

Of those who think that commercial relations will render war impossible, producing a sort of mutually inconvenient Siamese-twin nationality, with that bond of proverbially pie-crusty promises on parchment which diplomatists delight in and call "treaties," but which men of the sword have to support or see torn up, I would ask if trade-interests have never been subjects of dispute, especially between the weak and the strong? Was it a question of a tax on tea that set aflame the War of Independence between the two great branches of our race? Was not the tariff the main cause of the severance of the North and the South, though subsequently the shibboleth, slavery, was prominently brought forward, and became a war-cry between brothers in blood who had quarrelled in their trade? Are there still no burning questions in the South for the North to answer? Are there no Granges in the West?—and are all parties in England pleased at what some consider the prospect of partial exclusion of her commerce with Canada, in favor of the United States, as a natural sequence of reciprocity? Though it is natural to suppose that Imperial Parliaments, past and present, being more occupied with the parish politics of a people too absorbed in the Tichborne trial to notice the contemporaneous Treaty of Washington, have little inclination to interfere in any course Canada might think fit to follow, English diplomatists having *treated* away her cis-Atlantic Empire as soon as it was won by her soldiers and sailors, beginning as early as 1632:

1st. When Quebec was captured by English ships, in 1629, under Sir David Kertz (or Kirke), a French refugee, who carried Champlain a prisoner to England, a treaty with France, in 1632, restored to her Quebec, Acadia (Nova Scotia), and Isle Royal (Cape Breton), Champlain returning to Quebec and resuming the government, and restoring New France for a fresh struggle