

THE IMPERIAL INSTITUTE.

The Organizing Committee of the Imperial Institute have had under consideration the constitution of the governing body of the Institute, their desire being to make it fully representative of the industrial and commercial interests of all parts of Her Majesty's dominions.

The complete provisions of the scheme have not yet been matured, but the following outline has been prepared by the Committee and has received the sanction of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales.

The details are open to further consideration, but it is thought desirable to make public, without further delay, the nature of the body in whom it is proposed to vest the government of the Institute.

I.

GENERAL COUNCIL.

The governing body to be a General Council appointed as hereinafter mentioned, the management of the Institute being vested in an Executive Council chosen by the members of the General Council from among their number in the prescribed manner. Provision to be made for securing a fair representation upon the Executive Council of the United Kingdom, the Colonies, and India respectively.

II.

The General Council to consist of 100 members; such number to be increased to an extent not exceeding 50, according to requirements which may arise out of contemplated arrangements with the Royal Colonial Institute and the Royal Asiatic Society, and with respect to the creation of Fellows of the Institute.

Ten members to be nominated by the Queen.

Forty-five members to represent the United Kingdom and the Isles in the British seas.

Thirty to represent the Colonies.

Fifteen to represent the Indian Empire.

III.

SECTION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL TO REPRESENT THE UNITED KINGDOM, &c.

1. Ex-officio Members:—

- The Speaker of the House of Commons.
- The Governor of the Bank of England.
- The Lord Mayor of London.
- The Lord Provost of Edinburgh.
- The Lord Mayor of Dublin.

2. Representatives of the commerce and industries of the different parts of the United Kingdom, &c.

For the purpose of electing such representatives the country to be divided into districts (estimated at 17) and one such representative to be chosen in each district by the mayors of the municipal corporations in such district at a meeting held for that purpose.

3. Three members to be nominated by the Associated Chambers of Commerce and one by the London Chamber of Commerce.

4. Four representatives of agriculture to be nominated by the Royal Agricultural Society, the Central Chamber of Agriculture, the Highland Society, and the Royal Dublin Agricultural Society.

5. One member to be nominated by each of the following societies, institutions, and associations:—

- The Royal Society.
- The Royal Society of Edinburgh.
- The Royal Irish Academy.
- The Society of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce.
- The Institution of Civil Engineers.
- The Institution of Mechanical Engineers.
- The Iron and Steel Institute.
- The Chemical Societies.
- The Society of Telegraph Engineers and Electricians.
- The City and Guilds Institute of Technical Education.
- The Royal United Service Institution.
- The Royal Academy.
- The Mining Association of Great Britain.
- The Trade Union Congress.
- The National Miners' Union.

IIIB.

COLONIAL SECTION OF THE COUNCIL.

To be nominated as follows:—

Canada, Dominion and Provinces, and Newfoundland, 10.

Australian Colonies, viz.:—

New South Wales,	2	} 10
Victoria,	2	
South Australia,	2	
Queensland,	2	
Tasmania,	2	
New Zealand,	2	
Cape Colony,	2	
Crown Colonies,	6	

The mode of nomination of the representatives of the several Colonies to be hereafter determined.

IIIC.

INDIAN SECTION OF THE COUNCIL.

The mode of nominating the 15 Indian representatives to be hereafter determined.

IV.

A temporary committee nominated by the Prince of Wales to take the necessary steps for calling into existence as soon as practicable the permanent governing body, and to do such other acts as are in the meantime necessary. The duties of this committee to cease as soon as the Executive Council comes into existence.

CANADIAN HOME RULE.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,—Sir George Trevelyan at Manchester and Mr. Chamberlain in several of his recent speeches have suggested that the legislative powers exercised by the Canadian provincial authorities under the British North American Act, 1867, are likely to form a reasonable basis for a settlement of the Irish Home Rule difficulty. It may not be inappropriate to consider what those powers are, and how far a system which has been found to work well in Canada would be applicable to Ireland.

