

to the writer of the article, would be that the United States would surrender \$12,000,000 of duties, while the surrender of duties by the British West Indies would have been \$750,000.

The opinion of the writer in the *Banker's Magazine* is that it is impossible for the United States, with its large population, to make a profitable exchange of markets with the countries which have been desirous of effecting such arrangements. The reason is said to be the obvious one, which is that the United States market is that of 57,000,000 of the largest consumers in the world, while no other American country has more than a few millions, and in respect to most of them, the average *per capita* consuming power of their people is comparatively small. Our chief reason for noticing the article in the *Banker's Magazine* is to point out the wide difference between reciprocity between countries producing articles of a different description, and which are likewise produced by other countries, the effect being to impose discriminating duties against such countries, and a reciprocal free exchange of natural products, which are exported by both the countries which are parties to the arrangements.

It by no means follows that because the United States would suffer loss from abolishing the duties on sugar the produce of the British West Indies, in exchange for the free admission into such a limited market, of its flour, provisions and lumber it would also suffer by the free admission of breadstuffs from Canada, both countries being exporters to foreign markets of their surplus. There can be no doubt, however, that there is a strong prejudice in the United States against treaties of reciprocity, and we confess that we have little hope that it will be found possible to obtain a renewal of the old reciprocity treaty of 1854, which worked most satisfactorily for many years, and was only abrogated owing to feelings of dissatisfaction arising from the sympathy manifested in favor of the South by a portion of the Canadian people. The necessity, which is becoming more urgent, of raising a large revenue by import duties is another bar to the success of any scheme of reciprocity that would be found practicable in Canada, and we must console ourselves with the reflection that we have other markets for our natural products.

#### IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

It appears evident from the studied silence of the Federation League as to any definite scheme for giving effect to

their proposal that they find wide differences of opinion among themselves. Mr. McGoun, it is well known, has a scheme which he thinks well worthy of support, but in a letter addressed to the *Gazette* he has most carefully avoided entering into details. The *Toronto Week* suggests that if the promoters of the Federation League have formed any practicable scheme they should at once bring it before the Imperial Parliament, with which body any measure or authoritative overture to the Colonies must originate. From the same periodical we learn that it has been suggested by Mr. Freeman in an article in *McMillan's Magazine* that a Federation of the Empire would necessarily include the two hundred millions of *Hindoos* and give them, if representation was to be proportioned to numbers, a preponderance in the Federal council.

This is hardly a fair objection, as all the advocates of Federation have limited their demand for Colonial representation to the self-governing colonies. The issue is a most serious one, involving, as it does, the disintegration of the Empire, for the conviction that such would be the result of a successful effort to bring about the contemplated change in the relation of the self-governing Colonies to the Mother Country is by no means confined to the people of any particular section of the proposed Confederacy. Even among the leaders of the movement in England Mr. McGoun's views would be pronounced wholly impracticable. On the other hand, what has seemed to many in Canada to be a very harmless, if not desirable, change, that suggested by Earl Grey, of organizing a council composed of representatives of the Imperial Government and of the self-governing colonies, has by no means received general approbation in England, although it has satisfied the greater number, if not the whole, of the federationists whose names are being used by Mr. McGoun to entrap people in Canada. We venture to assert that not a single one of the statesmen named by Mr. McGoun, Mr. Forster, Lord Roseberry Lord Dunraven, Mr. W. H. Smith, and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, would countenance a proposition for a general body of representatives of the United Kingdom and the self-governing colonies to meet in London.

In Canada there is a great deal of misapprehension on the subject, and there are the widest differences of opinion among those who have allowed their names to be used as promoters of the League. Free traders and protectionists have gone to listen, in the hope that some scheme would be developed that would tend to promote their special views. No

one at the late meeting attempted, any more than Mr. McGoun has done, to state the grounds on which the disintegration of the Empire is apprehended. No one of the literary champions of Imperial Federation, embracing Sir William Dawson, Principal Grant, Dr. Johnson, Dr. Cornish, Mr. Murray and others expressed the least doubt of the continuance of our present relations, until certain gentlemen in London suddenly discovered that disintegration would certainly take place unless some new bond of union could be devised, which they, in their wisdom, felt assured that they could agree on.

At the very first meeting that was held, Sir Charles Tupper, the Canadian High Commissioner, succeeded in eliminating from the resolutions the declaration that disintegration was certain to ensue unless a remedy was found, and from that time to this no reason has been assigned for a change in our present system of Government. On the contrary, it will appear to reflecting minds that the English movement affords conclusive proof that its originators believe that the self-governing colonies enjoy such great advantages under the existing arrangements that they ought to be called on to contribute to the defence of the Empire. In addition to that feeling, there is a conviction in England that in return for the protection they enjoy, the colonies should either receive British manufactures duty free or at low revenue duties. That such opinions are held in England need cause no surprise, but that any people in Canada should be desirous of sacrificing the great advantages of our present position is a mystery, which we do not find that any one even attempted to solve at the late meeting in Montreal.

We entirely concur in the *Week's* opinion that the responsibility for proposing a change in our subsisting relations should devolve on the Imperial Parliament. If that Parliament should determine that, unless the Colonies agree to share in the expenses attendant on foreign wars in Europe, Asia and Africa, and unless they agree to adopt a fiscal policy such as may be determined on by some general authority, the subsisting connection must cease, then will be the proper time for Canada to determine whether it can give its assent to such a proposition. Meantime we must bear in mind that even when Canada did not enjoy that self-government which has been conceded to her, and when there was war with the great neighboring republic, there was not a whisper of a desire for disintegration, but a general union of all races in the common defence. At a later pe-