

the only child of one Stromminger, a rich peasant of the Tyrol, feared by all who knew him for his fierce courage and overbearing arrogance of behaviour, and cringed to by them as well for the sake of his wealth. The conflict between his hard nature, and the equally strong obstinacy of his daughter, is very powerfully related. While loving her heroine, the author has never in the slightest infringed on the probabilities of the case, or toned down the fierce outbreaks of stubborn passion which proclaim that the young vulture, Wally, is the true child of old Stromminger. After these bursts of passion are over, when better influences return, her spasms of fitful heart-rending repentance are as typical of her nature as are her daring deeds of violence when constraint is sought to be put upon her. Perhaps the most truthful portion of the tale is that in which Wally, become by her father's death the mistress of his large farm and the inheritor of his position and wealth, falls unconsciously into his overbearing ways, acts tyrannically, and disturbs even the house of God by obtruding her pride and jealousy upon the notice of her neighbours. Through all this, however, we never cease to love Wally, to make excuses for her, and to dwell on the better points of her character. The little tale ends happily, and too abruptly to place the author in any awkward predicament as to the behaviour of Wally under altered and happier circumstances.

—

*Are Legislatures Parliaments? A Study and Review.* By FENNINGS TAYLOR, Deputy Clerk and Clerk Assistant of the Senate of Canada; Montreal: John Lovell; Toronto: G. M. Adam, and Willing and Williamson, 1879.

It is gratifying to note that Mr. Fennings Taylor has not yet abandoned the literary field in which he has already approved himself a valuable labourer. The Civil Service of Canada is sensibly dignified by the work achieved by so many of its members outside the circle of ordinary routine. The public servants of the Dominion have shown that in more departments of authorship than one they can emulate with success the thoughtful energy and industry of the Mills, Lambs, Gregs, Trollopes, and Mays of England. The little work before us is rightly described as a "study,"

since it unfolds *in petto* the whole scheme of responsible or representative government as it obtains in these British North American Colonies of Great Britain. It is also "a review," since in seeking a solution for the crucial question submitted in the title-head, much of the political history of the country is surveyed with accuracy, and in an impartial spirit. At first sight, the inquiry may seem to be a mere logomachy. Everyone is supposed to know that a legislature is a law-making institution, and that a parliament is a talking or deliberative one. Yet, as Mr. Taylor points out, there is a technical distinction, from a constitutional point of view, of superior importance. If our Provincial Legislatures are not Parliaments, the practical results are of no little moment. The "privileges, immunities, and powers" of the Imperial House of Commons do not attach to them, and however closely they may imitate the forms and assert the prestige of Parliament, they want the essence of its authority and power. Early during the course of Ontario's first legislature, the question was raised by Mr. Blake, who contended that the use of Her Majesty's name in the enacting clause of Statutes was, constitutionally speaking, an error. The Ontario Legislature was not, in any sense, the hon. gentleman contended, a Parliament, and had no proper, and could lay no legitimate claim to its dignity. At the time, the objection raised was regarded as captious, if not factious, on Mr. Blake's part; but as our author shows, the question raised cannot be resolved into a mere quibble about words; it affected a matter of substantial moment in Colonial self-government.

It would be impossible, in the brief space allotted to this notice, to attempt a sketch of the historical precedents Mr. Fennings Taylor lays before us. Our only purpose must be the modest one of referring the reader to the work itself for the reasons, which seem to be irrefragable, in favour of a decidedly negative answer to the question set out on the title-page. Apart altogether from the actual facts, there is much *a priori* cause for taking the same view. It must not be forgotten by those who compare our free colonial system with the plan of government settled in the United States' Constitution, that the divergence between them is not a mere matter of form, as between monarchy and a re-