THE ROYAL MARRIAGE.

OUR READERS will be pleased to know that we have succeeded in making the most satisfactory arrangements in order that we may present them with the earliest, most reliable, and most artistic ILLUSTRATIONS and descriptions of the auspicious event above named. We have engaged the exclusive services of the talented Mr. FRANK VIZETELLI, to illustrate the incidents of the Wedding of the Princess Louise and the Marquis of Lorne.

Mr. Frank Vizetelli is the celebrated artist of the *Illustrated London News*, who was with Garibaldi throughout his first Italian campaign, when the latter captured Naples. He sketched the splendid picture of the "Coronation of the Emperor of Russia," and all the incidental scenes. He also assisted in illustrating the Royal Marriage between Albert Prince of Wales and the Princess Alexandra of Denmark. He acted as Illustrative Correspondent of the *News* in the American War, first visiting the North and then running the blockade to the South. The magnificent series of Illustrations which appeared in the *Illustrated News* of London, of that terrible conflict, were all from his pencil. In fact there is no artist whose name is so widely known as that of Frank Vizetelli, in connection with Illustrated Papers. He has now returned from the late war to London, and entered into arrangements with us to illustrate and describe the Royal Marriage.

Through the kindness of gentlemen on the staff of Prince Arthur, and the exertions of our friends across the Atlantic, most exceptional facilities have been granted to Mr. Vizetelli at Windsor, to enable him to make his drawings exact in every minutia.

THE CEREMONY IN ST. GEORGE'S CHAPEL,

A Double-page Engraving.

THE WEDDING BREAKFAST

in the White Drawing-Room, Windsor Castle; a full page Engraving.

CARDINAL WOLSEY'S CHAPEL,

now being turned into a Memorial Chapel to the late Prince Consort, and to be used as a withdrawing-room for Peeresses and other ladies invited to the ceremony.

THE ADVANCE OF THE BRIDAL PROCESSION

by way of the Fetterlock Cloisters, led by the Queen and Princess.

THE WITHDRAWING-ROOM OF THE BRIDESMAIDS.

THE BRIDEGROOM'S PROCESSION BY THE SOUTH ENTRANCE.

LARGE PORTRAIT OF THE PRINCESS IN HER WEDDING DRESS.

LARGE PORTRAIT OF THE MARQUIS OF LORNE IN HIS HIGHLAND COSTUME.

A VIEW OF WINDSOR CASTLE.

EXTERIOR OF ST. GEORGE'S CHAPEL.

The above will be the prominent illustrations given in connection with the Royal Marriage.

THE PORTRAITS OF THE BRIDESMAIDS AND GROOMSMEN,

INVERARY CASTLE,

the family seat of the Dukes of Argyll

OSBORNE, ISLE OF WIGHT,

and some other interesting Engravings will probably be added.

Though very considerable expenses are incurred in the perfecting of these arrangements, we confidently rely upon the liberality and appreciative taste of the Canadian public to reward our enterprise by still further increasing the already large circulation of the *Canadian Illustrated News*.

CALENDAR FOR THE WEEK ENDING SATURDAY, MARCH 25, 1871.

SUNDAY,	March 19.	—*Fourth Sunday in Lent.*
MONDAY,	" 20.	—Sir Isaac Newton died, 1727.
TUESDAY,	" 21.	—*St. Benedict, Ab* Cranmer burnt, 1556.
WEDNESDAY,	" 22.	—Knights Templars suppressed, 1312 Vandyk born, 1599. William I., German Emperor and King of Prussia, born, 1797. Goethe died, 1832.
THURSDAY,	" 23.	—Von Weber died, 1829. Sir G. Arthur Lieut.-Governor, 1838.
FRIDAY,	" 24.	—Queen Elizabeth died, 1603.
SATURDAY,	" 25.	—*Annunciation of B. V. M.* Sir C. Metcalfe arrived at Kingston, 1843.

THE CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, MARCH 18, 1871.

ONTARIO'S "elephant"—the Arbitration award—has been trotted through the House of Commons and dismissed with much discourtesy. In fact, Her Majesty's "faithful Commons" were more impolite, or, at least, more reticent of their opinions concerning it, than were the "six blind men of Hindostan," who found an equal number of resemblances when they examined a like animal, for they utterly refused, and by a very large majority, to pronounce any opinion whatever upon its merits. It is relegated to the uncertain fate of a Privy Council decision, with little assurance that either party concerned will care to take the trouble of carrying it thither for judgment.

The subject of the Arbitration is unfortunately not one for merriment. It affects the pockets of two partners, who, though in business together for twenty-five years, never ceased to watch each other with a jealous eye, and seldom spent a week without mutual accusation and recrimination, on the ground that each was trying to overreach the other. It would be a mistake to look at the Arbitration without the light which the old time jealousy throws upon it; but it would be no less of a mistake to overlook the palpable disregard of the conditions on which, both in law and equity, it ought to have been based in order to command the assent of the parties affected by it. The Union Act is exceedingly significant upon this point; it leaves no room to doubt but that the intention of its framers was to secure a mutual agreement —that is, a settlement of assets and liabilities which both parties, without the pressure of legal compulsion, would accept. Now, the majority of the Arbitrators rendered that impossible by proceeding with their consideration of the question at issue after the withdrawal of one of the contestants. This point ought to be thoroughly understood and estimated as distinct from the money value or practical result to each Province of the award made. Whether the conclusion of the two Arbitrators was just in itself or not, it was clearly in violation of the spirit of the Act, which undoubtedly, as frequently asserted both before and after the appointment of the Arbitrators, was designed to result in a mutual agreement. This agreement has not been reached, but several ineffectual attempts were made in the House of Commons to find a solution of the difficulty.

