

"banks of the Mississippi, and northward to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Merchant Adventurers of England, trading to Hudson's Bay, and which said territories are not within the limits of some other British Colony as allowed and confirmed by the Crown." We have italicized the words indicating the general direction of the lines of boundary, as so much stress has been laid on the word "northward," meaning "due north." When the bill came under consideration by the Committee of the House of Commons, Mr. Edmund Burke, then agent for the Province of New York, and others objected to the indefinite language employed, fearing that it might be held to include portions of the territories of the old Provinces, and especially the northern part of New York. After discussion, Lord North consented to define the boundary more precisely, and accordingly the boundaries were defined. It is unnecessary to describe the boundary until it reaches Pennsylvania, after which it proceeds "along the western boundary of the said Province, until it strikes the river Ohio and along the bank of the said river westward to the banks of the Mississippi and northward to the southern boundary of the territory granted to the Merchant Adventurers trading to Hudson's Bay." Is it conceivable for a moment that the intention of Parliament could have been to fix a boundary on a line to be drawn due north, leaving the territory between that line and the Mississippi without any government whatever? The idea is simply absurd. The Mississippi was the boundary, and the population on its banks was precisely that for which the Act was specially designed. The meaning attached to it by the framers of the Act was made manifest by the language of the Commission issued under it to Sir Guy Carleton in the same year. We shall confine ourselves to the part of the boundary description bearing on the point at issue: "Then, along the western boundary of the said province until it strikes the river Ohio, and along the banks of the said river westward to the banks of the Mississippi and northward along the eastern bank of the said river to the southern boundary, &c." We have italicized the words inserted that were not in the Act, and it really looks as if there was an apprehension as to the possibility of that misconception which took place in 1818, forty-four years after the passage of the Act. If the proceedings, as above stated, be duly weighed, viz., the original words of the bill, as introduced by Government, and carried through the Lords, the object of the bill to make provision

for all British territory, the admitted fact that the Mississippi was the boundary of Great Britain, and the hasty manner in which the new clause was framed by four members "having gone up-stairs in order to settle it, while the House was supposed to be proceeding on it," we scarcely think that there will be much difference of opinion as to the boundary of Canada according to the Act of 1774 having been the River Mississippi.

(To be Concluded in our next.)

TODD ON PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT.

The Colonies of Great Britain owe a deep debt of gratitude to Mr. Alpheus Todd for his valuable work entitled "Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies," which is a supplement to his former work, "Parliamentary Government in England," which has been acknowledged by the best authorities in the United Kingdom to be deserving of the highest commendation. The present volume is divided into 5 chapters, the fourth of which is sub-divided into three parts, entitled, 1st, "Imperial Dominion exercisable over self-governing Colonies;" 2nd, "Dominion exercisable over subordinate Provinces of the Empire by a central colonial Government;" 3rd, "Local self Government in the Colonies." A considerable portion of the work is devoted to the Australian Colonies and New Zealand, where there have been more cases of difficulty than in Canada.

The case of most interest to Canadians is the recent dismissal of Lieut.-Governor Letellier, and it is gratifying to us to find that the views advocated in this Journal are so completely in accordance with those which Mr. Todd has supported by authorities which cannot be controverted. The case is now so familiar to the public that it is unnecessary to enter into detail, but we are sure that the conclusion arrived at by Mr. Todd will be interesting. He says: "We are therefore compelled to conclude that the action taken for the removal of Lieutenant Governor Letellier was at variance with constitutional law and precedent, as well as contrary to the spirit and intent of the British North America Act, inasmuch as it was initiated by Parliament and not by the Executive Government, and did not set forth the particular acts of misconduct for which his removal was deemed to be necessary." On the question of the constitutional right of a Governor to dismiss his ministers, it is said: "The right of a Governor or Lieutenant Governor to dismiss his Ministers when he has ceased to

"have confidence in them is undeniable, and that right is not impaired by the fact of their being able to command a majority in the representative chamber." In support of this constitutional doctrine Mr. Todd refers to the recent despatch of the Secretary of State to the Marquis of Lorne, in which he states that "there can be no doubt" that the Lieutenant-Governor has an unquestionable constitutional right to dismiss his Ministers. Mr. Todd holds, very properly, that "such questions should always be determined upon broad grounds of justice and of public policy, wholly irrespective of party proclivities." No one, we presume, would imagine for a moment that any Secretary of State of Great Britain would recommend the removal of a Colonial Governor under circumstances similar to those which led to the dismissal of Lieutenant-Governor Letellier. The only case which it was pretended could be deemed a precedent was that of Sir Charles Darling, but there was no analogy whatever between that case and the one at Quebec. In the former case Sir Charles Darling had informed the Secretary of State that he could place no confidence in the opposition leaders, whereas in the Quebec case it was the Ex-Ministers who had placed themselves in personal antagonism with Mr. Letellier. The fact is that one of the weak points of our federal system is that representatives are sent both to the Dominion Parliament and to the Local Legislatures by the same constituencies, so that the same political parties exist in all. In the United States the same parties exist in the State Legislatures as in Congress. This is an evil inherent in our system, and we must make the best of it. The proceedings against Mr. Letellier would never have been taken had the tribunal, which had the decision in its hands, been a really impartial one, as the House of Commons of England would be if a similar case were to occur in one of the self-governing colonies. We feel assured, after a careful perusal, that Mr. Todd's work will be a great assistance to colonial governors and statesmen in the discharge of their duties.

THE BANKING ACT.

Various suggestions have been offered to the Minister of Finance for amendments to the Banking Act. The subject of greatest interest to the public at large is the paper currency. We presume that, whatever the policy of the Government may be, care will be taken that all bank notes, no matter by whom issued, will be convertible into gold or its equivalent on demand. Feeling implicit confidence on