

the arrangement. The following selections from it speak for themselves. Read them, and the building of the two (so-called) revenue vessels at Cleveland needs no further commentary:—

The naval force to be maintained upon the American lakes by His Majesty and the Government of the United States shall henceforth be confined to the following vessels on each side, that is:—

On Lake Ontario, to one vessel, not exceeding one hundred tons burden, and armed with one eighteen-pound cannon.

On the upper lakes, to two vessels, not exceeding like burden each, and armed with like force.

On the waters of Lake Champlain, to one vessel not exceeding like burden, and armed with like force.

All other armed vessels on those lakes shall be forthwith dismantled and no other vessels of war shall be there built or armed.

If either party should be hereafter desirous of annulling this stipulation, and should give notice to that effect to the other party, it shall cease to be binding after the expiration of six months from the date of such notice.

The naval force so to be limited shall be restricted to such service as will in no respect interfere with the proper duties of the armed vessels of the other party.

THEY'RE LOOKING TO WASHINGTON.

The Laurier Government are gentlemen of discernment. Their trade policy is a most ingenious piece of work. Their tariff is a masterpiece of wondrous beauty, and displays statesmanlike reasoning and logical sequence in its construction. Their careful attention to provision for all possible contingencies is really remarkable.

Perhaps the best instance of reasoning in the tariff is the provision for government action in the case of trusts. In making this provision the astute framers of the tariff undoubtedly displayed correct economic knowledge. The free trade policy of the Government may be read as we run. And the student of economics is, of course, aware that only under free trade can a trust flourish.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier is, at this writing, in the city of Washington, the capital of the United States of America. Can this be the man who has scarce been long enough from England to get the din of London out of his ears? Can this be the same Sir Wilfrid who next to Her Majesty the Queen, we are told, was the central figure of the greatest celebration that the world has ever known? Or is it rather the Laurier who on the 7th of April, 1892, stood on the floor of the House of Commons, at Ottawa, and told his fellow legislators that he looked ultimately to see Canada an independent nation? Has the time come, and is Sir Wilfrid about to make his intentions known? We were told that Sir Wilfrid Laurier's mission to Washington was in connection with the Behring Sea sealing question. What do we find? The Toronto Evening Telegram's clever Ottawa correspondent is in Washington, keeping a sharp eye on Sir Wilfrid and Sir Louis Davies. Listen to these extracts from his pen:—

Unless facts seriously misrepresent the character of his visit here, the Canadian Premier's chief object is not the consideration of the seal question. Already the experts in the Behring Sea conference have held three sessions, Sir Wilfrid Laurier has attended none of these. He learns something of the commission's doings through Sir Louis Davies, a regular attendant at the conferences, that is a matter of a short consultation between the two in Sir Wilfrid's apartments at the Shoreham. With this Sir Wilfrid Laurier's connection with the seal question seems to

stop. Two hour's talk with Secretary of State Sherman yesterday afternoon and a long conversation with members of the United States Cabinet at the State dinner last night was not confined to the question of seals in Behring Sea.

I saw Sir Wilfrid this morning. Both he and Sir Louis Davies admitted that questions of concern to the United States and Canada would be informally talked over during the next few days.

Now this is quite a different story from that first outlined by the Canadian Ministers. Both the Premier and Sir Louis Davies were emphatic in their denial that reciprocity would form a subject for discussion. Their answer was a decided "No," to a straight question. Of course, it is now easy for Premier Laurier and Sir Louis Davies to say that they happened across this idea of talking reciprocity quite accidentally. They can point out that suggestions were made by members of the United States Government for a friendly talk on reciprocity, etc., and they saw fit to fall in with such plans, but it looks clearer every day that Premier Laurier is here mainly to consider the question of reciprocity, but concludes to hide his intentions, forcing a possible failure in ultimately negotiating a treaty.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier's plans took definite shape to-day when arrangements were made for a conference between the two Canadian Ministers and Mr. Kasson. The latter is a commissioner appointed by the McKinley Administration, whose duties concern the arranging of trade relations between the United States and other countries. At the meeting between the Canadians and Mr. Kasson, the question of reciprocity with Canada will be freely discussed. Sir Louis Davies went to extra labor this morning to show me that the discussion is to be absolutely informal, a mere comparing of notes and perhaps arrangements made for negotiating a treaty. The latter, it may be said, will not be considered during this visit of the Canadian Ministers.

How does that sound? Discussion of trade relations the real motive of our Premier's visit to Washington. Small wonder that in England he discouraged at every turn the proffer of preferential trade with the Mother-land. His idea of our destiny is that we shall be no longer a colony of the British Empire, but a nation responsible to none but ourselves. Under these circumstances it is but natural to expect that Sir Wilfrid would rather curry favor with the other occupants of this continent than accept any bonds that would unite us closer with the Mother-land. Free trade is, of course, to be ultimately a concomitant of "Canada—a nation," and there is where Mr. Laurier's little statute for the regulation of trust will come in handy. Just follow that through and you have the evident line of the Liberal Ministry's reasoning.

Protection so stimulates domestic competition that inventions are multiplied, and the cost of production is reduced to a minimum. Under these circumstances no trust can succeed if it has for its object to maintain prices above a normal profit. The moment a combine undertakes to hoist the price of its product above the competitive price, that moment its downfall comes in sight. No more satisfactory proof of this need be adduced than the failure of the American wire mail trust, which undertook to make excessive profits and was forthwith driven to the wall by domestic competition. In the face of this, and with the added fact that Sir Wilfrid is discussing trade matters at Washington, there surely can be no doubt in the mind of any reader that the Liberal Government have in store for us propositions of a free trade nature. The sooner they disabuse their minds of any such idea the sooner the necessity of painful correction at the hands of the common-sense majority of the electors of Canada will have been removed.