

"The native Irish, Lord Salisbury says, though in truth the Celtic and Teutonic stocks are now inextricably mingled, always have hated us, and will continue to do so. It does not occur to him to ask why they have hated us. He takes it as a law of Nature. A student of Irish history would, however, not only ask the question, but find it easy to answer. For centuries we made war upon the Irish, plundered them, dispossessed them of their lands, persecuted their religion, imposed on them an alien Church. Ninety-five years ago we goaded them into a rebellion, and put it down with circumstances of frightful cruelty. During most part of this century, we have treated their complaints sometimes with neglect, sometimes with contumely, have introduced reforms slowly and grudgingly, have mismanaged their affairs, refused the restoration of their Legislature, maintained an oppressive land-system. These things which any one may find fully set forth by eminent writers belonging to Lord Salisbury's own party, are enough to account for the long continued bitterness of the Irish. As these grounds of offence have diminished, so has the hatred; when they have vanished so will the hatred vanish. Such at least is the teaching of history. Scotchmen and Englishmen fought with and hated one another for eight centuries, but that hostility disappeared with its causes. It was not mere Legislative Union that removed it. Legislative Union did not reconcile Scotland; it was the circumstances that followed the Scottish Union and the cessation during last century of the old causes of strife. And the expectation that Ireland also will forget former animosities when the causes of strife have ceased to operate is based, not on mere optimism, but on common sense and respect for the teachings of experience. Lord Salisbury is right in thinking that a hostile Ireland may be dangerous in war time. He is wrong if he thinks that she ceases to be dangerous because the Government is in the hands of a British Executive. Never was she more dangerous than in 1780-81, and 1796-98, when the Executive was absolutely under orders from London. It is the hostility of the people that is menacing, and the moral of Lord Salisbury's references to history is this: Beware of incensing the nation as you did in 1780 and 1796."

Mr. Bryce concludes with a reference to one "international aspect of the question which Lord Salisbury has failed to notice," though he (Mr. Bryce,) deems it by far the most important. It is the fact that the largest part of the Irish race is now outside Ireland. "In the United States alone, there are to-day more Irishmen—that is to say, men Irish in race and in political sentiments and conduct, than in Ireland herself." It is the anti-British attitude of this great mass of Irishmen, which politicians are forced to reckon with, that is "the one obstacle, to that solid and durable friendship between the Government of the United States, and that of the Queen, which is, in our international relations, the thing most to be desired." Here is, Mr. Bryce thinks, something practical, tangible, real, and worth aiming at, "which may well outweigh speculations about the impression which the Home Rule Bill makes on the minds of Indian Ryots."

RECIPROCITY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.—III.

The propositions for reciprocity which were submitted by the Canadian Government to the Harrison Administration at Washington are generally understood to have embraced the following terms:—Free trade between the two countries in the raw products of the farm, the forest, the mines, and the fisheries, including all articles manufactured or partially manufactured from the same, which were included in the former reciprocity treaty; the inland waters from the head of Lake Superior to the ocean, and all the canals connected therewith, together with the coasting trade thereon to be enjoyed by the citizens of both countries on free and equal terms; the fisheries on ocean and inland waters to be also free to both countries and subject to same conditions for each; the manufactured goods of either country to be admitted into the other on as favorable terms as those of any other nation; a limited list of such named manufactures as might be agreed upon, to be admitted into either country, free of duty; Canada maintaining the right to admit, free of duty, from Great Britain or any other country, any or all of the articles so admitted from the United States.

The counter propositions of the United States Administration appear to have been:—That any reciprocity treaty must include American manufactures generally, and that similar treatment must not be extended to any other country; that the United States "would not be inclined to accept a treaty upon any other basis than that of a free entry of both their natural and manufactured products into Canada, coupled with discrimination against all other countries." Mr. Blaine intimated that it was clear to his mind, "that no other arrangement would suit the United States, and that it must be accompanied by discrimination in favor of the United States, especially against Great Britain, which was their great competitor, and that it must likewise be accompanied by the adoption of a uniform tariff for the United States and Canada, equal to that of the United States. With such a wide divergence between the views of the representatives of the United States and Canadian Governments, a continuance of the Conference was useless, and the negotiations terminated.

If reciprocity between the two countries, based upon fair and equitable terms, would tend to their mutual prosperity and to the equal advantage of both, as it undoubtedly would, to which of two Governments should the blame be attached for failure in arriving at an understanding?

It is charged by the opponents of the Canadian Government, that they were insincere in their efforts to obtain reciprocity; that they had no reason for expecting that the terms which they proposed could possibly be accepted, because of the much larger advantage which Canada would derive, as compared with the United States. Is there any good foundation for this charge, or were the terms proposed by the Canadian Government unreasonable? When the McKinley bill was passed by the United States Congress, it was accompanied by a scheme of reciprocity applicable to every country in the continent of America, except Canada. The avowed objects of the contemplated treaties of reciprocity were to reduce the large adverse balance of trade

which existed against the United States, and to increase its exports of produce and manufactures to these countries. Canada was specially exempted from the operation of this treaty, either owing to what the Canadian Government supposed to be a misconception of the true position of the trade between Canada and the United States, or from a mistaken idea that the United States occupied such a controlling power over that commerce as to be able to regulate it according to its own good pleasure. The Canadian Government, in going to Washington, was in a position to prove by the records of the United States Bureau of Industries:—

1. That since 1872-73 there had been in every year, a large excess in the imports into Canada from the United States, over its exports to that country.

2. That while the exports of raw products from Canada to the United States had slightly exceeded the imports of like products from the United States, Canada's imports of manufactured goods from that country had very much more largely exceeded its exports of this class of merchandise; that this excess, during the last four years, had averaged over \$20,000,000, annually.

3. That Canada is the fourth largest importing country of American manufactures; its imports of this class of goods exceeding one-seventh part of the total exports of United States manufactures; that all this merchandise is admitted into Canada on as favorable terms as the same articles are admitted from Great Britain, which admits Canadian products, free of duty.

4. That Canada admits, free of duty, from the United States, about 50 per cent. more merchandise than that country admits from Canada, on same terms.

5. That even prior to the passing of the McKinley bill, the average rate of duty levied by Canada on dutiable goods imported from the United States was 20 per cent. lower than the average rate of duty levied upon the same merchandise if imported into the United States from Canada.

In view of the above facts, established by United States official reports, surely the Canadian Government was amply justified in demanding a modification of the many obnoxious clauses of the McKinley bill; and, if the remedy for removing its just complaints could be best found in a treaty of reciprocity, a fair and candid consideration of the existing condition of the commerce between the two countries must convince any impartial mind, that the terms offered by the Canadian Government were eminently just and reasonable. If reciprocity with the other countries of America were advisable, why not with Canada? The following two tables show the position of the commerce between the United States and these other countries, prior and subsequent to the operation of the reciprocity treaties which were made with them:—

STATEMENT showing the total values of Imports and Exports of merchandise into and from the United States from Mexico, Central America, West Indies and South American countries, during the following years, ending June 30, Compiled from Quarterly Report, No. 4, 1891-92, of the Bureau of Statistics, Washington, pages 837 to 842.

837 to 842.

YEAR.	Imports into U. S.	Exports from U. S.	Excess of Imports.
1890.....	\$198,940,575	\$90,886,103	\$108,054,472
1891.....	242,512,577	90,413,516	152,099,061
1892.....	288,894,902	92,545,868	196,349,034
Total for 3 years...	\$730,348,054	\$273,845,487	\$456,502,567
Proportion of Exports to Imports	37.51		
Value of the above Imports, distinguishing between dutiable and free.			