

REPLY TO LE CANADIEN.

We promised in our last number that we would notice the articles in *Le Canadien* of the 26th and 27th ultimo. We find nothing in the long article in the 26th that we have not already fully discussed, except the answer to what is termed our "naïve remarque," that there was no relation between the telegram as to finances and the Railway Bill. The answer is that the Railway Bill involved a large amount of money. Surely *Le Canadien* is aware that the Lieutenant-Governor's objection was based on the supercession of the legal tribunals of the Province and the constitution of the Governor in Council as a court to determine the liability of the municipalities. In his number of the 27th *Le Canadien* vindicates Mr. Angers' explanations in the House, on the ground that the Lieutenant-Governor gave to Mr. DeBoucherville permission to make explanations. *Le Canadien* does not venture to deny that permission was necessary, but he alleges that it was given. Fortunately the letter of the Lieutenant-Governor of 4th March leaves no doubt on the subject. The permission had been originally given verbally, and, as on other occasions, Mr. De Boucherville gave a much greater latitude to the Lieutenant-Governor's language than was intended. The Lieutenant-Governor very properly desired that the explanations should not be made until the new Cabinet had been formed, and he wrote to that effect on the 4th March, and he defined in his letter "his two memorandums (of the 25th "February and 1st March) addressed to "the Hon. Mr. De Boucherville and the "answers made to those memoranda "by the Hon. Mr. De Boucherville of the "27th February and 3rd March." How, after this precise definition, any one admitting that permission was necessary, could imagine that it extended to a document which had never been seen by the person whose permission was required, we fail to comprehend. *Le Canadien* has made a notable discovery, which never occurred to any of his party during the last nine months. It is said to be contrary to constitutional practice for the Sovereign to divulge what passes in confidence between himself and his ministers. A case is cited: When Lord Grey resigned in 1832, on the refusal of King William IV. to create peers to carry the Reform bill, the King informed the Duke of Wellington and Lord Lyndhurst that the Duke of Richmond, a member of the Grey Cabinet, had been opposed to the creation of peers, and possibly disclosed other secrets of the Cabinet, all of which was condemned,

and justly so, in our opinion. Mr. Letellier is charged with divulging the secrets of his Cabinet, but there is this wide difference between the cases: In the English case the communication was made to the opponents of the Grey Ministry, whereas Mr. Letellier wrote to the Governor-General, by whom he was appointed, a defence of his conduct in reply to an unwarranted attack on him by a member of his late Administration. The analogy in this case is between the Lieutenant-Governor and the Governor-General. Both are subordinate officers, and not only entitled but expected to communicate on all important matters with their chiefs, to whom they are responsible for their acts. It is well known that the Governors-General are in the habit of writing to the Secretary of State at great length on all subjects that they think fit to bring to his notice, and that their despatches are liable to be called for by Parliament although never seen by their Ministers. Mr. Letellier's letter to the Governor-General commences by submitting "for your Lordship's consideration documents and details which I could not lay before the public." For the publication of that letter Mr. Letellier is in no way responsible, though for its statements he unquestionably must be held answerable. For its subsequent distribution after publication at Ottawa, his Ministers may or may not be responsible according to circumstances. The charge as made by *Le Canadien* is wholly without foundation. The reference in Mr. Letellier's letter to the Montmagny affair is constantly misrepresented and misunderstood. It was not referred to with a view of making a new charge against the ex-Ministers, or of re-opening a question which had been disposed of, but because on that occasion the Lieutenant-Governor had intimated to the Premier that he "maintained on principle that all matters "cognizable by the Judiciary should be "invariably left to the Courts which from "their organization are better fitted than "the Executive to enquire into matters "of fact and of evidence, and that I would "never allow the substitution of the "powers of the Executive for those of "the Courts when the latter had jurisdiction." Now most assuredly the view thus taken by the Lieutenant-Governor is strictly a Conservative one, and it governed his whole conduct in the Montmagny case, which he brought up in his letter, "to show your Excellency that the "Prime Minister was then perfectly "aware of my views on that point, and "should not in consequence have introduced during the last session of our

"Legislature any legislative measure, or "performed any administrative act tending to substitute Executive for Judicial "power without notifying me, and especially without advising me on the subject." We contend that the Montmagny case was most properly adduced in a letter to the Governor-General to establish the special impropriety of introducing the objectionable clauses in the railway bill without previous consultation with the Lieutenant-Governor. We shall be very brief in our reply to *Le Canadien* about the Lieutenant Governor's alleged conversations with Members. We have no facts before us, and we must be excused from entering into a new controversy on the allegations of persons hostile to the Lieutenant-Governor, who neglected to prefer any charges they might have on that head against his responsible Ministers during the session. We regret having had to occupy so much space with this interminable controversy.

THE ROMANCE OF A BANK CLERK.

A curious case is on trial at Brussels, Belgium, which excites considerable interest in consequence of the amount of money involved, and the long series of successful thefts which it discloses. The person on trial is Eugene T'Kindt, until recently a clerk in the Bank of Belgium. Against him there are brought 149 distinct counts of fraud, forgery and embezzlement, and the aggregate of the amounts he has stolen reaches the enormous total of \$4,600,000. He has practically pleaded guilty, and the only object of the trial is to determine his legal responsibility and fix the penalty. T'Kindt is a young man of excellent family, who ten years ago presented himself to M. Fortamps, chief director of the Bank of Belgium, and desired a position as junior clerk. His agreeable manners and excellent business qualities won for him the confidence of his superiors, and he was soon appointed chief clerk of the deposit department. Immediately thereafter he began a series of systematic robberies. The thrifty burghers of Belgium reposed unlimited confidence in the bank, and when once their railway shares, bonds, scrip and other securities were safely deposited therein they gave themselves no further anxiety concerning them. The bank had a free and easy way of conducting its business, and when securities were deposited, the only entries made in the ledgers were the name of the depositor and the nature of his securities, but not the "number" of the latter. As most of the depositors kept no note of the