

When the Joly Government will say to the Lieut.-Governor: "We want elections," it will be an acknowledgment that they have tried all means and have failed to reestablish harmony between the two branches of the Legislature.

The right and duty of the Lieut.-Governor would be to immediately reply: "Are you sure to settle the difficulty in that manner? Are there no other means of coming to a satisfactory conclusion?"

Let us suppose, for instance, that a general election takes place; and that an immense majority of the Province declared itself in favor of Mr. Joly. That will not give him the supplies? In any event, if the Council persist in their refusal, and why should they not persist like the Legislative Council of Victoria, whom the general elections did not affect and who held their ground after repeated appeals to the people?

The means proposed by the Joly Government are therefore not infallible. But there is another means. His Honor the Lieut.-Governor, by virtue of the right he possesses to put himself in *constitutional relationship with those who have refused the supplies*, has only to say to one of the Legislative Councillors "are you capable of putting the two House in accord with each other?" "certainly," the honorable councillor will reply "if you authorize us to furnish you with other advisers who will have the confidence of both Houses." It is probable that the choice of another government which would be sustained by the two Houses will be easy. It is but right for the Lieut.-Governor to give the Joly Government any reasonable time to arrive at that result, and we must remember that liberal delays have been granted them; but it would be unjust for the country to have to submit to the trouble of general elections, with the sole aim of retaining Mr. Joly in power, when there is so simple a mode of restoring harmony.

This mode of procedure is justified by a Canadian precedent. In 1858, the Brown-Dorion administration was refused a dissolution and the following is an analysis