Power to legislate upon the following subjects is expressly withheld from the provincial Legislatures and conferred only on the Dominion Parliament:—

1. Public debt and property.
2. Regulation of trade and commerce.
3. The raising of money by any mode or system of taxation.
4. The borrowing of money on the public credit.
5. Postal service.
6. The census and statistics.
7. Militia, military and naval service and defence.
8. The fixing of and providing for the salaries and allowances of civil and other officers of the Government of Canada.
9. Beacons, buoys, and lighthouses.
10. Navigation and shipping.
11. Quarantine and the establishment and maintenance of marine hospitals.
12. Sea coast and inland fisheries.

13. Ferries between a province and any British or foreign country, or between two provinces.
14. Currency and coinage.
15. Banking, incorporation of banks, and the issue of paper money.
16. Savings banks.
17. Weights and measures.
18. Bills of exchange and promissory notes.
19. Interest.
20. Legal tender.
21. Bankruptcy and insolvency.
22. Patents of invention and discovery.
23. Copyrights.
24. Indians and land reserved for Indians.
25. Naturalization and aliens.
26. Marriage and divorce.
27. The criminal law, except the constitution of Courts of Criminal Jurisdiction, but including the procedure in criminal matters.
28. The establishment, maintenance, and management of penitentiaries.
29. Such classes of subjects as are expressly excepted in the enumeration of the classes of subjects assigned exclusively to the Legislatures of the provinces.

Any matter coming within the above classes of subjects is not deemed to come within the class of matters of a local or private nature comprised in the enumeration of the classes of subjects assigned exclusively to provincial Legislatures.

The provincial Legislatures have exclusive authority to legislate in regard to the following matters:—

1. The amendment from time to time of the Constitution of the province, except as regards the office of Lieutenant-Governor, who is appointed by the Governor-General in Council.
2. Direct taxation within the province, in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial purposes.
3. The borrowing of money on the sole credit of the province.
4. The establishment and tenure of provincial offices and the appointment and payment of provincial officers.
5. The management and sale of the public lands belonging to the province and the timber and wood thereon.
6. The establishment, maintenance, and management of hospitals, asylums, charities, and eleemosynary institutions in and for the province, other than marine hospitals.
7. Municipal institutions in the province.
8. Shop, saloon, tavern, auctioneer, and other licences, in order to the raising of a revenue for provincial, local, or municipal purposes.
9. Local works and undertakings other than lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs, and other works and undertakings connecting the province with any other province or extending beyond the limits of the province.
10. The incorporation of companies with provincial objects.
11. The solemnization of marriage in the province.
12. Property and civil rights in the province.
13. The administration of justice in the province, including the constitution, maintenance, and organization of provincial courts, both of civil and criminal jurisdiction, and including procedure in civil matters in these courts.
14. The imposition of punishment by fine, penalty, or imprisonment for enforcing any law of the province made in relation to any matter coming within any of the above classes of subjects.
15. Generally all matters of a merely local or private nature in the province.

The provincial Legislatures may, subject to certain rights and privileges existing at the time of the passing of the Act with respect to denominational schools, exclusively make laws in regard to education.

Where a Bill has been passed by a provincial Legislature the Lieutenant-Governor of the province is required to declare (1) that he assents thereto in the Queen's name; or (2) that he withholds the Queen's consent; or (3) that he reserves the Bill for the signification of the Queen's pleasure. Where a Lieutenant-Governor assents to a Bill the Governor-General of Canada may within one year disallow it, and such disallowance takes effect from the date of the signification thereof. A Bill reserved for the Queen's pleasure has no force unless and until within one year from the day on which the Lieutenant-Governor signifies that it has received the assent of the Queen in Council. The Governor-General appoints the Judges of the Superior, District, and County Courts of each province.

The decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and the Supreme Court of Canada as to the constitutional powers conferred upon the provincial Legislatures by the British North America Act in regard to several important sections have removed any doubt which may have existed as to their effect. For instance, it has been held that a provincial authority has no power to interfere with the business of a brewer by means of licences, this being exclusively within the scope of the Dominion Parliament under the section relating to "regulation of trade and commerce." Again, it was decided that a provincial Legislature was justified in passing a law prohibiting the sale of intoxicating liquors on Sundays. Another decision was to the effect that the local authorities had full power to appoint magistrates.

If there were any indication on the part of the Gladstonian party to entertain the objections stated by Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain, there is much in the Canadian system of Home Rule that might be imitated with advantage—but several of the sections mentioned above would have to be modified to meet these objections. As a Liberal Unionist I am much interested in ascertaining how far the Canadian method might be made applicable to Ireland and one would like to hear the views of others upon the subject. The consideration of this matter would, no doubt, be more profitable if the Gladstonian party had, to use Mr. Chamberlain's expression, come to closer quarters.

At present we do not know, and it is difficult to say how far, if at all, they will accept the points urged by the Liberal Unionists; indeed, I notice that almost the only reference Mr. Morley made to them in his speech last night at Norwich was to ask Lord Hartington to say if he still adhered to them. Mr. Chamberlain is, I should imagine, tired of repeating the points in almost every speech he makes, and in his last Birmingham address he distinctly stated that Lord Hartington was in complete agreement with him upon the points of objection he then mentioned.

If Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Morley would deal with those points *seriatim* we should at any rate know where we were and be better able to appreciate the consideration of details such as are involved in the subject of this communication.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

May 26. STANLEY BOULTER.

ANTIQUARIAN DISCOVERY.—An interesting discovery was made on Friday at Winchester Cathedral during the construction of the monument to hold the skeleton of Bishop Courtenay. A workman, on making an opening in the choir wall, exposed De Blois's leaden coffer in which that Bishop had enshrined the bones of his uncle Richard, the second son of the Conqueror, who was killed by a stag in the New Forest. Richard's bones were thus preserved by King Stephen's brother, and the coffer, after some seven centuries, remains perfect. The inscription denotes that the coffer contains the bones of Richard, but the words "Beorn Dux" lead antiquaries to believe that the coffer also holds the bones of Earl Beorn, nephew of Canute.

THE NATIONAL RADICAL UNION.

On Wednesday a general conference of the National Radical Union was held at the Midland Institute, Birmingham, and was followed by a large ticket meeting in the Town-hall. Mr. J. Chamberlain, M.P., presided at both meetings. The conference was attended by about 1,500 persons, most of whom were delegates. Among those present were Miss Chamberlain, Viscount Ebrington, M.P., Viscount Lynton, M.P., Sir Julian Goldsmid, M.P., Mr. G. Pitt-Lewis, Q.C., M.P., Mr. G. Dixon, M.P., Mr. Jesse Collings, M.P., Alderman Kenrick, M.P., Alderman Powell Williams, M.P., Mr. R. Chamberlain, M.P., Mr. A. H. Brown, M.P., Mr. D. H. Coghill, M.P., Mr. W. Morrison, M.P., Mr. H. Wiggin, M.P., Mr. M. N. Story-Maskelyne, M.P., Admiral Maxse, Lieut.-General Sir H. Daly, Sir J. J. Jenkins, Colonel Hozier, Messrs. A. Chamberlain, W. Chamberlain, H. Chamberlain, and H. O. Arnold-Forster.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, who was received with loud and prolonged cheering, opened the proceedings by reading the following important communication from Lord Hartington:—

“Hardwick-hall, Chesterfield, May 29, 1887.

