the Geneva award. A right to recover for loss of ships and apparatus would seem to be the proper measure of compensation, if compensation be in order, as it would in case of the regulated destruction of the sealing business. There are other considerations which may affect these conclusions. If the effect of the new sealing regulations were to transfer the catch from Canadians at sea to Americans on land, and the total capturers remained the same, then a larger compensation would be due.

After passing the constable voters bill, the legislature of Ontario has adjourned, so that this meeting does not constitute a session. The constable bill contains *ex post facto* legislation, and is on that account declared to be objectionable. The criticism of the general principle of such legislation is sound, but it must be remembered that *ex post facto* challenging of the constable vote preceded the censured legislation. If the objection to the constable vote had been made before the election, and when there was time for the legislature to remove the doubt which a belated discovery raised, the necessary legislation would have come before the fact, not after it.

In the Ontario Legislature a new question of the right of certain members to vote on the constable-vote bill, in which it was alleged they were interested, was raised. Disqualification in a member of the Legislature to vote may be founded upon personal interest, but the interests must be of a pecuniary nature. The Speaker decided in favor of the right of the members to vote, but as the decision rested on technical grounds the germ of the question was scarcely touched. What is certain is that the practice has been for members whose election is protested to vote, so long as they sit in the House. There are instances of members sitting more than one session and then being unseated. A distinction has been made between them and members who have a direct pecuniary interest in the result of the vote. And in the Parliament of United Canada a distinction was made between a member who was a shareholder in a company and a member who had an individual interest in the question to be decided. Thus Mr. Holton and Mr. Galt, as contractors with the Grand Trunk Railway Co., were permitted to vote on a question in which the company of which they were stockholders as well as contractors, had a heavy pecuniary interest; though it was not denied, but distinctly admitted that if they had been individually interested otherwise than as members of a company they would not have been allowed to vote. If the votes of the eight members could have been challenged at all it would have been that their seats depended upon how they were given.

In reference to the terms on which this Ontario lumber question could be settled, Mr. Hardy pointed to the difference of opinion among Canadian lumbermen from whom had come the pressure which produced the Ontario Act of last session; as a condition of the abrogation of the restrictions of the law some wanted the American duty of $2 per 1,000 feet removed, while others would be satisfied with half that concession. It so happens that this question contains within itself means of equivalents; but where there are many questions to be settled, equivalents in kind cannot always be looked for, and if there is to be any general settlement of differences it must happen that one concession will be offsetted by another of a different kind; in this way only can a general balance be struck. Special interests must be prepared to act reasonably for the greater benefit of securing a general result that will harmonize the interests of the two countries. We trust the allowance of counsel before the Quebec Conference in a special case, if it be allowed, will not be made general. The international character of the claim of the lumbermen makes the case exceptional, and furnishes no pretext for making the hearing of special interests by counsel general. The American lumberers claim arises under a contract, and even in their case appeal to the courts would be the most regular course; but the delicate nature of international relations may here justify an exception which there is nothing to warrant when the question is purely domestic.

Ministry-making and attempts at Ministry-making are proceeding in British Columbia in a happy-go-lucky, go-as-you-please sort of way. First of all, Lieutenant Governor McInnes dismisses his Ministry, avowedly on account of the adverse result of the elections, before the full result is known. This was clearly unwarranted; the blunder evinces sad lack of the knowledge of the way in which such delicate business ought to be handled. The Government thus summarily dismissed, without other cause than the unknown result of the elections, had a clear right to face the House, if it so elected, and receive its fate at the hands of the people's representatives. In his letter commissioning Mr. Beaven to form a Government, Lieutenant-Governor McInnes brings in extraneous matter, as if intended to reveal a personal bias. "I have," he says, "deeply felt the need of advisers in whom I could place full confidence and whose recommendations I could unhesitatingly approve." We could almost fancy, in reading this, that we had fallen upon a letter of George III. or George IV. A letter containing such a sentence is sadly out of place in conveying powers to an individual to form a Government, and it is difficult to see where such words from the mouth of a Governor would find a suitable place. Then Mr. Beaven, with a robust disregard of constitutional proprieties, puplishes this letter and gives an interviewer the impression, reported by the latter, "that the action [acts] which resulted in the dismissal of the Turner Government was of a cumulate character and that other circumstances than those referred to in his Honor's letter more immediately connected with ministerial advice and conduct brought about a different condition of affairs, and that the delay which must must have resulted from calling a session might have resulted in great injury." The Lieutenant-Governor has precluded himself from taking the benefit of any other explanation of the cause of his action in dismissing the Ministry than that which he has given, viz.: the result of the elections. Mr. Beaven had no right to make explanations of the part he took, on the street; no right to make them otherwise than in the Legislature, and if he should not be present to make them it was his bounden duty to depute someone else to do so. But in any case no explanation can constitutionally be made until leave to do so has been obtained from the Governor to make them on the floor of the Legislature. There has been a series of blunders committed from first to last, beginning with the first act of the Governor in dismissing his advisers without giving them the option of meeting the House, and ending we know not where, which anyone with the slightest pretension to constitutional lore ought to have avoided.

Mr. Semlin appears to have succeeded in forming a Government for British Columbia, but its provisional character is signalized by the fact that each office has not got its proper head. Mr. Martin went in reluctantly under Mr. Semlin, relinquishing the hope of being assigned the Premiership. The case is paralleled by that of Dr. Rolph when he entered the Government of Canada, speaking to