

foreign credit as contained in foreign goods and commodities of every kind. This is the "end" held in view. The partial cessation of foreign credit, on the renewal of which in ever-varying forms so much of our Trade depends, is the last straw which breaks the back of many a merchant tottering on beneath a load of over-trade which he could only hope gradually to reduce with safety to himself and others. He cannot reduce it so suddenly as required by the "N. P." Thus Insolvencies spring suddenly to light both in expected and unexpected quarters, till, hoping to stem the tide with a pitchfork of legislation, the Government legally puts an end to insolvency. It so strikes another death-blow at foreign credit. Foreigners can't find time or money to indulge in all these eccentricities of chattel-mortgages, registered judgements, and preferences; and even if they could they know the native creditor is pretty certain to get the best of them. The Foreigner therefore seeks other fields of investment where his interests are afforded something like equitable consideration. Thus we are thrown still more upon our own resources. Our bankers, knowing this full well, look carefully to securities. They are well aware of the effect. They see they must deal with actual values of securities here, within the Dominion, and can no longer depend on the continuation of foreign credit to recover their loans. Here we have the "cause" of the general demand for more money wherewith to buy goods for cash to supply our needs. Government seizes on the prevailing outcry, and tries to create more money for its own wants and those of others by watering the currency, and legally appropriating to its own uses the actual wealth of our banks and our people. Such is the "effect"—an embryo "rag-baby."

It is needful to retrace our steps. As a nation we are young yet, and can still do so. Recent errors are teaching us a wisdom which is conspicuous by its absence in our teachers. Already Montreal is waking to the advisability of erecting herself into a free port, and thus inviting ships of all nations. This is only a step towards free trade and direct taxation. It is no more an advantage to us to keep ships from our ports by taxing them than it is to keep goods and credit away by making both costly. The increased revenue derived from such a source can, in the nature of things, be only temporary. We gradually thereby slaughter the goose which lays the golden eggs; or rather send her flying elsewhere to lay them. Our energies were better employed in slaying the cause of the evil, *i.e.*, the spiff of "party" and class legislation which infests with its fetid breath the atmosphere of our politics. Absolute government by majorities is not freedom. It is mob-law. The mob may be a respectable one or a disreputable; but its influence is mob law all the same. Freedom rests, not on votes of majorities, but on the Divine right of man to use his faculties to the full so long as he does not infringe upon a similar liberty for others. Any majority-vote which aims at these natural and intrinsic rights is tyranny and oppression. However much the "party" may triumph the community must suffer if the majority achieved by it is used to deprive the minority of freedom to exercise their faculties honestly in trade with any or every nation. To vote with party may be noble, but to vote only for such measures as are just and equitable towards the whole community is nobler far. No man should sink the higher nobility in the lesser aim of mere fidelity to a party which lives only to dominate the rights of others by means of a majority vote.

Such a resolve faithfully carried out would have sunk the Scott temperance act, the "N. P.," the repeal of the Insolvent Act, and the banking and currency bill. Yet these sum up the whole of the active legislation of the "party" at present in power. The record is unpleasant. It will be altogether most wholesome when it is at an end and we can look back upon it with a less redolent shame from the heights of experience we shall ere long attain.

"Excelsior."

THE POLITICAL DESTINY OF CANADA.

BY JAMES LITTLE.

(Continued from our last issue.)

These are some of the chief arguments against Annexation which I find running through an article headed Canadian Nationality, which the *Canadian Monthly*, of Toronto, thought important enough to publish in its February number. It is from the pen of Mr. William Norris, of that city. He writes a very readable essay, and it is not his fault for not finding common sense arguments when none exist. But surely he ought to know that in the event of Annexation there would be no "their" and "our" in question. We would be States of the Union with all the privileges and rights enjoyed by the other States comprising it. He, like the *Globe*, appears to think it would be to the interest of the older States to do all they could to abuse and injure us. Did they do so with Louisiana, Texas or California? He is evidently unacquainted with commercial matters, or he would see that it would be Portland, Boston and New York that would suffer, and not the Canadian seaboard, and his knowledge of the political geography of the United States must be limited when he thinks the east controls the west and north west in trade arrangements, as the reverse is the case. Were Canada a part of the Union, Montreal would in a few years become a summer shipping port second only to New York.

