

P.S.—There is one view of responsible government altogether lost sight of by its advocates, to wit, the responsibility of the Colonial Minister. To make myself understood, I will furnish two examples of this want of responsibility. Sir R. Peel, in the debate in 1838, in describing Mr. Hume's letter to Mackenzie, said, that it was impossible to conceive the intense indignation excited in the colony by that detestable communication—that it was a direct incitement to revolt and treason, &c. &c. The Governor of the province laid these facts before the Colonial Secretary—He (the Lieut.-Governor) was punished! Hume and Mackenzie were unnoticed. It would have been the same had Sir R. Peel been premier instead of Lord Melbourne, and Lord Stauley, Colonial Secretary instead of Spring Rice. Why was not Mr. Hume indicted for high treason? Is the Colonial Minister to be irresponsible for this criminal participation? Again, when Lord Durham, trampling all law, all forms of law, all decency under foot, sent French Canadians to Bermuda, without bringing them to trial, was it sufficient in the Colonial Secretary to *reprove* the act, permit the men to return from transportation, and not proceed to impeach Lord Durham? Did not the Colonial Minister deserve impeachment himself? To whom then is he responsible?

Again, when Lord Durham abandoned his post whilst in a state of rebellion, did he not commit an enormous crime? Was the Colonial Minister freed from the responsibility of bringing him to account? Lord Durham's acts were those of the Colonial Minister, unless that minister brought Lord Durham to trial. I need not pursue the subject farther.