

"The Princess Royal to-day expressed herself very freely about the impudent Highlander, and the old lady was so infuriated that it took a visit from the Empress of Germany to compose the quarrel." How such a report, even had it possessed a shadow of foundation, could have come within the cognizance of the New York *Sun's* correspondent, would puzzle the Sphinx.

"THE Value and Virtue of the House of Lords" is a taking title. Independently of its alliterative attraction, it will, or ought to, secure attention from its novelty and—shall we say?—its audacity. Every politician is acquainted with the faults and failings of the House of Lords; no session of Parliament passes without affording illustrations of the fact; but as to the "value and virtue," well, it would puzzle many to discover any such qualities among our hereditary legislators. Nevertheless, under this heading a local journalist proposes to discuss the question, and to show, we presume, that the generally-entertained opinion as to the Lords Spiritual and Temporal in Parliament assembled is altogether a mistake. Two or three short essays have already appeared, but they do not accomplish much in the direction desiderated. We await future developments with patience and curiosity, but without much hope, for the experience of half a century is not to be overturned by platitudes and generalities. One of the most recent examples of lordly "value and virtue" is afforded by Lord Cardigan's speech in St. James's Hall the other day, when this hereditary legislator described the Ministers as "liars," and "Gladstone as the biggest liar of the lot." An upper chamber may unquestionably be a useful institution, but an hereditary chamber is a thing repugnant to reason and common sense. The conservative democracy will want a good deal of "educating" on this point.

An able and well-informed London correspondent, writing on the aims and character of Lord Randolph Churchill, gives the opinion of a gentleman who has special opportunities of knowing the pert and peccant member. It is a mistake, we are told, to suppose that the member for Woodstock is consumed with anxiety to head the English Tory party. He would take the leadership if it were offered him, but he does not really care much about it, and certainly would not remain in the position long, simply because he would not submit to any of the restraints it must necessarily impose. His lordship is convinced that he is not destined to enjoy a prolonged life, and, with the idea that his years will be few, he wishes to crowd in them as much excitement as possible. Opportunity has favoured him in every way, and his frequent encounters with nominal leaders are not merely revolts prompted by the idea that their policy is all wrong, but also proceed from the impatience and impetuosity of a man to whom all discipline is obnoxious.

JUBILEE, centenary, and tercentenary celebrations are following in quick succession. Arrangements are now being made for a jubilee commemoration, on a modest scale, of the coming into force of the Act, on August 1st, 1834, which abolished slavery in the British empire. Under this Act, passed in the previous year, the slave-owners were paid £20,000,000 by way of compensation; and the executive of the Anti-Slavery Society, who still keep a watchful eye on quarters of the globe where the work of emancipation remains unfinished, naturally consider the anniversary worthy of being signalled. A big meeting in London will form a chief item in the jubilee programme, and as British taxpayers so handsomely paid to give their coloured brothers

More than life,  
Giving what, lost, makes life not worth the keeping.

the occasion ought to prove an interesting reminder of the generosity which practically enforced a principle half a century ago.

DURING the prolonged drought and excessive heat which was experienced in England for some weeks, the people of London might be almost literally said to have drank up the whole of the Thames above the tidal flow. They take over 70,000,000 gallons from him daily, and actually during one week the bed of the stream in many parts was sufficiently dry to allow people to camp upon it, and take the chance of catching fever and agues. When the rate of the growth of London is considered, it must be evident that this question of the water supply must soon become vital. The water companies cannot add to the volume of the Thames or the Lea, and there is no other river available. Nor is it possible to get all the water wanted from the geological strata near London. Ultimately there is little doubt the metropolis will have to lay down pipes and tap some Welsh lake.

