

ment, his name was unknown. We pronounce this a deliberate misstatement, as is also the allegation that it is vain to hope to obtain a treaty between France and Canada, through the mediation of the British Ambassador. We are told by Mr. Perrault that Sir Alexander Galt cannot solicit an interview with the French Minister of Commerce because the laws of diplomacy are opposed to it. Of course, on the assumption that Sir Alexander Galt was disposed to act in accordance with the views of Mr. J. X. Perrault and *La Minerve*, and to ignore the British Ambassador altogether, the statement would be correct. On the other hand, knowing, as we do, that Sir Alexander Galt has all the advantage of the advice and assistance of the Imperial Government, there is not the slightest difficulty in the way except what arises from the injustice and obstinacy of the French Government. We have more than once pointed out that no difficulty whatever was experienced at Washington when the late Senator Brown was accredited to act in conjunction with Sir Edward Thornton in negotiations of a similar character.

It is alleged by Mr. Perrault that "England is necessarily hostile to more intimate relations with our Mother Country" try to the possible detriment of its own "commerce with us." Is the foregoing assertion evidence of mere stolidity or of intentional deception? What conceivable object, we should like to know, can a free trade country like England have in obstructing commerce between France and Canada, unless, indeed, Mr. Perrault should desire that French imports should be admitted into Canada on more favorable terms than those from Great Britain. Such a proposition would hardly surprise us; but even if Mr. Perrault's scheme of separation were carried, it would be wholly impracticable, unless, indeed, we established more intimate relations with what he terms "our Mother Country." At present France is on the footing of the most favored nations, and yet our imports are little over a million of dollars, the principal items being wine and spirits. Is it likely that England would have any apprehension that France would draw away its trade, when she is admitting all French exports of manufactures duty free, and sending her own manufactures to compete with the French in their own markets after paying considerable duties.

Mr. Perrault assures us that France has a lively desire to admit our exports on conditions the most favorable to us. Why, then, does she not admit them on the same terms that she grants to Turkey, Germany, Italy, etc. We don't

ask her to alter her conventional tariff; we ask to be put on the same footing as the most favored nations. It appears that Mr. Perrault has himself been taking part in one of those irregular negotiations which *La Minerve* has defended. In 1878 he must have had not one but several interviews with the French Minister of Commerce, for he refers to "mes entrevues," and he appears to have submitted our tariff, and asked if we were in a position to obtain the treatment of the most favored nation. The Minister was quite satisfied with the tariff, and declared that "if Canada had the right to make a treaty with France he would not hesitate to recommend it to the Chamber of Deputies; with the certainty of its being adopted." We are not told why a treaty is necessary, unless one of the parties desires some alteration in the tariff of the other. If we are satisfied with the French conventional tariff, and France is satisfied with ours, there is no occasion for a treaty. France has taken a course different from other nations in framing two tariffs, with the transparent object of extorting from other nations what may be described as "better terms." Notwithstanding Mr. Perrault's assertion, we disbelieve that France is satisfied with our tariff, and we are persuaded that the real difficulty is that France has demanded a reduction in our tariff, and has refused to make any concession to us in return. It has been well understood that in the irregular *pour-parlers* in Canada, the French agent insisted on concessions on our part in consideration of our being put on the same footing as the Turks. The difficulty now is that Sir Alexander Galt insists on concessions being made by France, if she demands concessions from us. Mr. Perrault has put a strange remark into the mouth of the French Minister. After stating that our tariff was quite satisfactory, and that there was no difficulty in the way, he proceeded to point out that, if the negotiations were conducted by the British Ambassador, all the questions of the French English treaty so difficult to solve would be brought up. Why? In 1878 there was a subsisting treaty between Great Britain and France, which we may remark Great Britain is and has always been ready and willing to renew, so that what the French Minister meant was that if England proposed a treaty of commerce between France and Canada, France would avail itself of the opportunity to break up a subsisting treaty, which had nothing whatever to do with Canada. This is French honor and evidence of "a lively desire to open commerce with Canada."

Mr. Perrault ridicules the idea of England having any diplomatic influence, and actually is stolid enough to argue that England has been unable to obtain a renewal of its commercial treaty with France, while Italy, Spain and Belgium have obtained theirs. Does Mr. Perrault imagine that Great Britain would have any difficulty in obtaining a treaty similar to what other nations have accepted? He cannot be so ignorant—France has up to this time insisted on materially increasing its duties, and Great Britain is unwilling to renew the treaty on such terms. In arguing this question, we have admitted the right of France to adopt a protective policy, and we have pointed out the difficulty under which Great Britain labors, owing to the aversion of her Parliament and Government to adopt retaliatory measures. Our own conviction is that nothing but retaliation will succeed with France, and that by adopting that policy, our Government could obtain all that we have a just right to insist on, viz., admission into France on the same terms as the most favored nations.

Mr. Perrault asks if we are ignorant that there was a *projet de traité* of Commerce in 1878 between France and the United States with a simple stipulation, that the duties levied in the latter country should not exceed 30 per cent. We know nothing of *pour-parlers*, but no such treaty was agreed to, and it is notorious that far more than 30 per cent. is levied in the United States on a great variety of imports. Mr. Perrault cannot get rid of the idea that England is "necessarily hostile" to our interests in a commercial treaty with France. So serious a charge should be supported by proof. What conceivable interest has England in obstructing the negotiation of a commercial treaty between France and Canada? We must also remind Mr. Perrault that the people of the Dominion of Canada cannot properly be designated as "ses anciens colons," even if that term should be applicable to a portion of the population of the Province of Quebec, and although Mr. J. X. Perrault, an avowed advocate of revolution, may desire "sur-tout a renouveler nos anciennes relations d'amitié," the Canadian people simply claim that France, after treating them for years with the grossest injustice, will at length recognize the propriety of admitting them to the same privileges which she accords to the United States, and to all the principal states of Europe. We have been led to notice Mr. Perrault's letter at considerable length, owing to the prominence which has been lately given