

more than sufficient to justify the resignation. But if instead of taking the broad ground which they did, the late Ministers had resigned upon what Mr. Viger would call "un fait distinct," viz : on some one of the many appointments which were calculated to undermine their political influence, what would have been the result? Why, the delusion under which Mr. Viger and the public were and are still labouring would have been kept up. It would have been supposed that the Governor was really administering public affairs with the advice of his Council, and that the latter had resigned merely because *in some one particular case* the Governor had differed from them. Then we should have heard on all sides, both from friends and enemies—"What an unreasonable set of men! They wanted an entire controul of the Prerogative,—they wished to deprive the Governor of all voice in the administration of the Government,"—in short all that has been falsely urged against them might, under such circumstances, have been said with perfect truth. We contend, that notwithstanding all that has been said of the superior conduct of the Nova Scotia Councillors, the Canadian Ex-Ministers were still more faithful to their constituents as well as to the great cause of Responsible Government. Lord Falkland has, it is true, like Sir Francis Head, "let the cat out of the bag," and has shewn clearly that he either does not understand Responsible Government or that he has no idea of carrying it into practice. We believe the views of Sir Charles Metcalfe—and we judge him by his own public declarations—to differ in no essential particular from those expressed by Lord Falkland. The Governor who could contemplate offering such a situation as the Speakership of the Legislative Council without consulting his Council, either does not understand the working of Responsible Government or does not choose to practise it.

Our object in the foregoing remarks has been to shew, that *in the circumstances in which the late Ministers were placed, differing entirely* from those under which the resignations occurred, quoted by Mr. Viger as *precedents*, they would not have done their duty to Parliament or the people had they not brought the real question under discussion. Then as to the time. That of course is a point which their supporters ought to have the liberality to leave, *in some degree*, to their own judgment. They themselves could never have had a doubt that they would be censured by many. Some charge them with holding office *too long*, from mercenary considerations, although one of their number had previously resigned twice, and had then been accused of being too hasty. Others again raise the cry of *precipitancy*, and amongst the latter class we should be almost inclined to rank Mr. Viger, who says "on ne croit pas devoir se permettre ici des conjectures sur les motifs de cette précipitation de leur part lors qu'ils devaient, ce semble, pouvoir souffrir encore quelques semaines de ce qu'ils ont qualifié d'*antagonisme*, qu'ils avaient pu supporter pendant déjà près d'une année." This subject has been fully treated by Mr. Baldwin in his speech at the Toronto dinner, and we shall therefore content ourselves here with stating that although particular circumstances forced the Ministry to bring the state of public affairs under the notice of the Governor General, yet we can imagine no time more suitable for a discussion of the points of difference between His Excellency and the Coun-

cil, than
that the
they de
them bu

We l
sentation
sufficient
Country
following
British
ples as
occurs
fore us,
Dunn a
remont
Charles
shape of
Council
mentary
Not bei
party, (c
ance and
in the c
was ther
ceeded t
ever opp
Govern
ground
bringing

We c
for maki
tôt le pl
prove th
the resig
Mr. Vige
Councill
dans leur
nor) la
sur lesqu
mission
gislatu
Viger go
facts of
have son
altogeth
nations