MR. ARTHUR ORTON, *alias* Roger Tichborne and the rest, who in a few months will be free again, is good enough to say that he is not going to make a show of himself, and will not keep a public house or anything of that sort. Mr. Orton is wise in his generation. He is no doubt aware

that the conditions attached to a ticket-of-leave are of a somewhat stringent character, and might interfere considerably with any public career he might contemplate. As for keeping a house of refreshment for man and beast, it so happens that the law does not permit convicted felons to hold licenses, so he does well to make a virtue of necessity in regard to that. No doubt this eminent rogue looks forward to living in comfort on the contributions of his dupes, and, fools being so plentiful, he will probably not be disappointed.

It appears that £160,000 is the modest figure which the Duke of Marlborough asks for two of his pictures, the Madonna Dei Ansdei, by Raffaele, and the equestrian portrait of Charles I., by Vandyck. The English Government will be justly open to the charge of gross extravagance if it gives anything like this ridiculous sum. The money would furnish a splendid gallery with first-class works, and one might venture Philistinely to say that no two pictures ever painted were worth £160,000.

### THE DISPUTED BOUNDARIES.

BEFORE the Privy Council, the disputed boundaries of Ontario, in which Manitoba and the Federal Government are also interested, have at last arrived for final adjudication. The case has not gone through the Canadian courts, but was submitted to arbitration, and one of the parties to the reference, the Federal Government, declined, on the advice of Parliament, to accept the award. The ground of the objection was that the arbitrators had exceeded their authority in describing a conventional boundary instead of finding the true boundary, by the light of the evidence placed before them. After much cross-firing, the parties interested wisely agreed upon a reference to the Privy Council, in England, for it was evident that no other means of settlement would prove acceptable. Last week Mr. Mowat opened the case before that august body on behalf of Ontario. The first question raised, whether the award was not, under all the circumstances, binding without parliamentary ratification, was decided in the negative. There had been a doubt whether the Federal authority had not, by apparent acquiescence after the award was rendered, become estopped from objecting. If there had been an international treaty instead of an award by arbitrators an exchange of ratifications would have been necessary to give it validity. The objection that the negotiators have exceeded their powers is always held to be fatal to their conclusions, and treaties formally signed under such circumstances are invariably refused ratification, if one of the principals thinks fit to object.

The non-validity of the award, in the absence of ratification, having been declared, the whole question comes before the court on its merits. The true boundary, as indicated by the evidence, has now to be found. There is no dispute that on the north Ontario is limited by the co-terminous territory of the Hudson's Bay Company, and it seems to have been contended on behalf of Ontario that the position of the company's posts on the south marked the limit of its territorial possessions in that direction. But the court decided that the true boundaries of the Hudson's Bay Territory must be determined. This decision leaves the dispute where it was before; but the court declines to admit that the territorial rights of the company were restricted to the range of its posts. The company's charter will be relied upon to prove the extent of its territorial rights; and under this instrument a claim to extend to the Height of Land, north of Lakes Superior and Huron, has often been set up. The description of boundaries, given in the charter, reads: "All those seas, bays, rivers, lakes, creeks and sounds, in whatsoever latitude they may be, that lie within the entrance of the straits, commonly called Hudson's Straits, together with all the lands and territories upon the countries, wastes and confines of the seas, bays, lakes, rivers, creeks and bounds aforesaid, that are not already possessed by the subjects of any other prince or state." This description, beyond cavil, takes the company, on the south, to the Height of Land, provided no part of the territory on the water-shed of Hudson's Bay was in 1670, when the charter was granted, in possession of any other foreign power. The French, through M. de la Barre, Governor of Canada, at once set up a claim of prior discovery; but the dispute which arose out of this pretence was settled by the Treaty of Utrecht. By that instrument the French King agreed to restore—the English insisted that the transaction should take the form of a Retrocession—to the Queen of Great Britain, to be possessed in full right forever, "the Bay and Straits of Hudson, together with all lands, seas, sea-coastes, rivers and places situate in the said Bay and Strait, and which belong thereto; no tracts of land or sea being excepted which are at present possessed by the subjects of France." These words appear to cover the water-shed of Hudson's Bay; and if so, we again arrive at the Height of Land, unless the lines of the respective claims