The opposition members, through Messrs. Dorion and Holton, sought to shirk the whole trouble by transferring the surplus debt of old Canada to the Dominion, and compensating the other Provinces, *pro rata*. This is, by itself, a fair proposition, but in its ultimate consequences would be a serious drag upon Canada for all time to come. Both Ontario and Quebec receive already quite as much money as they need to carry on their local governments, and if New Brunswick and Nova Scotia find themselves somewhat cramped, it is only because of a too extravagant legislative machinery, which a little self-denial and ingenuity on the part of their public men might readily simplify and reduce so as to bring the cost of government largely within the Provincial income. If the eastern Provinces desire to be rich as Ontario, they have only to do as Ontario does, pay for their roads and bridges, their other local public works, and at least half their educational expenses by municipal taxes. But let the Dominion assume ten and a-half millions of debt for Quebec and Ontario, with about three millions more as compensation for the Maritime Provinces, and the incomes of the local governments would be unnecessarily large, while the taxation of the country would be as necessarily increased. For these reasons it is to be hoped that the respective legacies of debt owing by Quebec and Ontario in virtue of their former associations as moieties of the old Province of Canada will be amicably determined and honestly assumed.

Passing by the rather extra-judicial motion of the Premier of Quebec, we find the motion in amendment introduced by Sir George E. Cartier, and which was carried by an immense majority, practically affirming the principle already sanctioned by the Canada Privy Council on the report of the Minister of Justice, that until either one of the contestants shall secure the judgment of the Queen's Privy Council, or some other competent tribunal, it is inexpedient to pass any opinion on the award.

It will not be doubted that the course of the Dominion Government is a correct one in this particular. The Government holds a claim of about ten and a half millions against the old Province of Canada, for which Ontario and Quebec have been made legally responsible, and for the interest of which (all that is stipulated to be paid) it can always indemnify itself from one or both of its debtors. It further did its share towards a settlement and equitable distribution of assets and liabilities by appointing an Arbitrator to act conjointly with the representatives of the two Provinces. We have never heard that it commissioned its nominee to act and adjudicate with one other arbitrator only. Further, as we ventured to remark when the award was first made public, the Canadian Government has no legal authority to pronounce upon its merits one way or the other. Obviously then, its policy was to avoid the expression of an opinion to which it could not give effect.

In this extraordinary dilemma the Minister of Justice suggests that Ontario may appeal to the Queen's Privy Council for a confirmation, or Quebec for a condemnation, of the award made by the two arbitrators, which has, as yet, received no legal sanction. There can, of course, be no question as to the jurisdiction of this final Court, as it may review any judgment which by statutory enactment is not made final before an inferior tribunal. With respect to the arbitration, the law, in accordance with the intent of its framers no doubt, has omitted all provision for enforcing the award, and thus, though it may fairly be assumed that the Queen's Privy Council can pass it in review, and pronounce upon its legality, it does not, therefore follow that the decision can be enforced. It would surely be un-British to permit any Court to create machinery for the enforcement of its decisions,—and, up to this date, there is no legal machinery extant to compel the submission of either Province to the award of any two of the arbitrators. Must not the question, therefore, go back, as we remarked it would have to go, to the Imperial Parliament, unless the Provinces can come to an amicable settlement? The compulsory settlement can, we think, only be enforced either directly by Imperial legislation, or vicariously through the Canadian Parliament's being authorized by Imperial Statute to dispose of the matter. At present it is quite unlikely that Quebec will risk a verdict on an issue, the consequences of which she can, under existing circumstances, afford to defy, and Ontario is almost as little likely to jeopardise a decision so manifestly in her favour by appealing to a tribunal which may, perhaps, confirm, but has no power to enforce it. The lock is as much of a "dead" one, as before the award was made, and the most feasible way out of it is reconsideration of the whole question.

It is a significant feature in the British North America Act that it provided for a division, &c., between "Upper Canada and Lower Canada," which two Provinces ceased to exist after the Union in '41, and were only reconstituted under new names in 1867. Yet, though the use of these terms must, constructively at least, be held to have been for the purpose of including within the range of the arbitrators' cognizance the condition of each Province at the time they entered into partnership, the majority of the arbitrators refused to consider that very material point; and this, substantially, was the ground on which Quebec withdrew. We are not now going to discuss the merits of the award, however, as its manner and its result—that is its failure to be mutually satisfactory—amply prove that it has not fulfilled the intention of the Statute from which it professedly derives its warranty. It might, perhaps, be questioned, since the majority of the arbitrators refused to recognise "Upper Canada" and "Lower Canada," but persistently confined themselves to the consideration of "that part of the Province of Canada *formerly called*"—Upper or Lower Canada, as the case might be, whether their action can at all come within the meaning of the 142nd section of the Union Act. A reference to the 6th section of the same Act clearly shows that the sense attached to the terms "Upper Canada," and "Lower Canada," is the respective Provinces anterior to the Union of 1841, and as it was between these two reconstituted Provinces, with all their separate interests in the Union dissolved in 1867, that the arbitrators had to judge, it would hardly require a Philadelphia lawyer to prove that they had fallen short of their duty, when they refused to consider what each brought into the Union, as well as what each might be permitted to take out of it. The case is one which earnestly calls for reconsideration and—for what it has seldom yet received—calm and conciliatory discussion on both sides. In this way we have confidence that Ontario and Quebec might arrive at a satisfactory understanding without the intervention of further Parliament or Privy Council.