

General was advised to remove M. Letellier from office, which advice it was his duty to accept, and act upon—or reject, and dismiss the Ministry. But he declined to do either. Sir John understood the position perfectly, and explained it to the Governor-General—showed him, as we can see from the memorandum just published, that the power to dismiss the Lieutenant-Governor is vested in the Dominion Parliament. The Marquis would not be persuaded, and as an easy way out of the difficulty, Sir John suggested that it be sent over to the Imperial Parliament. And the answer of Sir M. Hicks-Beach has borne out the position taken by Sir John A. Macdonald in every particular.

#### MR. MENZIES.

Can anybody tell me what is the present condition of the Mechanics' Bank, and how it has been brought about? I have asked several questions with regard to its affairs, which no one feels disposed to answer. Mr. Menzies evidently regards himself as beyond the reach of criticism, but it is possible that we shall have to use some rougher method to disturb his self-complacency.

Then there is the Fraser Institute business; when are we to have the long promised report as to how this matter has been managed? Hope deferred maketh the heart sick, and if Mr. Menzies or the Hon. J. J. C. Abbott will not condescend to enlighten us soon, in the public interest I shall publish such facts and figures as I have at command.

The *World* seems to have good authority for the belief that better times have already come to England:—

“During the long and dreary period of depression through which English trade and enterprise have passed, hope was prevented from darkening down into despair by the vision of the good time coming, which the revolving cycles of change were thought certain to bring. It was from the United States that the impetus was to come which would alter the whole course and aspect of business. The revival once fairly under way in the West would spread Eastwards; and Europe would share in the good things that were in store for America. In this instance expectation has not been disappointed; for already prediction has passed into fulfilment. The overflowing harvests of the Western land of promise have supplemented the deficiencies of the Old World; and capital has flowed from Europe in return for the abundant supplies of breadstuffs and meat which have reached us. The stimulus thus applied to enterprise in America has, in natural course, supplied powerful motive-force to counteract the dulness and depression that have weighed like lead upon England. The movement in prices thereby initiated continues to make progress. Confidence on the other side of the Atlantic is begetting confidence on this side, and all the tendencies are towards animation and buoyancy.”

#### AMERICAN HARD MONEY.

Hard money—that is, sober sense—is winning the day in the United States. The “solid South” took up the cause of the “rag baby,” and the “solid North” has won a signal triumph. Butlerism is gone to the wall, and honesty and sober common sense prevail. We should and do rejoice in this triumph of good principle. Who ever the next President may be, the Americans have saved themselves from the party of dishonesty and ignorance.

#### ENGLISH LIBERALS.

The English Liberals are confident of success at the next elections. When those elections will come off is by no means decided, for the Conservatives appear to be in no hurry about it. But at present the Liberals have not decided on a leader. The question is, Who shall be Prime Minister? Lord Granville, Lord Hartington and Mr. Gladstone are the candidates spoken of. But there should be no difficulty in arriving at a solution of the problem. The first and main question is how to put the finances of the country in order. The “spirited foreign policy” of the present Government has resulted in disasters, and the country needs now real financial ability to put its affairs into shape. The financial is certainly the first consideration, and no man in all England is capable of undertaking the unravelment of the difficulty but Mr. Gladstone. He is the first financier of England, and to him the people must look as the only deliverer. No other leader is possible.

EDITOR.

#### “MIXED” POLITICIANS.

The “Blue Book,” presented to the Imperial House of Commons, in relation to the dismissal of M. Letellier, has reached Canada, and we have now the advantage of comparing, under one cover, the singularly conflicting views of the various persons concerned in the quarrel, as to the status of a Provincial Governor under the present Constitution of the Dominion. The decision of the Imperial Government, recorded in the despatch which closes the book, decides the question for ever; for, as Lord Lorne anticipated in his despatch of April 9, it settles for the future the relations between the Dominion and Provincial Governments. That there ever could have been a doubt as to these relations is one of the most surprising things in “practical politics,” and shows that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a “practical” politician to eliminate party issues from abstract political questions.

