from falling into the hands of the enemy. It led to the demoralization of the invading force and its expulsion from the country. The attack was planned by Col. Harvey, afterwards Sir John Harvey, who was then Gen. Vincent's Chief of Staff. Gen. Vincent's force, numerically much inferior to that of the enemy, was encamped on Burlington Heights. The American forces marching from Fort Niagara to the attack, Gen. Vincent rested for the night at Stoney Creek, about eight miles east of Burlington Heights. Col. Harvey, with a comparatively small force, marched to the attack from Burlington Heights at about 11 o'clock at night, reaching the enemy about two o'clock in the morning. He commenced the attack with the bayonet; the victory was complete."

Government Stewardship.

Our political system, committing, as it does, all responsibility for the initiation of proposals for the distribution of the public funds to the Ministry of the day, places that Ministry under the highest obligation of honour to discharge its trust with the strictest conscientiousness, and, at the same time, under considerable temptation to appropriate the money now and then in such a way as to reward party allies, or influence wavering electors. The administration which should make its appropriations, as every administration is always bound in honour to do, on perfectly just principles, never deviating by a hair's breadth from the line of strictest impartiality, would, no doubt, as party politics go, be a paragon of political virtue. But that it should profess and aim to do that is the least that could be expected of any honest Government. The obligation to manage the people's money as a trust fund, which he is bound by every principle of honour to appropriate with the most scrupulous disregard of personal interests, or party affinities, is so clear that it is hard to understand how any minister who aspires to an honourable name could for a moment admit, even to himself, much less publish to the world, that any other consideration than that of the public interests, pure and simple, could have the slightest weight in determining his disposition of it. That a minister of the crown could deem it consistent with his public duty, or personal sense of honour, to practice favouritism in the administration of his financial trust, seems so unthinkable that we have always found it hard to believe that the Dominion Minister of Public Works really used the language ascribed to him by the Opposition papers, in his address to a Nova Scotia constituency, a few months ago. Now that that Minister has personally admitted, on the floor of the House of Commons, that he did use the language attributed to him, one does not know what to say. And yet that admission does not seem to have shocked either Parliament or the people, and was not even repudiated by the Ministers own colleagues!

Parliamentary Independence.

One becomes tired of reading tedious debates upon such questions as that of preserving the independence of members of Parliament, and is disposed to query whether it is really of any use for members, zealous for such independence,—Opposition members, of course—to be continually seeking to add line upon line and clause upon clause to the acts already existing, with a view to stamping out every practice which is inconsistent with the absolute independence of the individual members. The bill recently introduced by Mr. Mulock, to make it unlawful for any member to continue to sit in the Commons after having received from the Government of the day the promise of some act or appointment which will bring him honour or emolument, is a case in point. The idea that any so-called "honourable" member will continue to sit and vote in the House after having received a virtual or actual promise from the Government of some such appointment is so repugnant to all nice notions of propriety or decency that it seems well-nigh hopeless to attempt to restrain such a one by any statute, since the man whose lack of moral sensitiveness, to use no harsher term, makes such legislation necessary, is the very man who will pretty surely find means of evading its operation. And yet it is almost impossible for anyone at all conversant with political affairs in Canada to doubt that there are now both in the Commons and in the Ontario Legislature, to go no further, not only one or two but a considerable number of members who are simply waiting the convenience of the Government in order to accept appointments to senatorships, or to positions in the Civil Service, or in some other places of emolument or honour, which have been distinctly or virtually promised them.

Were its Functions Judicial?

A very important question in connection with the remedial order given by the Dominion Privy Council in the Manitoba School case is that of the capacity in which the Council were acting. In the May number of *The Canadian Magazine* Mr. Edward Meek, a barrister of this city, reviewed the whole question, with the hope of being able to throw such light upon it as might help, amongst other effects, to allay prejudice and passion. His statement of the case in its various constitutional aspects and phases is very clear and helpful until he comes to the question of the capacity in which the Canadian Privy Council were called upon to act in considering the appeal. At this point his good genius fails him. He at least fails to carry with him the judgment of the reader. He maintains, in opposition to the contention of Mr. McCarthy before the Council, that its functions were judicial. His reasons for this view are summed up in the following: "The Council have three things to consider and determine, viz.: (1) The right or privilege claimed, its nature and extent. (2) The interference, its nature and extent. (3) The remedy to be applied, its nature and extent." All these are, Mr. Meek claims, "clearly and indisputably judicial functions." This is singularly inconclusive for the following reasons:—(1) Was it not the special duty of the Judicial Committee to consider the very questions stated in "1" and "2"? They surely pronounced upon those points in their deliverance, under which the Dominion Government subsequently acted. (2) Suppose the Council had reached different conclusions on some of these points from those of the Judicial Committee, could their decisions override those of the Judicial Committee? (3) Is there not a manifest absurdity in supposing the Council to be endued with judicial functions, which, by the admission of Mr. Meek, it has no means of enforcing? (4) Had the Dominion Government been acting in a judicial capacity, for any purpose other than that of deciding the constitutional question, which was the special business of the Judicial Committee, would it not have been their duty to hear evidence, *e.g.*, in regard to "the interference, its nature and extent," which surely involved matters of fact? Touching this question of the capacity in which the Canadian Privy Council acted, which is a vital one in the case, the reader of Mr. Meek's article would do well to turn to that of Mr. Douglas Armour on the same question, in our last number. In fact those who wish to get a clear and comprehensive view of the whole controversy cannot do better than to study the whole series of Mr. Armour's excellent papers.

Blood vs. Training.

There are few questions of public policy in regard to which the differences of opinion between intelligent and well-meaning citizens are wider or more sharply defined than in regard to that of encouraging or otherwise the immigration of pauper children from the charitable institutions of the Mother Country. During the last twenty or thirty years, thousands of such