

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
						✓					

CANADA EXPECTS EVERY MAN TO DO HIS DUTY.

No. 5. June, 1880.

{ \$1.00 per year.
0.10 per copy.

RARE
HF
1
C35

THE DOMINION OF CANADA HAS ALL THE ELEMENTS OF NATIONAL GREATNESS, LET US BE A FREE PEOPLE.

A Monthly Review

DEVOTED TO



CANADIAN EMANCIPATION

AND

COMMERCIAL UNION

WITH THE

UNITED STATES.

MONTREAL:

J. X. PERRAULT & COMPANY, PUBLISHERS,

44 St. Denis Street.

THE COMMERCIAL UNION OF CANADA WITH THE UNITED STATES MEANS PERLASTING PEACE AND PROSPERITY.

WE ASK THE SUPPORT OF EVERY TRUE CANADIAN.

CANADIAN EMANCIPATION

AND

COMMERCIAL UNION WITH THE UNITED STATES.

JUNE 1880

Commercial Union with the United States.—The following letter of Mr. Wharton Barker, Executive of the Industrial League, to Hon. James A. Garfield of the U. S. Congress, is of the highest importance.

“ My Dear Sir: I have just learned that the subject of our commercial relations with Canada will be before the House Committee of Ways and Means, in an indirect way, at an early date. I take the liberty of calling your attention to some important considerations, which I believe should have great weight in moulding our national legislation in that regard.

“ The Dominion of Canada, as we all know, is a purely artificial union of English Colonies, which possesses no internal coherence. Its different members, or provinces, have with each other but slight affinities of any sort, and in commercial interests any of them would naturally be more closely associated with the adjacent States of our own country than it is with any of the rest. Their union under a common government was effected partly by political pressure and partly by fiscal inducements held out by the Mother Country. One such was the aid given to erect an unprofitable railroad, by which to effect some channel of communication between the seaboard and the inland provinces, during that large part of the year when the St. Lawrence is impassable, and thus obviate the necessity for the latter making their way to the sea across our own

territory. The policy of England in effecting this union does not concern us, except as it looks toward the commercial isolation of the Dominion from the continent to which it belongs, and its commercial dependence upon a continent with which it has only artificial relations.

“The financial position of the Dominion, whether under its recent policy of Free Trade, or its present policy of moderate Protection, has not been satisfactory. She has \$170,000,000 of debt, the interest of which presses more heavily upon her resources than does that of our debt upon those of the United States, as is shown by the annual deficits in her budget and the all but bankruptcy of most of the Provinces. She contributes to our country a larger quota of immigrants, in proportion to her population, than does any other country. She is, therefore, more than ready to accede to any reasonable arrangement which will give her a larger freedom of trade with her neighbors on our side of the line. She indicated this in her proposal for a Reciprocity Treaty in 1873, and only the failure of that Treaty in the Senate prevents her from making renewed offers. Her present Tariff, as was avowed by its chief author, Sir Leonard Tilly, was intended to force us to make concessions as regards commercial relations.

“In these circumstances it seems to many of us a perfectly wise and proper thing for the United States to take the initiative towards an adjustment of our mutual interests. But that this should not be in the direction of Reciprocity, but towards a continental *Zollverein* or Customs Union, like that which Prussia in 1828 formed with the lesser German states. Such a Union would establish absolute freedom of trade between the two countries. It would be based upon a common Tariff, enforced on the seaboard only; and the receipts from duties would be divided between the two countries according to population, or on some other just basis. My reasons for urging this as preferable to Reciprocity are briefly as follows:—

"1. If we may judge what Canada means by Reciprocity, from the proposals of the unfortunate treaty of 1873, or from the terms of that of 1854, then that measure is so one-sided and unfair to our own country as to deserve no consideration at our hands. Her first offer in 1873 was simply to allow of a completely free interchange of agricultural products between the two countries. Under Mr. Secretary Fish's leading, they enlarged this to include all those coarser grades of manufacture which were found to exist even in a British colony practising Free Trade with the Mother Country, and in which the Canadians might be expected to hold their own against our competition.

"The great object of such Reciprocity manifestly is to throw open to the Canadian farmer our Eastern markets for agricultural products and raw material. That market has been created through the development of manufactures in our Eastern and Middle States, beyond the capacity of their agriculture to supply food to the people thus employed. Canada has had no share in the sacrifices made for the development of these manufactures. She has followed the easier policy of buying in the cheapest and selling in the dearest of the markets she found open to her. She has done nothing to create other and more advantageous markets on her own soil by the diversification of her industry. It is true that she has just awakened to the necessity of doing something. Her perennial poverty has prompted the adoption of what is called a "National Policy" to that end. But the one year of that Policy, of course, has not effected any great change, and Canada is still an agricultural country, anxious for access to the better markets created in our country for her corn, her timber, and other raw materials.