“My dear Chamberlain,—I do not think that the conference of Radical Unionists over which you are to preside on Wednesday next could have been held at a more opportune time. I see that it is proposed to direct attention to the present position of the Home Rule question, and there is still on this subject, notwithstanding all that has been written and spoken, a good deal of doubt and confusion which requires to be cleared away. Language is sometimes used which seems to indicate on the part of the majority of the Liberal party a willingness to accept modifications in the measures of the late Government which would remove the objections which have been raised by ourselves and others; but I am not aware that any practical suggestions in this direction have emanated from them (hear, hear), and so far as they are concerned the defeated plan alone is before the country. (Hear, hear.) It seems at present that their only object is to retain at any cost the support of the Irish party (hear, hear), and that their policy is to follow unreservedly the leadership and to adopt some of the Parliamentary methods of their new allies (hear, hear), while the opinions of the Unionist portion of the party are considered as of comparatively little importance. But there can be little doubt that no scheme of extended self-government for Ireland will have any chance of success which does not take into account Liberal Unionist as well as Irish Nationalist opinion. (Loud cheers.) The present action of the Liberal Home Rulers is indefinitely postponing the settlement of the question of the government of Ireland on any basis which can be accepted by the people of Great Britain. (Hear, hear.) But this is not all. The alliance of the Liberal majority with a party which neither feels nor professes to entertain any affection or respect for the Parliamentary institutions of the United Kingdom is daily weakening the authority of Parliament and the public estimation in which it is held. (Hear, hear.) I had imagined that it was to the increased energy and activity of a reformed Parliament that Liberals of all sections were looking with confidence for popular and beneficial legislation, and for more efficient administration of public affairs; but now the determination to force upon the country schemes which have failed to command its approval, and the vain attempt to secure the political support of a party which I believe to be irreconcilable, seem to have rendered the leaders and the majority of the Liberal party indifferent to the dangers which are menacing the whole system of Parliamentary government and are bringing popular institutions into contempt. (Cheers.) I have no doubt that these topics and others which are closely connected with them will receive the earnest attention of the conference.

“I remain, yours sincerely,

“HARTINGTON.”

(Cheers.)

Letters of apology for non-attendance having been read from Mr. W. S. Caine, M.P., and others,

The PRESIDENT said:—Ladies and Gentlemen,—This conference is held in connexion with the first annual meeting of the National Radical Union, which was established in June of last year in order to represent the opinions of those Liberals and Radicals who, disagreeing with the Irish policy of Mr. Gladstone, are nevertheless ready to promote the fullest possible extension of local government in all parts of the United Kingdom which is consistent with the maintenance of the integrity of the Empire, the protection of minorities, and the unquestioned supremacy of one Parliament for the United Kingdom (cheers), and ladies and gentlemen, this infant association has received an amount of support which, I believe, is unparalleled in the history of similar organizations. (Cheers.) The time has now come to give to its operations a great development. I suppose that if such objects as those we are met to discuss were decided upon their merits and without regard to party or personal considerations, our platform would be found wide enough to include the whole of the Liberal party and the vast majority of the intelligent Conservatives. (Cheers.) We have two principal points. In the first place, we disagree with the policy of Mr. Gladstone as expressed in the Irish Bills which he brought into the House. (Hear, hear.) But, ladies and gentlemen, it is a very curious fact in this controversy that no man has yet been found hardy enough to defend the details of those Bills. (Hear, hear.) Our second point is that we desire to promote an extension of local government, and I think there are very few indeed who have not come to the conclusion that some great development of our institutions in the direction of decentralization has become absolutely and urgently necessary. Under these circumstances we have asked our opponents again and again to help us to define the issues which separate us. We have implored them to state in detail the doctrines of that new political sect whose tenets have been ardently embraced by Parnellites and Gladstonians, and outside whose limits we are told no true Liberal can find salvation. (Laughter.) But although we have asked, we have asked in vain. (Hear, hear.) If you will take the trouble to analyze any of the recent speeches either of Mr. Gladstone himself or of any of his supporters, and if you will deduct from them everything in the nature of personal criticism—all that is irrelevant to the main issue—you will find that nothing remains (“hear, hear,” and laughter) except vague and rhetorical assertions of principles which nobody, I should think, would find it worth while to dispute. (Hear, hear.) This method of discussion has placed us at a considerable disadvantage. We have been unable to come to close quarters with our adversaries, and we have been kept in constant expectation that a fairly full discussion might show that the differences which separate us are less serious than we feared. We have consequently been afraid to take anything in the nature of a forward movement lest it should injure the chances of reconciliation which we had earnestly desired to effect. Even the modest efforts which we have made from time to time to defend our position, and to maintain our principles have been denounced as if they were a proof of special malignity, and they have been declared to be the real obstacle to union. Ladies and gentlemen, that is a state of things that cannot indefinitely continue. (Hear, hear.) It is time to take a new departure. We cannot continue to make appeals which are only met with contemptuous silence or with ridicule (hear, hear), but if we are to take this step—a step which I do not conceal from you is one of great gravity, and which may have far-reaching consequences upon the Liberal party—we are bound to make good our ground beforehand, and to endeavour, with such exactness and care as we can command, to understand the exact nature of the situation which has

