

ously attached. As the members of the Cabinet in the United States do not sit in Congress and impress their general policy on legislation, it is difficult to say what is the exact relation borne by the reports of the Sub-Committee on Ways and Means and the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs to each other. But both committees are controlled by the Republican party, and the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs may be taken at all events as a proof that the attitude of the party towards Canada is not hostile and that the door of commercial negotiation is still open. If Mr. Hitt's Resolution passes the House and afterwards the Senate, of which there appears to be every probability, there will be an overture which those who are responsible for the welfare of Canada will have to accept or refuse. All the attempts to open markets for us in the moon have failed, and the Government will be called to say whether it is resolved or not that our natural market shall remain closed.

The Resolution of Mr. Voorhees has been at once pounced on by our Protectionists as a proof that the farmer in the United States is no better off than he is here and that consequently nothing would be gained by Commercial Union. But evidently it is a mere move of the party game and its representations must be discounted accordingly. To set off the measure of protection promised by the Republicans to the farmer, Mr. Voorhees on the part of the Democrats holds out the lure of some special measure of relief, hinting apparently at legislation on the subject of mortgages or a grant for their reduction. Of course, to give colour to his resolution, he overpaints the necessities of the case. Nobody who goes into the United States can imagine that distress reigns there. The very difficulty with which all these revenue reformers have to deal is a redundancy of revenue resulting from a plethora of wealth.

—The debate on the two commercial policies is opened by a resolution passed unanimously by the Manitoba Legislature