

Queen and held a public meeting in the hope of reversing what had been done. The incident of the resignation shows that a Governor, if he oversteps the limits of his authority, may find that, in one way or another, his error may cost him his office. He opposed as improvident the contract with Mr. Reid, as anyone not a Governor would be well warranted in doing. Just now this contract meets an elaborate defence at the hands of Professor Grant, who seems to have felt the necessity for the operation. The Government undertook to build a railway 700 miles long and paid Mr. Reid so well for building it that, according to Professor Grant, he made millions of profit out of it. If the island needed a railway and the Government had to pay for it, why should not the Government that pays also do the building itself and save the profit of millions? Dr. Grant tells that the danger of corruption is too great. Does he really believe that as many millions as the contractor made in profit would be stolen if it had been built by the Government directly? Because Government contracts have sometimes engendered corruption, must we conclude that this is a necessary and normal state of things in all Government contracts? The instances of corruption to which he refers as a warning, occurred in exactly such contracts, the Government on one side and a private contractor on the other, as he defends, in the case of Newfoundland. Is not the Post-office Department as well conducted and as free from corruption as the average private business? And is this not true of the Department generally, in all countries? Canada paid \$100,000,000 for the enjoyment of the doctrine which professor Grant continues to preach in the case of the Pacific Railway. Does any candid man, a fair judge of the facts, now believe that that was a wise or a proper thing to do? Of the second contract, between the Newfoundland Government and Mr. Reid, we have already given our opinion. Economically, we have no doubt, Governor Murray was right in hesitating to sign this contract; but as Governor he was bound to act upon the advice of his Ministry when it was supported almost unanimously by the House of Assembly. The petitioners for a reappointment of Governor Murray are not likely to get their prayer favorably answered. His hesitation so to act was no doubt conscientious, and his resignation may be intended as a protest against what he was virtually obliged to do. If this be so, it would have been better that he had resigned before rather than after he had signed.

The Newfoundland correspondent of the Montreal Gazette professes to give the history of the representation of the island at the Quebec Conference. Her claim to representation was not at first admitted, and the number of delegates on each side was five without counting one for her. Urgent reclamation was made by the Newfoundland delegates to England, and as no treaty affecting her could go into force without local legislation the claim to representation in the Conference was admitted. To make this possible without disturbing the appointments already made, President McKinley consented to make the number of delegates on each side six instead of five. The superior facilities which Newfoundland possesses of furnishing to the Americans bait, without which they could not carry on their fishing operations, gives her something to say in the Conference, for though the existing *modus vivendi* covers the ground, it is not necessarily a permanent arrangement. She complains that in spite of this concession the Americans greatly restrict the import of her products by high duties.

## THE QUEBEC CONFERENCE.

Various private interests, especially in the United States, are trying to impress their views upon the Quebec Conference. If they do not succeed there they will have one more chance when the time comes for the Senate of the United States and the Parliament of Canada to pass upon the treaty, if a treaty should issue from the Conference. The views expressed by the Chambers of Commerce, like that of Boston, are generally broad and ought to be helpful in the formation of a treaty. The restrictionists who wish to prevent more liberal trade arrangements, for the supposed benefit of private parties, do their work in a different way. They send lobbyists, by whatever name called, to buttonhole and impress their views upon the members of the Joint Commission. Congressman Tawney, of Minnesota, who embodies certain power as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, at Washington, is at the ancient capital to oppose reciprocity in forest products or a lowering of the American timber duties. The members of the Commission themselves when they accepted their appointments must be supposed to have made up their minds to do as Cobden did when he consented to negotiate on behalf of the British Government a commercial treaty with France: to sink such part of their own special views as stood in the way of obtaining such commercial advantages as they were appointed to secure. "We have no doubt," says the New York Times, "that the protest of our barley raiser from this side of Lake Ontario would outweigh in Mr. Dingley's mind all considerations of commercial expansion and international amity, which just now make a cordial understanding with Canada so much to be desired." This may correctly describe the ordinary bent of Mr. Dingley's mind; but we take it for granted that the Commissioners exist not to express their own peculiar views, but to do a public work and that they are under instructions which must control their acts. On this side, we have seen similar remarks applied to Mr. Charlton, only they were more complimentary and credited him with an intention to do the right thing, as the writer understood it. This statement, like the other quoted, assumes that this Canadian commissioner can make his personal views prevail. Treaties are not made in that way. If the Commission were to permit itself to be turned aside from its duty by personal predilections, we might well despair of a happy issue of its labors. If the commissioners exchange proposals by the end of this week, each side will then know what the other wants, and when discussion is resumed the full case will be before them, and the kernel of the work of the Congress will have been reached. This progress will not more than barely indicate what result is likely to be reached.

The adjournment of the Quebec Conference till the 20th September will give time to both sides to consider fully the case presented by the other. The American commissioners can consult their Government on matters of policy; matters of fact depend upon demonstration, but matters of policy are subject to the direction of the supreme authority. With the Canadian commissioners the case is somewhat different. Such of them as are members of the Government are, in a sense, their own directors, inasmuch as they bear a part in preparing the instructions by which they are to be guided. They have nobody to consult except their own colleagues, unless matters of Imperial interest crop up. One critic of a suppositious treaty points out that if the trade question were mixed up with articles in their nature permanent, the denouncing of one part of the treaty might endanger the whole. There