M. Letellier must have the credit due to boldness. He gives no uncertain sound. He dismisses his servants “as *representative of the Crown*.” He will not abdicate his position “as *representative of the Crown*.” His ministers have acted “contrary to the *rights and prerogatives of the Crown*,” and he complains to the Governor-General that “as the *representative of my Sovereign* I have been shamefully dragged before the public.” This is consistent, at least. Charles I. could not have done better. The *pose* reminds one of passages in the “Eikon Basilike,” and it was effectual in hoodwinking a large number of English-speaking Conservatives, who could not, or would not, distinguish between words and things. Their sentiment of loyalty was touched most unreasonably, for M. Letellier was a nominee of the Governor-in-Council precisely as the late Chairman of the Harbour Board was. Possibly it was inexpedient to remove either of these functionaries; but to mix up the “loyalty” cry in the matter was no more reasonable in one case than in the other. “Loyalty” is a cry like “No Popery,” a very efficient instrument in the mouth of “practical” politicians with which to bewilder the brains of puzzle-headed constituents.

M. Joly, however, has other notions about the matter. Sometimes both views are advocated in the same document and affect with a kind of kaleidoscopic dizziness the outside observer. Thus, M. Joly says that by the elections “the sanction of the people to the action of the Lieutenant-Governor was obtained in the proper constitutional manner.” This surprising statement appears in a report of Council approved by M. Letellier, although, in the document in which it is embodied, M. Letellier says: “I cannot for a moment admit that the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province was on trial by the people.” Certainly not; the people of Quebec had no more right in M. Letellier's theory to sit in judgment on him than had the people of England to sit in judgment on King Charles. Good sound Tory doctrine, for an old Reformer, this, and one wonders how he picked it up, considering the company he kept. And he goes on further to say “that the Representative of the Crown in the person of the Lieutenant-Governor is *practically independent* during the period of his incumbency.” Now King Charles' incumbency was for the term of his natural life, and the parallel according to M. Letellier's theory would appear to be precise.

It does not seem that M. Joly adhered very long to the Lieut.-Governor's notions, for in a letter to the Colonial Secretary he says: “The verdict of the Province, with the full knowledge of the causes of dismissal of the late Ministry, was an approval of the Lieut.-Governor's act”; and the Executive Council, in a report approved by M. Letellier on April 24, states that “if a Lieut.-Governor could be dismissed by a vote or a censure of the Senate and House of Commons, the result would be that the duty of the Lieut.-Governor would be so to govern as to obtain the approval, *not of the Local*, but of the Federal Legislature.” But it is beyond question that if a vote of censure upon Lord Lorne were passed in the Imperial Parliament, the Ministry would have to recall him. According to M. Letellier's theory he was *really* (to use his own words, p. 114) “*irresponsible for acts performed in the legitimate sphere of his duties*,” an advantage which Lord Lorne does not possess, inasmuch as he is responsible to the Imperial Ministry for the manner in which he performs all his duties. M. Joly again returns to his view in a letter to the Colonial Secretary dated May 22, where he says of the Lieut.-Governor that “his immediate appeal to the Province of Quebec by a dissolution of the House resulted in a verdict in his favour.” This is language appropriate when applied to a party leader, not to a representative of the Crown. In another place M. Letellier asserts his right to reveal the secrets of his Council to the Governor-General or to the *Secretary of State for the Dominion of Canada* precisely as the Governor-General communicates with the Secretary of State for the Colonies. This looks as if he thought that he was only the representative of the Dominion Government after all.

This last is Sir John Macdonald's view in the despatch which accompanied the reference to the Imperial Government. He says “the Lieutenant-Governor of a province holds the same relation to the Dominion Government and Legislature, as the Governor-General does to Her Majesty and the Imperial Parliament.” That is, and always was, the only tenable view, and it is a pity it was not put forward more boldly at the beginning. The minds of many Conservatives were obfuscated with the misleading phrase of “Representative of