

sume that this suggestion is offered to the mercantile classes as the condition on which the Grangers will withdraw their opposition to the Insolvency Law. It is we think on the whole fortunate that the Farmers, Parliament has shewn its hand, and enabled other classes to form some idea of its aims.

We do not find any expression of opinion as to the recent changes in the tariff on agricultural products, notwithstanding the lively discussion that has been going on as to their effect on the interests of the very class represented at the meeting. It would really have been interesting to learn the views of the Grangers on this subject, but neither in the report nor in the Master's address is there any allusion to it.

#### RELATIONS BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA.

We can readily comprehend that our English fellow-subjects who are so devotedly attached to the principle of free-trade must feel a good deal of irritation at the protective policy recently adopted by Canada, but, when the exponents of public opinion in the United States make grave charges against us on the same ground, we confess that we are inclined to feel indignant. We are indebted to the Toronto Globe for the opportunity of perusing an article which recently appeared in the Albany Evening Mail, in which both the Canadian parties are charged with evincing jealousy of and hostility to commercial intercourse with the United States. It is not a little amusing to find in a United States Journal a charge that our policy is characteristic of China or Japan, in view of the fact that our exclusive tariff is really a free-trade one in comparison with that of the United States. Our chief complaint against the Albany Journal is the omission on his part to state that precisely the same duties are levied on our imports from the United States, where heavy duties are imposed on every article of Canadian production, as on those from our own Mother Country, where Canadian products of every kind are admitted free of duty. Surely this fact is of essential importance, and ought not to be kept in the back ground. The Albany paper affirms that our tariff was especially constructed with a view to exclude American manufactures from crossing the border, but he makes no reference to the exclusion of Canadian manufactures from the markets of the United States. With regard to the negotiation of another reciprocity treaty, it is highly improbable that Canada will make any further effort in that direction. She has

undergone quite sufficient humiliation already in connection with reciprocity, and has now determined to adopt a policy of her own, which, if not perfect, she will amend without reference to the opinions of her neighbors.

The Albany Mail is equally unfair on the subject of the fisheries. It must be borne in mind that Canada does not feel any desire to lease her fisheries to the United States for considerations of any kind, pecuniary or otherwise. The United States fishermen are anxious to enjoy the privilege of fishing in Canadian waters, and in the last treaty on the subject all their demands were granted, notwithstanding their refusal to entertain the Canadian demand for a new reciprocity treaty. As the United States would not consent to give an equivalent for the right of fishing in the form of free commercial intercourse, the only mode left for settling the value of the fisheries was by arbitration; and, after interposing delays for years, a fairly selected commission gave an award which Canada at once accepted, though far below what it deems the fair value of the rights conceded, but which was bitterly complained of by the United States. The Albany Mail, referring to the Fortune Bay affair, insists that the American fishermen were doing nothing but enjoying the rights secured to them by the Treaty of Washington. That is precisely the point at issue. Is there one line in the Treaty of Washington granting to United States fishermen privileges which are denied to British subjects? The United States journals are most careful to avoid the discussion of the question of Sabbath breaking. Are their laws, we should like to know, such that Canadians would be permitted to carry on fishing in United States waters on Sunday? We feel assured that, even if there was any temptation to fish in the United States, no such impropriety would be attempted, but it would be interesting to learn whether there are any laws in the United States for preventing the desecration of the Sabbath. It is wholly incorrect to assert, as the Mail has done, that "an attempt has persistently been made to justify the lawless depredations of the rioters." It has been admitted by the entire Canadian press that the people of Fortune Bay were wrong in taking the law into their own hands, but it is likewise maintained that the United States fishermen were the first violators of the law, and that, when redress is claimed for one act of violence, it is not unreasonable that it should likewise be sought for a flagrant violation of the municipal law. The case lies in a

nutshell. The treaty confers on United States citizens the right to fish in common with British subjects, but no greater right. Had, then, British subjects the right to do what the United States fishermen were doing in Fortune Bay on the 6th January last? If not, the United States ought to be as ready to grant redress as they are to claim it. The Albany Mail charges Canada with "a morbid jealousy" of the United States, and with assuming "a hostile attitude" towards that country. We have little doubt that the feeling here is almost universal that the repeated efforts made by Canada to carry on friendly intercourse with our neighbors have been invariably met in a hostile spirit. Such articles as that in the Albany Evening Mail are not calculated to improve the feeling which exists.

#### THE GLOBE AND MR. STRATHY.

The chief organ of Mr. Strathy, for, thanks to the influence of the Federal Bank, he has some minor organs, has replied to our article of last week, and has endeavored to persuade his readers that we had resorted to abuse of the Globe instead of meeting Mr. Strathy's charges. The charge of black mail, the Globe says "has not been met at all." We fail to comprehend how it is possible to meet such a charge, otherwise than by a positive assertion of its untruthfulness. When on business tours we solicited advertisements from the Federal Bank, precisely as we have done from other banks and merchants, but we emphatically deny that we used threats or other than fair business inducements. As we felt that Mr. Strathy's letter involved a question of personal veracity, we deemed it our duty to refer specifically to articles in the JOURNAL OF COMMERCE of which Mr. Strathy had complained, and of which the Globe now complains. Our object was to prove that we had not attacked the Federal Bank. We are prepared to join issue with the Globe on the subject of his criticism of one of our former articles, which excited the wrath of Mr. Strathy, although it may not be irrelevant to remark that it was published about a year and a half ago. We contend that the rate of interest allowed by the Chartered Banks on deposits is a fair subject for the criticism of the press, and especially of commercial journals, and that, to stigmatize such criticism as "tactics which no journal of repute would employ towards any one," is discreditable to the Globe. The article was not aimed specially at any bank, but, towards the conclusion, it was remarked that the support of the Federal Bank to a reduced