been forced upon us. (Hear, hear.) What has been the history of the last 12 months? I will endeavour to recall it to your minds in a few brief sentences. Twelve months ago, when this association was formed, we were on the eve of a general election. The Home Rule Bill had been defeated in the House of Commons. Mr. Gladstone had appealed to the country, and his followers were everywhere going about in a state of exuberant confidence counting upon victory, and, above all, absolutely certain that the Liberal Unionists would be swept out of existence. (Hear, hear.) It is no thanks to them that some of us still survive to tell the tale. (Laughter and cheers.) When, however, the Gladstonians went down into the country they found that the electors were not so enamoured as they supposed of the legislation which had been proposed, and accordingly at once there was a change of tone. Mr. Gladstone did not attempt to defend the Bills which had been before the House of Commons. One of those Bills had fallen still-born; the other was in a state of suspended animation (laughter), and it was perfectly evident that they only looked forward to its revival with apprehension and dread. They recognized the force of many of the objections we had taken to them. They did not show any gratitude to us (laughter) for the action which had alone prevented both these Bills from being sent up to the House of Lords with all the authority of a vote of the House of Commons behind them. But they made no attempt to defend them. They admitted the reasonableness of some of our objections, and they allowed it to be understood that if they succeeded in the contest Mr. Gladstone would bring forward a plan which would combine many modifications—important modifications—with his previous proposals. But, ladies and gentlemen, in spite of this way of putting the subject, our opponents were defeated at the general election. (Hear, hear.) You know what the result of the contest was. Mr. Gladstone, who had taken office at the head of a united party of 333 members, resigned office at the head of a shattered minority of 193. And then a Conservative Government came into office. I say a Conservative Government took office, because, although Lord Salisbury, with a patriotism that did him credit (hear, hear), offered to stand aside and accept the assistance of Liberals in the formation of a Government, we did not think it to be our duty to accept that offer (hear, hear); and accordingly the Government was formed exclusively of men who had hitherto fought under the Tory flag. But it was essentially and above all a Unionist Government. (Cheers.) It was a Government which recognized the importance of Liberal support, and whose leaders accordingly pledged themselves to a policy which, I think, it would be very difficult to distinguish from the authorized programme of two years ago. (Hear, hear.) Under these circumstances, when we came back to Parliament in 1886, we hoped that our Gladstonian friends would have learnt the lesson of the conflict in which they had just been so unsuccessfully engaged. We hoped that they would consent to put aside the wild and dangerous project (hear, hear) which was foreign to all the traditions of Liberalism (hear, hear), which had been attempted to be rushed through the House of Commons with such extravagant haste, and which had thus been placed before the country without time for discussion and due deliberation. We hoped, I say, that the Gladstonians would have united with us in an endeavour to keep the Government to their pledges and to carry forward those great reforms in local government, in the land laws, and on many other social and political subjects which we had always hitherto placed foremost in the Liberal programme. (Hear, hear.) But we were disappointed. We were told that Ireland blocked the way, and that no legislation for Great Britain should, or could, be passed until the question of Irish government had received a final solution. That was a hard saying. We had been taught by Mr. Gladstone himself that the main grievances of the Irish nation had already been fully dealt with (hear, hear), that, although there remained reforms to be accomplished, they might take place side by side with the reforms which were even more necessary in connexion with Great Britain. (Hear, hear.) We know that in past times when Irish discontent rested on the foundation of real grievances, much more serious than any with which we now have to deal—we know that in those times Irish obstruction had not been suffered to prevent British legislation, but we found, for the first time in our political history, Irish obstruction fomented and assisted