

THERE were thirty-three failures in Canada reported to Bradstreet's the past week, as compared with fourteen in the preceding week, and with thirty-two, eleven and six in the corresponding weeks of 1883, 1882, and 1881. The same firm report 182 failures in the United States last week, as compared with 148, 130, and 82 respectively, in the corresponding weeks of 1883, 1882, and 1881. About 80 per cent. were those of small traders, whose capital was less than \$5,000.

UNDER the caption, "Reciprocity with Canada," the *Springfield Republican* points out that from 1854 to 1866 some \$229,000,000 worth of Canadian products had gone into the American markets, scarcely half that amount having been bought by Canada from her neighbour. In reply to the assertion that this was evidence against the beneficial effects of reciprocity to the States, our contemporary says, "the same reason would justify an embargo on our foreign trade with many of the nations of the earth." Continuing: "Whether the abrogation of the treaty at that time was wise or not, the condition of things is greatly changed. In 1854 Canada was a free trade country, but now the Canadian tariff falls on English importation as it does on ours, and we are in a position to make a bid for the trade of all British North America. It is not the policy of Great Britain to allow the colonies to make reciprocity treaties with the United States, and it was only the other day that Lord Derby said as much to a delegation of British West India traders who asked the home government to make for them the terms contemplated in the pending reciprocity treaty between the United States and Cuba. But there is a difference between Jamaica and Canada. The latter is not under leading-strings. She puts on a tariff against the home country, and when the sentiment for a reciprocity regulation is undeniable in Canada, she will doubtless be allowed to have her own way. With us reciprocity is a proper means of increasing our market, if it cannot even be called a preparatory step toward free trade. We have made our treaty with Mexico; we are likely to do the same with Cuba, and now Canada wishes it."

"THERE are a few hardworking, patient, and inoffensive Chinamen working in and around Montreal," says the *Shareholder*. "It is difficult, however, for them to live here. Their enemies are the same class of browbeating scoundrels that hanged negroes to the lamp-posts in New York and prevented them obtaining work because of their colour, although crying for freedom at home and in their dynamite clubs in New York. It is the same class of villains that ever and anon seek their vengeance on two or three poor Chinamen, who are anxious, in a free country, so-called, to work for their living—for what reason no one can explain. They own no stocks—have little or no money beyond the wants of the day. That they should be so maltreated, and then badly protected by the magistrates, is a disgrace to the Dominion of Canada. Far better to be a heathen Chinese than such so-called Christians." Amen!

DR. MACAULAY, the editor of *Leisure Hour*, has just published in volume a reprint of papers that had appeared in his magazine descriptive of America. He has called the book "Across the Ferry," and though it is overloaded with statistics, it is the most favourable description of America given to the world of late. The interest felt in England in all that relates to this continent seems to be increasing. It says a good deal for the Americans that they enjoyed Lord Coleridge's candid speeches. He told them that it was not their colossal fortunes that interested him—he could see them at home. It was not the size, or force, or strength of their nation that impressed him. That England, Greece, Holland, occupying so little of the world's area, had affected the destinies of mankind was more amazing than that America should have done so. Frank speech like this, which was courteous as well as frank, found an echo among enlightened Americans. Less agreeable were the comments of Mr. Matthew Arnold. Mr. Arnold resisted the interviewer. If he had anything to say about America he declined to say it through that medium. But he hit out palpably enough at the essential spirit of the American institutions, and indeed, of the American Constitution. The most popular visitor to America by far is a man of a widely different type. Mr. Irving's personality is eminently attractive. Mr. Irving did not go to America as a philosopher having a message, or as a prophet having no better desire than to travel from the modern Dan to Beersheba and cry out "All is barren!" He went out as a public entertainer, and has added to the sufficient lustre of a name that has perhaps no equal in the annals of his profession, and he has taken the best part of one hundred thousand pounds sterling of the money of the Americans. His book is naturally being read with a good deal of interest. Dr. Macaulay can hardly be said to have seen anything that tells against America. He finds less drunkenness and

more religion than he does in England. He was witness to less misery among the poor, more comfort amongst the middle classes. He thinks the intellectual life of the country, active, earnest and honest. To put it in a word, he is in all but complete sympathy with the dominant spirit of American life. He could not see in New York apparently, streets dangerous to foot passengers, houses rendered unsightly by forests of telegraph poles or uninhabitable from the scream of the overhead engine, does not object to pay five dollars a day for board, and is oblivious of the evil doings of the interviewer. But for the "popish" aspect of American life, Dr. Macaulay would appear to think it as near perfection as anything he knows.

