

Apparently the leaseholders who banded together in Toronto, and began by asking unreasonable concessions in their favor, have abandoned the proposal forcibly to compel lessors to hand over the freehold to them. In an interview with the Attorney-General they pointed out that arbitration in the renewal of leases is costly and unsatisfactory. Here, at least, they are on solid ground, but whether it would be best, as they propose, to appoint an official arbitrator, is open to question. He would have a dangerous power in his hands. The proposal to fix ground rent at an ascertained rate of interest on the investment is one which would, if adopted, carry us far: it might lead to official interference in many other directions. We constantly hear in these modern days that the lessor renders no personal service for what he gets. This argument is not new; it long did duty against usury: the most moderate rate of interest on money being stigmatized by that qualifying epithet. One man buys land, another buys stock in a company, a third puts his money at interest. None of them render any personal service, in which respect they all stand on a common level. Where is the warrant for treating them differently?

THE AMERICAN VIEW OF RECIPROCITY.

Col. Foster, whose hand was conspicuously busy in aiding to make the reciprocity treaties between the United States and countries to the south, has given his opinion of what ought to control the chances of reciprocity with Canada. His language is unmistakable, because put into writing to do duty at a dinner at Delmonico's, which he was unable personally to attend. And what is more, he must be presumed to have spoken in some measure as a representative of the State Department. His view of the case, which has most interest for us, is contained in a few words: "The fact that Canada does not possess the right of negotiating her own treaties, but must have them negotiated for her by a distant power which is controlled by economic principles entirely different from those of both the United States and Canada, constitutes the chief barrier to any arrangement. So long as other interests than those of Canada are to control, negotiations for commercial reciprocity must prove a failure. It is the duty and the interest of the United States to cultivate the most intimate and liberal commercial relations with such of our neighbors as recognize American (in its broadest sense) as paramount to European influence on this hemisphere. To all such countries we should open the doors of trade as wide and as freely as the interests of our own established industries will permit. Beyond that the spirit of genuine Americanism does not require or permit us to go." Of the statement that Canada has not the power to make her own treaties, we may say that it is at once true and not true. As a matter of legal authority, it is true; as a matter of actual practice, it is only part of the whole truth; the counterpart is that Canada, in the making of treaties which

concern herself, is at liberty to shape her own destiny. In such negotiations Canada is not the legal factor, but she is the motor and it is her volition that governs. The negotiations are carried on through British representatives: that is, the form of the procedure. But it is, nevertheless, true that the Canadian Premier, negotiating the Treaty of Washington in association with the resident British Minister at the American capital, was there to act for Canada, for which purpose he was specially appointed. If a commercial treaty is to be made affecting the commercial interests of Canada, the practice is to make it in the interest of the Dominion. The negotiations are not controlled by other interests than those of Canada. At the same time Canada does not forget, in these negotiations, that she is a part of the British Empire, and that as such she enjoys privileges and has correlative duties laid upon her. As a part of the British Empire, it is out of the question that she should discriminate in her commercial arrangements against the parent State to which she looks for protection. For us, the trade question cannot be narrowed down to a mere continental American issue. We are on the American continent, but of the British Empire. This is the position of our choice and preference, and simple good faith requires that our acts should be in strict accord with our position.

Col. Foster tells us that, to make ourselves acceptable candidates for commercial reciprocity at Washington, we must be prepared to accept "American as paramount to European influence on this hemisphere." With us it is not a question of influence, but primarily of allegiance. No influence adverse to our duty can be permitted to become paramount. Col. Foster explains that in speaking of American influence, he uses the expression in its broadest sense. This is somewhat ambiguous, but the truth can easily be found, if we read between the lines. His object is to gain predominant influence for the Republic to which he belongs. For him the aspiration is natural; but to Canada the proposition presents itself in a different light. Canada has no desire to be swallowed up by the predominant influence of her great neighbor, with whom she is anxious to live on terms of amity and good will. But she wishes to live her own life, not that of another; to work out her own destiny; to solve the problems which circumstances have given her for solution, without complicating them with others with which she is not familiar and for which she neither has nor desires any responsibility.

Canada, as well as the great Republic, her neighbor, is American. Her view of "genuine Americanism" is that each country should pursue its own interest, and follow its destiny, in its own sphere; that true liberty is to be found not in one great aggregate national system, but in the natural growth and development of two separate nationalities. For Canada "true Americanism" is to be found in individual national growth and development. If Col. Foster intends to say, and to our reading he does, that the United States should, on

this continent, cultivate commercial relations only with such countries as will acknowledge her paramount influence, the proposition would have to be taken as closing the door against reciprocity, if he spoke by authority. Canada is not prepared to take reciprocity on this condition. There is of course no assurance that Col. Foster's utterance is to be taken as the last word of the American Government; if it were we should reluctantly be compelled to bid adieu to all hopes of reciprocity in that direction.

But by far the strongest objection to unlimited reciprocity, from the Canadian point of view, is that it would prove to be highly burthensome to Canada. We would advantageously reciprocate free entries in such articles as the Americans can produce at reasonable prices; but we cannot undertake to protect American manufactures, in our own markets, against rival manufactures of all other countries. Mr. Springer, Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, in an article in the February number of the *North American Review*, puts the average duty on woollens, under the McKinley tariff, at 91.65 per cent. Under unlimited reciprocity, we should practically have to accept the American tariff: in other words, we should come under a heavy penalty to prefer American woollens, enormously augmented in price, to those of all other countries, some of which could be purchased at half the price. If we are to protect any manufactures, our own should have the preference: it would be little short of madness for us to undertake to protect those of the United States by rates of duty which we should never think of enacting to protect our own.

SPRING MILLINERY.

Are the millinery openings a sign of spring? Undoubtedly they are. Cold though the air and sky, nipping the wind that this week reddens the cheeks of the busy, bustling milliners, in search of novelties, and hopeful of bargains—once inside the warehouses the wintriness out-of-doors is forgotten. The dear visitors are expected and are welcome. Presently, the showroom of each house is alive with pretty milliners, who move about among the costumes, the hats, the bonnets, the *parterres* of artificial flowers, the forest of plumes, with a sparkling and delighted air. In Montreal and Toronto alike, the weather for the openings was wintry though bright, and the attendance fully as large as usual.

There appears in the stocks for this season to be a leaning towards solid colors, the subdued tones and half-tones that were so numerous and bewildering giving place in some degree to more pronounced color. Bonnets are as a rule small, but as great a variety exists in their shape as ever. Hats range in size from medium to large, and there is a decided predominance of black lace and jet effects. Pointed and flat crowns are both extensively affected, but the variations in color of last season are often discarded for black. Flowers are to be worn, it seems, in as great profusion as ever; indeed they promise to supplant the