

who has parted with possession of his property irrecoverably, and not in favor of him who has only lent his property, and never stands in danger of losing more than part of his revenue over a short period. The business community is unanimous in demanding attention to the removal of the injustice from which creditors are suffering. Should their wrongs be allowed still to continue unheeded, it need be no cause for surprise if, keeping in view the time spent in legislating upon subjects that are trivial in comparison with justice to creditors, the impression becomes strong with electors that members of Parliament hold their positions, and assemble, not for the purpose of remedying evils, but rather for their perpetuation.

#### RECIPROCITY.

The United States papers that have recently discussed the question of reciprocity seem not to understand very clearly the views of Canadians on the subject. It must not be imagined that the reluctance to respond to the demand of those who are anxious that our Government should make a new effort to obtain reciprocity is any evidence that there is a party in Canada hostile to such a measure. Quite the reverse. It may be admitted that Canadians feel that, under the circumstances which exist, their Government would not be justified in subjecting them to the humiliation of another rejection of their proposals. It must be borne in mind that Canada had been for about three years prior to 1854 urging the United States Congress to agree to a measure of reciprocal free trade in natural products, but without success. In 1854 the late Earl of Elgin was appointed an Ambassador Extraordinary to propose a measure, and, his time being limited, the negotiations were brought to a speedy and satisfactory termination. No complaint was made on either side of the operation of the treaty, which was beneficial to both countries.

There has never been a doubt raised as to the cause of the rather sudden termination of that treaty in consequence of a notice from the United States Government. There is no ground for believing that such a notice would have been given but for the Civil War, and the bitter feelings engendered thereby. When the Treaty of Washington was negotiated about ten years ago, Canada spared no effort to procure even a partial renewal of the treaty, but without success. It was deemed expedient to make a further effort before submitting the fishery ques-

tion to arbitration, and the late Senator Brown was accredited to Washington, and had protracted conferences with the Government of the United States, which professed a willingness to treat, and which made many demands which, though unacceptable to Canada, were nevertheless agreed to. After having succeeded with the President and Secretary of State, the measure agreed to was quietly shelved in the Senate.

When the present tariff was framed by the Canadian Government, power was taken to admit duty free a considerable number of articles imported from the United States, and which were subjected to duty, whenever similar articles should be admitted into the States free, when imported from Canada. This was equivalent to a declaration that Canada was prepared to meet the United States in the most liberal spirit. Any further advance would merely expose us to the humiliation of another refusal. The *Boston Journal* has distinctly avowed that the United States claims from Canada advantages which Great Britain does not enjoy. It then adds that what is true of the United States "holds with other Governments." In other words, foreign Governments claim that Canada should give them a preference in her markets over their own Mother Country. So long as the reciprocity was confined to natural products there was no difficulty, and Canada never desired that it should be extended. The United States first insist on including manufactures, and then further demand that the concessions made to them shall not be extended to Great Britain. Under these circumstances all that we can do is to be satisfied without reciprocity, and to let it be understood that there is no reluctance whatever on the part of Canadians of all parties to agree to such a measure when proposed.

#### ANNEXATION.

The April number of the *North American Review* contains a contribution from Dr. Bender, giving "a Canadian View of Annexation," which deals, as might be expected, with some commercial questions. The most startling assertion is that a caucus meeting of the Liberals was held at Ottawa on the 13th February last, when "the policy of Canadian independence was generally endorsed by the party." Such an assertion made in a review of high reputation, over Dr. Bender's signature, would seem to justify a demand that Mr. Blake should admit or deny its truth. It will readily be conceived that Dr. Bender did not fail to cite,

as one of the "telling indications of public sentiment," the efforts of the Liberal party to obtain for the Dominion the right of making her own commercial treaties, and also "the speech of Mr. Edgar, a Liberal leader, in favor of Canadian Commercial independence." The Corn Exchange of Montreal will probably be surprised to learn that, among the straws, of which Dr. Bender assures his readers a great many might be pointed to at this time to show how the wind blows, those that he thinks specially deserving of notice are, that "the several hundred merchants" of the Corn Exchange "petitioned the Federal Government in favor of the abolition of Canal tolls, and the 'obtainment of a new reciprocity treaty with the United States.'" The members of the Corn Exchange will be, unless we are greatly mistaken, rather surprised to learn that their action has been cited as evidence in support of the assertion that Canada is ripe for annexation.

The main element of popular uneasiness and uncertainty, according to Dr. Bender, —who adds "I might say alarm,"—consists in the rapid increase of Government expenditure and the public debt. Whatever ground there may be for the allegation that there is any alarm on this subject, it cannot be imputed to British connection. Dr. Bender cannot be unaware that in all matters relating to the debt and to the revenue and expenditure, Canada is just as independent as any country in the world, including the United States. It might be expected from one who is writing in favor of revolution that he would do all in his power to create dissatisfaction with all our public works, including the canals, the Intercolonial and the Pacific Railways. Dr. Bender asserts that several millions were paid the old Hudson's Bay Company for the North West Territory. We were not aware that the Hudson's Bay Company had undergone any change, or that there was an old and a new company. However, Dr. Bender will find that the United States paid considerably more for Alaska than Canada for the North West territory.

The reference to Sir Alexander Galt's knighthood, as a proof of the indifference of the Mother Country to the connection, might have been spared. It is the public policy of Great Britain to reward meritorious public services, by admission to orders of merit. The French Republic follows the same practice. In consequence of meritorious public services Sir Alexander Galt was offered knighthood. From a strong sense of delicacy Sir Alexander felt it right to state that he was an advocate of independence, and this did