

tures" by a war of tariffs commenced in Canada is certainly a novel one, and ought to ensure for the learned editor a demonstration in the United States. We acknowledge that if we were to attempt to characterize the remark, we should probably expose ourselves to the charge of "interjecting angry comments on the opinions of the author." After the unceasing and fruitless efforts made by Canada to establish a liberal commercial policy with the United States, it is hardly conceivable that a Canadian writer could be found capable of imputing to her Government and Parliament the inception of a war of tariffs.

The *American* has been hypercritical in his remarks on the use of the term "annexation." After assuring us, what we were very glad to learn, that the United States could not afford to bring Canada under her flag, except with "the free and unanimous consent of her own people," he adds, "that process we have never heard called 'annexation' except by such writers as Sir Francis." We cannot admit that the word used was misleading, and the *American* has failed to supply a better one. The *American* has adulated the instances of Ireland and Poland to prove that Commercial Union does not always ensure contentment, and he might have likewise referred to the fact that it has equally failed to produce harmony between the Northern and Southern States of the Republic, but he would have strengthened his argument if he had been able to cite a precedent for an integral part of any state entering into an alliance with a foreign Government prejudicial to the interests of the parent State. Let us, by way of suggestion, invite the consideration of the *American* to a commercial union between the Southern States and Mexico, based on a common tariff against the Northern States. We would like very much that our Philadelphia contemporary would argue this question fairly to its conclusion. He has assured us that the higher view of English statesmen is, that they look forward to the day "when the new country shall be sunder the bonds which bind it to a continent where its real interests can never lie, and take an independent and dignified position in the political system of the New World. With this view we believe Mr. Smith is thoroughly in unison." We believe precisely as does our Philadelphia contemporary, and we have therefore deemed it our duty to express our dissent from the views which have been sedulously inculcated by the *Bystander* and other journals in the interest of the United States. It may be that

we are "out of the stream of English thought and feeling," and that our tone is that of "forty years back," when there was still "some sentiment and some political feeling." It may be that, on the occasion of the unveiling of the deSala-berry monument a few days ago, the Governor General of Canada and Lieutenant-Governor Robitaille, a French Canadian, expressed, with the unanimous concurrence of those who heard them, sentiments of the strongest affection on the part of the Canadians to the Crown, while all the time the demonstration was mere fraud and deception. We prefer, at all events, to believe that the Marquis of Lorne and Lieutenant-Governor Robitaille are more faithful exponents of the opinions of the people of Great Britain and of Canada than the Editor of the Philadelphia *American*, or his distinguished ally, the learned Editor of the *Bystander*. We do not believe that either the British or the French settlers "are in danger of becoming mentally petrified through Canada's isolation, combined with dependence."

We must not conclude without noticing a most disingenuous and offensive remark in the *Bystander*, which, however, is quite consistent with his intimation, that the United States may be "driven into hostile measures by a war of tariffs commenced here." In the article contributed to the London *Fortnightly*, Mr. Anderson, M.P., was, to use the language of the *Bystander*, taken to task "for speaking unfavorably of Canadian finance." That is the mild way of stating that Mr. Anderson in express terms affirmed that certain obligations of Canada to Great Britain "had been written off as bad debts." In the article in the *Fortnightly*, it was shown that the specific debts had been incurred, not by the Government of Canada, but by private companies. Will it be believed that the *Bystander* suggests that Mr. Anderson "may have been misled" by an article in this journal on the subject of the *bond fide* debts of Canada, which had nothing whatever to do with the specific transactions referred to by Mr. Anderson, and proved to have been incorrectly cited? We own that we find it difficult to deal with imputations of such a character, and which naturally lead to "interjecting angry comments on the opinions of the author." We make a rule never to misrepresent those, whose opinions we feel called on to controvert, and we shall content ourselves with exposing the unfair reference to Mr. Anderson's statements without characterizing it as it deserves.

The *American* has likewise been guilty of gross, though we are willing to

hope unintentional, misrepresentation. He informs us that Mr. Smith is "no unqualified admirer of American institutions. He would prefer for Canada a 'hereditary Executive to an elective President.' An hereditary Executive! What the learned Professor must have felt on reading in the columns of a devoted admirer, that he favored an hereditary Executive! The *American* carefully ignores the fact that the Professor has objected in the strongest terms to an elective President in the United States. The learned gentleman is at least consistent. He proposes the same system both for the United States and Canada, viz., an Executive Council elected by the Legislative Houses, on some plan which he has not yet condescended to describe in detail. The truth is that the Professor has, in successive numbers of the *Bystander*, pointed out the imperfections of the political institutions of the United States, and has, we believe, convinced many of his readers that his first task should be to make those institutions perfect, after which he might with more consistency endeavor to persuade his countrymen to give them the preference over the time-honored institutions which they at present enjoy.

CONDITION OF THE BOOK TRADE.

There are certain growing grievances connected with the business of the bookseller which, if not dealt with in time, must result in driving him to other fields for the employment of his capital. It is only when some of the most common practices of the trade, thus characterized, are viewed from the standpoint of other departments that their inconsistency is most obvious. The wholesale grocer who sells a pound of tea, the sugar refiner who sells a few pounds of sugar, the manufacturer who sells a pair of shoes, a yard of cotton or woollen cloth to consumers at large, anomalous as this may seem, would be doing nothing more injurious to his trade customers than does the publisher who sells a single volume to every caller, or who offers to "send by mail, postage free," any of his publications on receipt of the price at which his retail customer must sell the same. But the publisher evidently does not feel himself bound by the usual restrictions and regulations of trade, for after, and even while, stocking the shelves of his larger customer, he does not for a moment hesitate to enter into active competition with him.

Among the grievances under which the Canadian formerly labored, not least was the advantage which the purchaser of single books direct from the publisher