for York had eulogized had formerly deserted a Lieutenant Governor of Upper Canada, in the hour of danger, and had opposed his administration. And what had the hon. member himself done? Why, he had been *hired* as a delegate to proceed to England in opposition to a Lieut. Governor of this Province. (Mr. Wilmot—No; not *hired*.) He (Mr. Street) would say yes; he was paid for his time and remunerated for his services—he was hired by that House. And as to the money spent in going home it could be made productive of ten times more good were it now in the treasury. (Hear, hear.) But the hon. member could produce much mischief in the House, for the eloquence with which he was gifted drew a great many to vote for him, whose reason afterwards convinced them that they had done wrong.—One of the hon. members for Charlotte had stated during the debate, in reference to the dispute betwixt Sir Charles Metcalfe and his late Council, that he could agree with both! He (Mr. S.) was surprised that a clear-headed man, as the hon. member was generally reputed to be, should fall into such a mistake (Here Mr. Brown arose and stated that Mr. Street had fallen into an error, for that the expression attributed to him had fallen from another hon. member.) He begged the hon. member's pardon—he was sorry he had made a mistake, and was very glad to find his (Mr. B's.) heart in the right place.—He would still contend that a responsible government must be a party government; it could not be composed of half Whigs and half Tories, for if in order to keep in office men would do any thing the people might bid them, it would all be right with them so long as they pull together, but if they were made up of conflicting materials they would always be pulling apart. He (Mr. S.) had been asked in that House what he would do if he was called on to form an administration. Why he should look out for men of strong judgment, good understanding, &c., and give the Governor the best information in his power, but it would rest with him to act on this advice or not. But a party-government Executive Councillor would say "Oh! he's an enemy of mine; he opposed me at an election!"—He would only add that if this form of government be introduced he hoped the danger anticipated might never arrive.

(It being now past the usual hour of adjournment a motion was made that the House adjourn; supposing this would be carried, we packed up our writing materials in order to withdraw, when Mr. Wilmot arose and spoke at some length. But as a speech from the same gentleman, and pretty much to the same purpose, will be found among our reports of Wednesday's debates, our readers will suffer but little loss by the omission.)

Wednesday, February 21.

Mr. W. H. Street said he concurred cordially in the address now before the House, and he would state his reasons for doing so. When Sir Charles Metcalfe first arrived in Canada he acted