Government, has not met with any party opposition in Parliament. In this city the members of the Corporation and the clergy, with hardly an exception, have acknowledged the necessity that exists for the employment of energetic measures for the preservation of the peace. Let us hope that the Act will be put strictly in force at once, and we may hope that the practice of carrying firearms will have been abandoned before our period of excitement arrives.

THE CROWN AND THE CABINET.

Such is the heading of an article in the Montreal *Gazette* of the 14th inst., the apparent object of which is to establish a similarity of views between those who have maintained the constitutionality of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier's recent dismissal of his ministers, and a writer in the London *Quarterly Review*, who has advocated a complete change in the constitution. There is an old adage "drowning men catch at straws," and there could scarcely be a better illustration of its truth than the article to which we have called attention. It is scarcely necessary to point out that there can be no possible analogy between the two cases, for the writer in the *Quarterly* confines his claim for a more extended exercise of the prerogative to matters "relating to foreign affairs" with which we Canadians have nothing to do. Even, therefore, on the very preposterous assumption that the writer in the *Quarterly* had any considerable following in support of his new theory, it could have no application whatever to our constitutional question. But the *Gazette* takes comfort in some remarks on the article in question by the London *Spectator*, which we shall copy, together with the introduction of our contemporary. "Our object is not to deal just now with the general question raised by this discussion. The importance which the discussion has for us is that it has evoked certain statements as to the true relations of the Crown with the Cabinet, which are calculated to disabuse people's minds of the extraordinary doctrines to which Sir Francis Hincks has not hesitated to give the sanction of his name." We quote first from the *Spectator*, of the 27th April, as follows:—

"The safety of the Throne, which, as we have so often argued, is essential to our moderated liberty, depends on its release from responsibility, on its relief from the burden of personal power, *on the willingness of its occupant to confide in the Ministry which the people choose, and to support the policy which they, through their representatives, have accepted.* That the King should remonstrate, and argue and influence, and do all these things with the force inseparable from ancient kingship, is most legitimate; BUT TO OPPOSE A POLICY OR DICTATE ONE IS TO EMERGE FROM THE SECLUSION IN WHICH ALONE OUR ENGLISH OR ANY KINGS ARE SAFE, and to lower the Crown to its position in the countries where defeat implies, if not a revolution, at least an abdication of the throne."

To the *Spectator's* remarks, as we understand them, we give our entire assent, and they are consistent with every line that we have written on this question at issue. We should have been very glad to have had an explanation of the mode by which the King can "remonstrate and argue and influence" if the measures of his ministers are carefully concealed from him. We are quite certain that the *Spectator* would never for a moment deny the right of the Crown to appeal to the people under the circumstances which led to that appeal in the Province of Quebec. With regard to Mr. Bagehot's authority we shall merely observe, as we have already had occasion to do, that it is far safer to rely on the utterances of English Statesmen of practical experience as to the relations between the Sovereign and the ministers of State than on mere general statements by constitutional writers. No one has disputed the rule that the individual who exercises the regal power should "confide "in the ministry which the people choose, "and support the policy which they, "through their representatives, have ac- "cepted." Nor has any one proposed "the revival of its powers under the "Tudors or the Stuarts." We must add a word on "the bold constitutional innovation" of the veto. The veto has been rendered unconstitutional in England simply because all measures introduced into Parliament have had the previous sanction of the Crown. Instances have occurred, and have been quoted during the present discussion, in which the assent of the Crown was given with reluctance, and in which the Crown at a later stage endeavored to defeat the measure of its ministers. If it has been difficult to cite a precedent exactly in point for the Quebec case, it has simply been because no English minister has ventured during a period of nearly two centuries to treat the Crown or its representatives as the Quebec ex-ministers treated the Lieutenant-Governor. The absurdity of the reference to the veto is that the DeBoucherville Government was willing to have reserved their own railway bill to meet the Lieutenant-Governor's wishes, a proceeding for which we defy their admirers to cite a precedent. The *Gazette* chooses to misapprehend our remarks on the reservation of bills. He cannot imagine that we ever intended to maintain that bills might not be reserved by a subordinate government under instructions from a higher one, precisely as the four bills lately reserved by the Governor-General, and which of course "will become law, nevertheless." Had there been any instructions from the Governor-General to the Lieutenant-Governor to reserve the railway bill on any special ground such as that it was beyond the powers of the Local Legislature, or for any other cause, then its reservation would have been a matter of course, and would have led to no difficulty. The proposed reservation by Mr. DeBoucherville was simply a mode of escape from a dilemma in which he and his colleagues found themselves, owing to their having introduced as ministers of the Crown a bill to which the Lieutenant Governor had not given his sanction. They proposed, and the *Gazette* supported them in doing so, the reservation of such a bill, knowing that the Lieutenant-Governor held it to be "contrary to law and justice." Why was it to be reserved? Was it contemplated that the Dominion Government was to act as umpire between the Lieutenant-Governor and his ministers? It was simply absurd, and wholly in violation of the principle of responsible government, to which the *Gazette* is so much attached, for a ministry to advise the reservation of a bill introduced and carried by themselves. A new ministry might constitutionally and consistently advise such a course, and it did so. We will observe in conclusion that we are under no apprehension as to any satisfactory refutation of the views on this question which have been maintained in our columns.

CITY FINANCES, TORONTO.

The time has arrived, nay it has long since arrived, when it has become a necessity that in our city councils the financial management should be entrusted to some member of the council who is possessed of the ability, inclination, and leisure to devote himself to the subject. In our own city, Alderman Nelson has succeeded in obtaining the confidence of his colleagues, and has been for some years in succession placed at the head of the finance committee of the corporation. In the sister city of Toronto, Alderman Turner has devoted himself most assiduously to similar work, and we have had an opportunity of reading an elaborate exposition of the financial position of Toronto, made by him on the 6th instant, in a speech delivered at a special meeting of the city council. The figures dealt in are large, and it is rather startling to find that the city debt of Toronto is larger than that of the Province of Upper Canada at the period of the union in 1841. The entire revenue of Upper Canada was, at that