

cil, than when Parliament was in Session ; and we would remind Mr. Viger that the Council were never informed of the "antagonism" until the day that they determined on resigning, and further that the term was not employed by them but by the Governor General.

We have endeavored to demonstrate, that assuming Mr. Lafontaine's representation to be true, and uncontradicted in any way, there were facts quite sufficiently "précisés clairs et distincts" to be laid before Parliament and the Country, and that Mr. Viger has no right to charge the Ex-Ministry with not following British *precedent*, until he is prepared to shew a *precedent* of a British Sovereign administering the affairs of the Empire on the same principles as Sir Charles Metcalfe did those of Canada. The only *precedent* that occurs to us at this moment that can be applied with propriety to the case before us, is the resignation of Messrs. P. Robinson, Markland, Wells, Baldwin, Dunn and Rolph, in consequence of Sir Francis Head's meeting a very similar remonstrance to that of the Ex-ministry in a very similar manner to that of Sir Charles Metcalfe. In that case the Council put their views on paper, in the shape of a memorandum, which was answered by the Governor, on which the Council resigned. Mr. Baldwin asked permission to make the usual Parliamentary explanations, which was granted, exactly as on the late resignations. Not being in Parliament, he wrote a letter to the Parliamentary leader of his party, (Mr. Perry,) stating all the circumstances connected with his acceptance and resignation of office, which letter was read in the House of Assembly in the course of debate. An address to the Lieut. Governor, for information, was then passed, and all the documents communicated, when the House proceeded to pass a vote of want of confidence in the new Ministry. Now, whatever opposition may have been made to Mr. Baldwin's views of Responsible Government at the time, we never heard any one assert that there was *no ground for the resignation*, or that the proper mode had not been taken of bringing the question fairly before the country.

We come now to consider, 2dly, the Ministerial explanations, the authority for making them, and what Mr. Viger terms *the protest* against them (le protêt le plus formel) on the part of the Head of the Government. We shall also prove the correctness of Mr. Lafontaine's statement as to the real cause of the resignation of the late Ministry, which we have already assumed to be true. Mr. Viger has very correctly stated the circumstances under which Executive Councillors may disclose to the public "ce qui se passe ou se communique dans leurs deliberations." He says "Ils peuvent obtenir de lui (the Governor) la permission de faire connaitre aux Chambres Législatives les points sur lesquels leurs vues se sont trouvées différentes." "They may obtain permission from him (the Governor) to make known to both Houses of the Legislature, the points upon which their views are found to be different." Mr. Viger goes on to add that they can give no explanations but with regard to facts of public notoriety ; and refers to past history for examples. We shall have something more to say to Mr. Viger about "precedents," but we deny altogether his position that the Ministers are precluded from giving such explanations as may be required for the public good. The rule with regard to