

as, not to convince the friends of Mr. Mercier of the justice of the act of the 16th of December, 1891, but to show that it is quite possible that two acts, apparently the same, may yet be widely different in essential points, in their very nature and results.

The Crown or its representative has a perfect right, under the constitution, to dismiss a government. But all admit that this right is restricted within very narrow limits and should never be exercised but for reasons of the gravest and most extraordinary character. Danger to the State or the public welfare alone justifies the dismissal from office of a ministry: this has been held by all contemporary authorities on the subject in Great Britain during the present reign. Were the causes that led to the dismissal of the ministry in 1878 and in 1891 identical or not? Were the dangers that threatened the State at these respective periods exactly the same? This is the whole question in a nut-shell, and this is the question that must be satisfactorily answered before we can undertake to pass judgment on Lieutenant-Governor Angers' action. It is quite clear that the Lieutenant-Governor did not consider the cases analogous. We can analyse the circumstances of each case; we may believe that Mr. Angers was wrong in 1891, in censuring the Mercier *régime* as bad, extravagant, dishonest and a menace to the common weal, and punishable by dismissal from office, whilst proclaiming that the dismissal of de Boucherville was iniquitous and unconstitutional. But this is rather a discussive view of the position and does not touch the vital points at all. Mr. Angers conscientiously believed, and does so still, that de Boucherville's ministry was wrongfully dismissed, whilst he is as firmly under the belief that Mercier's government deserved dismissal. All his enemies can pretend is that his appreciation of the circumstances is wrong: his sincerity and reasoning cannot be impugned. To attempt to impugn them would be tantamount to proclaiming that because, years ago, he protested against the punishment of an innocent party, he has no right to-day to inflict punishment on a guilty one.

I will now return to the subject of my sketch where I left off.

Fallen from power in 1878, Mr. Angers resumed the practice of his profession with keen alacrity, keeping his eye all the while on the trend of the political crisis, which he so powerfully aided in bringing to an issue. His friends importuned him to return to his post as