BARON TENNYSON and Matthew Arnold have joined the movement for international authors' copyright, and the American Authors' League will, says the *New York Nation*, no doubt "welcome their offer of alliance. The battle, however, will have to be fought out on American ground, and must be lost or won at Washington. English authors' motives are always suspected by a large number of Congressmen, who, on hearing that Tennyson and Arnold are in favour of protecting authors' rights, will only be hugely delighted, and point to the fact as additional evidence of the corrupt designs of all English advocates of copyright."

It is now said to be practically settled that when Lord Ripon goes back to England and is made a duke, Lord Lorne will go out to succeed him. At one time the Viceroyalty of India was thought Lord Dufferin's *bonne bouche*, but the influences in favour of Lord Lorne, which everybody can understand, were too powerful to be resisted—especially since the Duke of Connaught being in India the Princess Louise wishes to be there at the same time. Lord Ripon has still some time to serve, but having used up his power as a reformer over the Ilbert Bill, he may come home at any moment. Lord Lorne, as his successor, would at once revive the popularity of the Viceroyalty, and the visit of the Princess Louise would probably have good results on native feeling. But it is a pity that the greatest Governor-General of our day should spend all his time in keeping a foolish Sultan from acting foolishly. Lord Dufferin was an ideal Governor-General of Canada. He would make an ideal Viceroy of India.

THE preparations for an expedition to be despatched to Egypt in case General Gordon should require military assistance are being pushed forward vigorously in England, though the Government decline to be "drawn" as to details. Everything goes to show that, however wise or otherwise the policy of the government has been, Mr. Gladstone and General Gordon have been in perfect accord on all material points, the bellowings of the Jingoists to the contrary notwithstanding. The Government have re-affirmed their determination not to attempt a permanent occupation of Egypt, and a basis of agreement is said to have been arranged for the conference. Mr. Forster's attack upon the Government's Egyptian policy seems to have been of so virulent a character as to justify him being spoken of as *un homme fini*, and would appear to render it impossible for the Premier again to speak of him as "my honourable friend." The Bradford Liberal Four Hundred probably exceeded their duty in calling their member so severely to task for his attack on Mr. Gladstone, it being impossible for Mr. Forster to accept the rôle of delegate of any constituency; but he was so utterly regardless of party exigencies—an unpardonable offence in an ex-cabinet minister—that he will probably forfeit his seat as a penalty at the next election. When a malcontent Liberal is not content to criticise his chief's policy, but must needs challenge the whole party by endeavouring to put in their opponents, the Liberals have as much right to complain as a general would have if one of his men turned round and fired at him instead of the enemy. The position is justly, if somewhat brusquely, summed up by a London weekly: "Because a Liberal member does not agree with the Egyptian policy of the Government, that is no reason he should turn round and fire a broadside into the ministerial ranks. On such a distinct issue as a vote of censure Liberals have a right to remonstrate with those who betray their trust. No one has yet come forward to champion Judas Iscariot on the plea that he might conscientiously have objected to some portion of his chief's programme. But had he lived in these later days he would have had at least a dozen leading articles written to show what a very honourable and patriotic person he really was."

WHY anything that Mr. Biggar said, on any subject, should be cable-gramed is a mystery. Yet Monday's papers contained a long telegraphic account of what that Irish member thought of the Nationalist and Orange meetings in Ireland, which resulted in a collision. Mr. Biggar is an ignorant nonentity whose sole reputation consists in being a malignant