notes or silver. It was alleged some time since that there had been a renewal of the attempt to introduce United States silver into Canada, but this is highly improbable The cause of the circulation of American silver several years ago was that its place was supplied during the suspension of specie payments with small fractional notes, which have nearly disappeared. The fractional silver currency is only coined in sufficient quantity to meet the public demand of the United States. The coinage of silver dollars has been much in excess of the demand, but this is required by a law of Congress which was passed with the view of maintaining the double standard. Unless the coinage of silver be suspended there will be serious difficulty before very long. The silver coins have been accumulating in the Treasury, and are represented by silver certificates, which are taken with no little reluctance by the banks. It is a singular state of things, and one for which it would be difficult to find a precedent, to have legal tenders in gold and silver circulating in the same country on an equal footing, while the actual market value of the one is several points higher than that of the other. The conference on the subject of the double standard seems to have been postponed *sine die*, and it must be obvious that the United States will have either to adopt a single gold standard or, by adhering to the double standard, come practically to silver.

THE HAMILTON SPECTATOR AND THE BOUNDARY.

Our Hamilton contemporary will not, after reflection, impute to us that "after a week's silence" we returned to a consideration of the boundary question. In truth we are inclined to apologize to our readers for troubling them so often with remarks on a question which, though of immense public importance, has been so fully discussed that it may be hoped that it is at last very generally understood. And yet we find the *Spectator* still in the dark on more than one point. In our issue of the 22nd ult. we had noticed at some length the proceedings at the Toronto Convention, and of course the speech of Sir John A. Macdonald with reference to the boundary controversy. We had before seeing the *Spectator's* article devoted as much space to that question as we thought it entitled to, and we regret having to revert to the subject. Still when we find the *Spectator* needing further instruction, we cannot refrain from attempting to give it. We have never disputed the *Spectator's* assertion that "only Parliament can change the boundaries of a Province." In the case under consideration it is not proposed *to change* the boundaries, but only to determine them. It must, of course, be admitted that Parliament has refused, not as the *Spectator* states to change the boundaries, but to confirm the award of arbitrators appointed by the Governments of the Dominion and of Ontario to determine what the boundaries are. As to the reference to the Judicial Committee, the *Spectator* must surely be aware that such a reference would be *simply* a fresh arbitration, as the question is not one that could come before that tribunal except by agreement. The arbitration was agreed to as a usual and satisfactory mode of adjusting differences. There are precedents without number for referring such disputes to arbitration, and it has not been the practice for Governments to ask Parliament to pledge themselves before the arbitration is entered on, to confirm the award. Arbitrations are resorted to as a convenient mode of settling disputed points, and the parties are expected to act in good faith. In the Mother Country the invariable practice has been for one Government to consider itself bound to abide by the action of its predecessor, and for an obvious reason. The honor of the Crown is at stake. The Crown may obtain new advisers, but those advisers will not recommend a breach of faith with another party. In regard to the settlement of the disputed question, the Province of Ontario is to all intents and purposes in the same position as the United States or France would be to Great Britain. The board of arbitrators was not, we contend, improperly constituted—quite the reverse. A Government possessing the confidence of the Parliament of the Dominion agreed with the Government of the Province of Ontario to refer a disputed point to the arbitration of three persons selected in the usual way. All the proceedings were open and straightforward, and yet the Dominion Government, which obtained power on a question having no reference whatever to the boundary, has seen fit to advise the representative of the Crown to repudiate the action of his predecessor. All that the *Spectator* urges about "a court of competent jurisdiction" is mere verbiage. There is no such court. The contending parties may agree on a new tribunal, but there would be the risk of another repudiation, and moreover there would probably be great difficulty in agreeing on a case. We do not know the exact state of the controversy, but, from all that we have heard, the Ontario Government would even now, ill-treated as it has been, agree to any fair proposition for the prompt settlement of the dispute.

We must repeat that the Dominion Government has been twice guilty of repudiation. The *Spectator* alleges that Messrs. McDougall and Taché were appointed merely "to mark upon the ground "well defined boundaries which he (Sir "John A. Macdonald) assumed to be ac- "cepted by all parties." Now this raises an issue that can be easily disposed of. On 17th July, 1871, Lieutenant-Governor Howland called the attention of the Government of the Dominion to the necessity "which exists for the settlement of the "true boundary or division line separating "the Province of Ontario from what is "known as the North-West territory." He pointed out that appropriations had been made for defraying the expense of a committee by the Dominion Parliament and the Ontario Legislature, and suggested that *joint instructions* should be issued. The subject was duly considered by the Government, and an Order in Council was passed appointing Mr. Taché a commissioner "to act with the commissioner of the "Ontario Government to determine the "boundary line between Ontario and the "North-West Territories." This was on the 28th July, 1871, and it was on 1st of October of same year that without any consultation whatever with the Ontario Government Colonel Dennis, under instructions from Sir John Macdonald, wrote the report which only saw daylight in 1880, in which he declared the boundaries to be wholly different from what Sir John Macdonald's Government had contended for during many years. This was a virtual repudiation of the first agreement entered into in good faith by the Ontario Government, and the *Spectator*, we observe, keeps an ominous silence as to the fabricated clause in the Hudson's Bay Company's charter, which Sir John Macdonald, we are persuaded, would have ordered to be expunged if he had taken the trouble to read the report which he adopted. The *Spectator* proceeds to assert that "the "arbitrators were appointed to report "upon the meaning and intent of the Imperial laws creating the boundaries of "the Province," adding "they failed to do so; did something they were not instructed or empowered to do." The arbitrators were not appointed for the purpose stated above. They were to determine the boundaries of Ontario, and they did precisely what they were appointed to do.

The *Spectator* gives Judge Armour as an authority for the assertion that "the "treaty of Ryswick (a mistake for Utrecht) "undoubtedly advanced the French "possessions to the shores of the Hudson's "Bay, and restricted France to the height