

world, the day is not far off when that language will become more general in diplomacy. M. Ribaut, the French Minister, claims that the custom has been to use French on occasions such as that of the Newfoundland commission; but even he found it necessary to compromise this claim.

In the Province of Quebec, the dual system of representation still survives, along with other anomalies of a similar kind. For instance, a sheriff of Quebec can be a senator at Ottawa, and such anomalies do still as a matter of fact exist. A sheriff, being a subordinate officer of the local government, ought not to be a senator, for either he cannot exercise an independent judgment, as a legislator, or if he does he may go counter to the government whose officer he is. This state of things is to be put an end to by the Quebec Government, in a way which is certainly not objectionable; the persons who hold the dual positions are to be left at liberty to say which they will retain and which they will relinquish.

#### TARIFF CHANGES.

In the session of the Dominion Parliament which closed on Saturday last, the tariff changes were few. But they were on the lines previously laid down and extended from time to time. The first line of the National Policy claimed to be one of arrangement merely, without on the whole increasing the duties. The increase of duties for the purpose of protection was, at the outset, distinctly disavowed. Nothing beyond incidental protection was aimed at, or at least avowed. This position was entirely different from that afterwards taken, when duties were increased avowedly for the purpose of protection. When this last stage was reached, the manufacturers, to a greater or less extent, were able to get what they asked for. There can be no doubt that, since then, some manufacturers have been favored at the expense of that part of the population which is not engaged in that industry.

In regard to West India produce, sugar and molasses, an attempt was made last session to force arrangements with countries to the south, with which the United States has obtained commercial treaties. In its treaty the British West Indies did not discriminate against Canada, but placed this country in as favorable a position as the United States. Such conduct, our Government argues, deserves recognition. We leave ourselves open to make with the other sugar countries an arrangement which will place them on the same footing as the West Indies. But if they refuse to reciprocate to this extent, the preference is to be given to the West Indies. Here we adopt the plan which Mr. Blaine got inserted in the McKinley tariff. Are we to do this out of gratitude to the West Indies? Clearly not, because we shall leave them out of the question, if the other sugar countries will listen to our overtures. There is no reason why some of them, Brazil for one, should not be willing to do so. Brazil seems to have been under the

impression, when she negotiated the treaty, that she was getting an exclusive arrangement, and she has said to have protested when other countries were treated by the United States on the same terms as herself. Brazil ought to be in a suitable temper to accept the overtures of Canada; and if she should fail to respond to our advances she can scarcely complain if we retaliate in the way proposed. But that the retaliation threatened would, in itself, be a good thing for Canada, may well be doubted. It would limit the markets from which we could purchase sugar and molasses, being in this particular open to the objection that lies against Commercial Union. The effect would be to injure ourselves quite as much as countries retaliated against. This may be a wise thing to do; but wisdom in the guise of a foe that may injure us is open to suspicion. The one real advantage of the arrangement is that it opens the way to negotiation with the countries which have made reciprocity treaties with the United States. But this does not prove that retaliation would not injure Canada.

The duty on eggs is clearly retaliatory. It is a feeble echo of one passage of the McKinley tariff. The injury which it will inflict on American farmers will scarcely be felt at all. The notion that it will protect ours has no solid foundation to rest on. The eggs that we import from the Republic are Southern eggs, which come earlier than ours. The duty of five cents a dozen, if it fails to stop the trade, will add to the price, but it will not force Canadian hens to lay out of season. If the duty should put an end to the trade, Canadians will be deprived of fresh eggs; a senseless punishment which can in no way aid our farmers. If the farmer be induced to believe that he is getting protection under this head, he may be more tolerant of protection where he is not or does not appear to be so directly concerned.

#### THE PROBLEM OF THE CARRYING TRADE.

In the life and writings of John Alfred Poor, with which Laura Elizabeth Poor deals in this book ["The First International Railway," Williamson & Co., Toronto], we find the problems of the carrying trade of Canada and the United States as they were presented at an earlier period. The riddles are solving themselves in a way which early projectors did not always foresee. To the later Mr. Poor, more than any other single individual, the construction of the first international railway between Canada and the United States, connecting Montreal and Portland, is due. His central idea was to make Portland the shipping port for Canada and the Western States, as that of Mr. Young was to gain the same distinction for Montreal. Poor believed that the days of long canals were, so far, over, that they could never compete for the Western traffic with railways. The utmost use to which they could be put was, in his opinion, to forward freight a certain distance, till it could best take rail for Portland, which was to him, in some respects, the centre of the world. As a con-

tribution to the history of the international carrying trade Mr. Poor's writings are valuable. The student of that history may also profitably consult the writings of the late Hon. John Young of Montreal, and of Mr. Hamilton Merritt, who earned the title of father of the Welland Canal.

One of Mr. Poor's great aims was to unite Canada and the United States commercially, and he thought that in projecting means of communication between them, commercial considerations should alone be regarded. His theory was that there should be one tariff from Labrador to Mexico, and that this was destined to happen under a zollverein arrangement. In this respect, he may be regarded as the father of commercial union, and he so conducted his advocacy of this measure as not to excite the hostility of national prejudice on either side of the line. On this side, he was regarded as eminently the friend of Canada. In an address delivered at Rutland, Vermont, in 1869, he said: "Public enterprise and commercial necessity look upon this continent as one great field open to development, regardless of national boundaries of State lines. They conform to physical facts alone. Lines of railway, starting from great commercial centres, or important commercial points, rely upon the level and the transit as the only safe guide to open the way to profitable investments." If the St. Lawrence route should prove the cheapest, he admitted that that must obtain the preference, but he persuaded himself that this would not happen. His forecast, discouraging to the Buffalo Canal route, has not been realized; but then the freeing of the canal from tolls did not enter into his calculations. He made too little allowance for national or political influence; and the result is that instead of the free intercourse between the two countries which he foresaw in his mind's vision, we have been called upon to witness a reciprocity of restriction in tariffs. But the problem of the commercial relation between the two countries is not yet solved, and it never can be so long as the United States Government will consent to build commercial reciprocity only on the foundation of exclusiveness. To all students of the question, the life, writings, aims and aspirations of the late Mr. Poor will prove an invaluable aid.

#### TRADE RELATIONS BETWEEN CANADA AND BRITAIN.

After stating the result of the voting on Sir Charles Tupper's amendment favoring differential duties in the Chambers of Commerce Conference in London the other day, namely, that thirty-three chambers voted for and fifty-six against it, the *London Economist* says: "There is one broad fact which the decision of the congress has made clearly apparent, and that is, that amongst our colonies Canada is alone in pressing for tariff discriminations in her favor. No fewer than seventeen Canadian chambers supported Sir Charles Tupper's amendment, only two being opposed to it, while of Australasian chambers nine opposed and two supported it, and the only two votes recorded by South Africa were