

OPINIONS OF THE PRESS ON THE GENEVA ARBITRATION.

THE ALABAMA CLAIMS QUESTION.—Yankee "smartness" has again outwitted British diplomacy, and the result of such "cuteness" is the creation of a "question" which may require all the forbearance, tact and self-denial of the nations to bring to an amicable conclusion. When the people of Canada congratulated themselves upon the settlement of the Alabama Claims by the Joint High Commission, they little thought that the American Government had a mental reservation which they were ready to spring upon us at the proper juncture. We considered the whole matter disposed of except the mere assessment of the damages; and we have every reason to believe the Americans did the same, and that their outrageous demand for indirect or consequential damages was an after thought of theirs, intended, no doubt, to secure better terms than they had attained by the treaty. We were among those who considered the concessions made by England on this very question too great, in consenting to a review of her conduct during the American war by any foreign power; it was more than the Americans had a right to ask and more than England should have granted, but so anxious was Her Majesty's Government to remove all causes of national irritation that they went to the "verge of national humiliation" to meet the American half way. And how has Britain been repaid for all these concessions? By deceit and bad faith to which no Government, representing a free people, should submit. The claim for consequential damages is not only unreasonable but an insult to England; unreasonable because they can never be defined with sufficient certainty; the whole cost of the war being but a portion of the indirect damages; an insult because the demand is sprung upon us in an underhanded manner, at a critical moment throwing the whole responsibility upon us of breaking up the Geneva Conference by compelling us to withdraw from the Arbitration, and tainting our conduct with a treaty-breaking stigma. England must, at all hazards, repudiate American greed as set forth in this rapacious demand. She must withdraw from the Conference, if her presence there, notwithstanding her demurrer to the reception of the claim for inferential damages, should be considered a waiver on her part.

What then? That war between the two countries should be the result we consider highly improbable. England has no desire to reconquer her old colonies, and she never goes to war for a mere idea, and the United States are not in a position to go to war. The South is a slumbering volcano, ready at any moment to belch out rebellion. A considerable portion of the country is under martial law; northern bayonets keep the people from overt acts of treason against the Washington Government. Besides this, the Americans have no navy, and in a war with England greenbacks would go down almost to zero. The worse that can happen will be a reversion to the position we occupied before the Treaty of Washington—a very unsatisfactory one, it is true, but indefinitely preferable to national dishonor. That England will remain firm but conciliatory, we do not doubt, and that Grant's Cabinet will not at present recede from their position we think equally probable; but wiser counsels will prevail by and by, and the efforts of diplomacy, we hope, will succeed in removing every barrier to a thorough understanding between the two nations for the future. We in this country want peace, but no

"peace at any price." True, we had nothing to do with fitting out of Alabamas; the Canadian Government, at great expense, observed the strictest neutrality that one friendly power could have observed towards another, and our skirts are clean and our consciences clear on that point; but England's quarrel is our quarrel, and we shall stand by the old flag to the last.—*Sarnia Canadian*.

