

On the day when that motion was made, the Ministers resigning were, as they even yet are, considered to be the Councillors of the Governor. They ought to have seen at once, that it was wrong to require of him communication of documents which concerned themselves alone, and which were to be their guide with regard to their ulterior proceedings. The paper signed by His Excellency was his answer to the Memorandum prepared by a Member of the late Ministry in the name of his Colleagues, and would doubtless, (as I have before remarked) never have been read in the House, if they had not taken upon themselves to give their explanations, notwithstanding the protest with which it closes. It left them no alternative, and ought to have reduced them to silence.

They should, therefore, have immediately perceived that it was their duty to oppose the proposition of the Honorable Member for Hamilton, and to throw it out. Their majority would have enabled them to do this. They were under an imperative obligation to take that course, because they ought to have known that even if the document were before the House, the conduct of the Governor on this occasion could never properly be made the subject of comment or discussion.

I felt deeply all the inconsistency of this demand, with constitutional principles and with parliamentary usage; and it will be remembered that I vainly strove to oppose it.

The Governor's answer (the remark cannot be too strongly insisted upon) could concern the Ministers alone; but he thought he had reason to fear (and the event has proved him right) that they would give their explanations in the House, notwithstanding the protest with which it concluded. It was intended to be used in his defence in this case only, which, it would seem, must have appeared so unlikely to occur. His Excellency's foresight, however, did not deceive him. He had no