But, supposing we were independent, how long would it be before the Eastern States would bring on a conflict on the fishing grounds, and in that case, how long would our independence last? Just so long as they could despatch one or two war vessels to take possession of the Lower St. Lawrence. That is all they would require to do, without firing a shot on land or water, to force us into the Union if they desired it.

Were Mr. Norris a native of this Province, and his name a little less Hibernian, I should be inclined to take him for a lineal descendant and representative of the first Norman colonists for whom the Parisians composed the prayer, "O Lord, we Thy chosen people do not ask for wealth, only do Thou place us alongside somebody who has it." He would be placed alongside the United States to get access to their markets and every other good thing they have to share, and perhaps repay them with abuse.

The *Globe* appears to agree with Mr. Norris that nothing would be gained by annexation. It wants to know "how the interests of Canadians would be advanced by annexation?" And it is the *Globe*—the leading organ of a great party, the leading political journal of the Dominion—that wants the information.

Would Canadian interests not be advanced by sweeping away the battalions of custom officials who block the free interchange of the products of both countries, on both sides of the line, and that at an enormous cost?

Would Canadian interests not be advanced by having a market free from duties and all obstructions alongside of them, for their farm produce of every name and nature, and their lumber of all descriptions, (rough, dressed, manufactured, &c.,) without having to pay one-quarter to one-half their value in duties to a foreign nation?

Would Canadian interests not be advanced by the manufacturers of all kinds of wares and textiles having a free market of fifty millions of consumers, and sharing in all those the States opened up abroad?

Would it be no advantage to have our lake craft, which are rotting in our harbours or wearing out pursuing a losing business, profitably employed in the trade of the western lakes?

Would it be no advantage to have our ocean vessels partake in the coasting trade from the eastern boundary of Maine to the Gulf of Mexico, and thence to and from all parts of the world under protection of the American flag?

Would it be no advantage to have our shipwrights profitably employed in building lake craft and a commercial marine for the Union, which in respect to wooden vessels they could construct cheaper than any other country?

Would it be no advantage to have the wheels of our whole industries, which have so long remained blocked, set in permanent motion, and our people share in the wealth and prosperity of the most prosperous and progressive nation on earth?

Would it be no advantage to have an inflow of American capital to develop our vast mineral resources, build up manufacturing industries, and improve our cities, towns, and villages?

Would it be no advantage to have our waste lands in Ontario and Quebec occupied by American farmers, who would know how to work them?

Would it be no advantage to have our crushing burden of taxation taken off our shoulders, by making over our North-west Territory to the States in payment?

Would it be no advantage to stop the exodus and save the country from depopulation?

Would it be no advantage to be protected from all foreign aggression, and our people secured in peacefully developing the great resources of the country, many of which remain hidden in the bowels of the earth—unexplored and out of sight?

Would it be no advantage to have the liberties of the people secured, and themselves freed from the cost and loss of keeping an army, which both of our political parties have for years been engaged in organizing—withdrawing our young men from peaceful industrial pursuits to learn military gun handling and sword exercise, field evolutions in camping out, target practice to ascertain at what distance they could shoot down their fellow men, with batteries of artillery, schools of gunnery, royal military colleges for the scions of our aristocracy, and imported lieutenant-generals to take command? Our army of volunteers now number 40,000—about double the regular army of the United States, and it is just announced by the Press that "a scheme has been drawn up, with the approval of the Canadian Government, for the establishment of an army reserve to consist of 10,000 men drawn from the Dominion militia, who will be liable to serve in the Dominion, England or abroad in the event of Great Britain being involved in war." A navy and a naval reserve are, I find, also favourably mooted by the Press. Has the Government totally lost its senses? Has the Press gone mad? It would look like it. The people are crushed down with a load of taxation, the country is in a state of bankruptcy, and in the face of this the Government approve of further burdening them with the cost of a standing army of 10,000 men drawn from the producers of the country—and the Press pats them on the back; and for what? To meet Gen. Sherman with his five hundred thousand veterans of the late war, who, if