by a strong body of English and Scotch Liberals, and under these circumstances it was evidently impossible to make progress with English legislation. (Hear, hear.) But even then—even then we were not discouraged. Finding that we could not persuade our old colleagues and friends to join with us and to co-operate with us in endeavouring to secure those reforms upon which we were all agreed, and to postpone the one point of difference, we endeavoured to come to some agreement upon the question which separated us. There seemed to be justification, ample justification, for taking such a course. I have already said that throughout the election the Gladstonians had made no attempt to defend the Bills of the late Government. They had expressed willingness to consider modifications. What we had to find out was, what was the nature and the extent of those modifications, and how far they offered a common ground of acceptance. That, ladies and gentlemen, was the reason for the round table conference which met at the beginning of this year. (Cheers.) In the first instance it seemed likely to succeed if the only people concerned in the agreement had been those who were present at the conference. (Hear, hear.) But the conference has failed. I am not now speaking of the reason of its chief object, which was to elicit from the Gladstonian Liberals some definite statement on the changes which they were prepared to make in their plans in order to meet our objections. They knew perfectly well what those objections were. The cardinal objections which we felt to the proposals of the Home Rule Bill have been stated again and again by Lord Hartington and by others, and they are repeated in the resolution which will presently be submitted to this conference. What we had to see was whether the changes of which our opponents spoke were changes which met this difficulty of ours with anything in the nature of satisfactory and sufficient concessions. And now, ladies and gentlemen, I must turn aside for a moment to consider some speeches which have recently been made by Sir George Trevelyan, who was my colleague at the conference. These speeches of Sir George Trevelyan have been hailed with great exultation by the Gladstonian Liberals as if they involved a recantation of opinions previously expressed. I think that that is not a correct interpretation to place upon them. (Hear, hear.) As far as I understand the position of Sir George Trevelyan, he still maintains in all their fulness the objections which he took to the Home Rule Bill and the general Irish policy of the late Government, and in support of which he resigned his position in the Cabinet. (Cheers.) But unfortunately he has come to the conclusion that he can no longer take any active steps to enforce these objections. He prefers to lay down his arms rather than continue to engage in what he considers to be a fratricidal struggle. It is not for me to blame a statesman for whose character and motives I have so great a respect (hear, hear), and who has already made such sacrifices in order to maintain his principles. But I may be allowed to express regret that Sir George Trevelyan should doff his armour just in the hottest of the battle (“hear, hear,” and cheers), and that he should stand aside in an attitude of critical, nay, even of hostile, observation at a time when friends and comrades are in the thickest of the fray. (Cheers.) I am quite unable to follow the reasoning which has led him to stand aloof at such a moment. He says, and it is perfectly true, that the conference showed an unexpected agreement upon all questions of principle among those who took part in it. He assumes, and I am not inclined to dispute the assumption, that the rank and file of the Gladstonian party would have accepted any agreement at which the conference might have arrived, and then he asks, “Why does the battle continue to rage? Why do you not disarm, as I myself have done, and wait for the signature of the treaty?” (Laughter.) Can he tell us that the Gladstonians are prepared to disarm? (Hear, hear.) What assurances can he give us that any treaty at all will be signed? (Hear, hear.) If he knows anything which justifies these sanguine anticipations, why does he not make it public? For my part, I say that I know of nothing, I know of no assurance given by any one who is authorized to speak in this matter which carries it one jot or one tittle beyond the vague and the unsatisfactory promises which were tendered during the discussion on the second reading of the Bill, and which Sir George Trevelyan himself found to be so unsatisfactory that he opposed the second reading and lost his seat in conse-