A GERMAN CRITIQUE ON THE AMERICAN DEMAND.—The Cologne *Gazette*, referring to the claims put forth in the American case says: "Think a little on the magnitude of the sum comprised under the six heads enumerated. It is at least as much, if not more than France must pay to Germany for her foiled aggression, but which she consented to pay when her armies were everywhere overthrown, her Emperor taken prisoner, her capital captured, her strongest fortresses fallen, a great part of her territory in hostile occupation, her resources and her prospects utterly destroyed—in short, when there no longer remained to her a hope of a change for the better. Contrary to this, an equal sacrifice is demanded from England on account of disputed questions, which admit of different interpretations, and especially before the adversaries have measured their strength. It appears inconceivable. The fifth part which demands an indemnity for the prolongation of the war, would alone impose upon the English a contribution of £400,000,000, for the cost of the war to the Union amounted yearly to £200,000,000; and that the struggle was prolonged two whole years by England's fault alone is a proposition which has long enjoyed widespread credence in America. Compared with this, what is the sum of \$14,000,000 which is demanded as compensation for the owners of the ships and cargoes destroyed by the Southern cruisers, and which England in her innocence supposed would be the principal item in the American bill submitted to the Geneva Council of Arbitration. It must be supposed that America has run up her demands so high in order that the award, even after great deductions may still amount to a considerable sum. This may perhaps be smart, but it certainly is not dignified, nor politically judicious. Respectable individuals and respectable States, as a rule claim only what they are entitled to, and the one merit hitherto of the Treaty of Washington was that it was designed to be an example of fairness and moderation. But the example will fare ill if unjustifiable claims are put forward, not to mention if the Americans should in the end be dissatisfied with their government should it obtain only a fraction of what it had originally demanded for the Union and for citizens who had suffered injury. Respecting the inner justification of these claims, the English have good grounds to ask the Americans. 'You moral people, why do you not apply to us the measure of neutral duties which you have applied to yourselves and your conduct during the Franco-German war? Pray, did you not a year ago sell ship loads of arms and munitions of war, by means of which Gambetta was enabled to prolong for months resistance to the German armies? The preservation of the peace of the world and the welfare of all nations is of higher interest to us Germans than the gratification of a malicious pleasure, otherwise we could not help feeling satisfaction that the only two countries which, for the sake of a miserable gain, supplied our enemies with the means of stubbornly prolonging the contest have fallen out with one another on account of a similar piece of huckstering.'

FRONTIER RIFLE ASSOCIATION.

The tenth annual meeting of this association was held at Franklin centre on the 13th February. The attendance of delegates was good, nearly every company being represented. Lieut. Col. Fletcher, President, occupied the chair. The report and financial statement was read and adopted. The Treasurer's report shewed a handsome balance on hand. The following gentlemen were then elected the office bearers for the ensuing year.

President: Lieut. Col. Fletcher.

Vice Presidents: Lieut. Cols. Rogers, Ried and Macdonald; Majors McNaughton, Lucas and McFee, Captains Johnson and Bredner.

Secretary Treasurer: Lieut. Colonel McEachern.

Council: The President, Vice Presidents, Secretary-Treasurers, and the Captains of Companies.

The several Committees were next appointed, after which it was unanimously resolved, that the next annual match be held at Havelock, the time to be determined upon by the President and Secretary so that it shall not interfere with the annual camp drill. A list of matches and prizes was also adopted.

The case of the young man McCarroll whose sight was injured at the last match, was brought before the meeting, when the sum of \$25.00 was voted as a gratuity to him.

From the interest shewn by the officers and members of the association, as well as by the people of the county of Huntingdon, the next match promises to be a very successful one. This association has done a great deal towards keeping up the *esprit de corps* and efficiency of the border volunteers in the 2nd Brigade division, and its continued prosperity reflects credit on its managers. An additional feature of interest at the next match, will be a match between the Borderers and the Rangers for a champion cup presented by the Lieut. Colonels belonging to the association.—*The News*.

DEBT OF CANADA.

The debt of the Dominion as it stood on the 30th June, 1868, is payable as follows:

Payable in 1872.....	\$255,951 87
" 1873.....	882,868 43
" 1874.....	36,772 00
" 1875.....	1,851,433 33
" 1876.....	3,957,203 34
" 1877.....	1,531,833 35
" 1878.....	569,533 33
" 1879.....	2,657,113 33
" 1880.....	7,613,413 33
" 1881.....	6,111,560 00
" 1882.....	1,338,333 32
" 1883.....	2,684,940 00
" 1884.....	1,357,965 00
" 1885.....	1,529,266 66
" 1886.....	33,658,962 54
" 1887.....	3,471,093 33
" 1888.....	474,266 67
" 1889.....	1,703,333 33
" 1891.....	959,220 00
" 1892.....	705,666 67
" 1893.....	600,000 00
" 1895.....	40,000 00
" 1896.....	88,500 00

The Right Hon. Edward Cardwell, Secretary of State for War, has submitted to Parliament the ministerial estimate for the support of the army during the military year from April, 1872, to April, 1873. The figures show a reduction of £1,000,000 from the estimate of the year from 1871 to 1872.