"I think it is self-evident that such Reciprocity — and we have no other proposed — would be unjust, not so much to the manufacturers of the East, as to the farmers of our great West. In ordinary years four-fifths of the grain which crosses the Alleghany watershed is

consumed by the people of the Eastern States, and only one-fifth is exported. To deprive our Mississippi Valley of this great market for provisions, for the sake of Canada, at the very time when the settlement of Manitoba promises to make her a great wheat-producing country, and a leading competitor with us for the supply of wheat to Europe, would be neither wise nor patriotic.

“2. The Reciprocity plan would still entail upon us the maintenance of the expensive custom-house system which now lines our common frontier, and which will grow more costly with every expansion of the two populations, and the consequent increase of their points of contact. And, while always costly, that custom-house line must always be inefficient. Every inequality in the duties imposed by either country upon European goods, every duty imposed by either upon the products of the other, presents temptations to bold and lawless spirits to indulge in a little “Free Trade” at the less observed points of this long and purely conventional frontier. No fiscal system can be enforced by either country which does not obliterate that line, and retain the seaboard as the only customs-line, for the American continent. But no measure of Reciprocity that has ever been proposed,—neither that of 1854 nor even that of 1873,—has ever looked to any such obliteration. A Customs Union such as I have suggested would do so while Reciprocity, by relaxing the official attention to imports from Canada, might result in giving us a *Zona libera* on our Northern as well as our Southern frontier.

“3. Reciprocity would leave Canada in her present position of commercial dependence upon England, and would encourage her to maintain that position by our removal of the disadvantages which would naturally accompany it. It would give her advantages to which she has no right, and would leave her free to follow a policy hostile to the interests of the continent at large, and European rather than American in its charac-

ter. Her *political* relations to England are not our concern. So long as 'the silken rein' of the British connection pleases her, we all welcome her to wear it. But we surely have a right to expect, in entering upon closer commercial relations with her, a substantial guarantee that she feels herself a part of the great American continent, and is not ready to lend herself to such glittering Imperial schemes as recently found favor in the ministerial councils of the United Kingdom. If we may judge of her own attitude towards those schemes, as it is reflected in the speech made by Sir Alexander T. Galt, when setting out for London as Canada official representative, she was far from unwilling to entertain them. This official representative of the Dominion expressed his conviction that English Free Trade with the rest of the world having proved a failure, the people of England were awakening to the fact that they had within their Empire a larger market for their manufactures than the rest of the world can ever give them; and also, since the opening of the Manitoba region, an abundant food supply on their own territories. And he pointed to an Imperial Customs Union, by which the colonial markets for manufactures should be guaranteed to England, and the English markets for food and raw materials to her own colonies, by an Imperial Protective Tariff on both sorts of goods, as the goal toward which English public opinion was tending. It is well known that these 'great expectations' were inspired and fostered by Lord Beaconsfield. Happily, they have been laid at rest for the present by the results of the English elections; and the new Liberal Government, while less forward in proposals for closer association with the colonies, will be more ready to leave Canada free to control her own destiny.

"A Customs Union with the United States would be a final declaration of her Continental sympathies, and her farewell to Imperial aspirations. It would be a declaration of her readiness to unite with us in the

great work of developing the resources of our vast inheritance, and the creation of free nationalities of the American type in the New World.

“4. A Customs Union with Canada gives every prospect of permanence, while Reciprocity can never do so. Upon the former we can all unite. Neither Protectionists nor Free Traders need have any quarrels with an arrangement which would make Canada, for *business* purposes, one with ourselves. A Reciprocity Treaty will always be a bone of contention between the two parties, and will be exposed to all the fluctuations of party feeling. That of 1854 was a partisan measure, and its abolition in 1867 was equally a party victory.

“In view of the fact that we look to our commercial readjustment with Canada for a settlement of the Fisheries Question it is of the first importance that what is done shall be done to last forever.

“5. It may by some be doubted whether Canada is either ready or competent to enter into such an arrangement.

“From a close observation of the drift of her opinion, I am satisfied that she *is* ready. In the adoption of the Tariff of 1879 she declared to the world that she meant to make her own interests the foremost consideration in her policy. When told that the policy imperilled the British connection, her reply was, ‘So much the worse for the connection.’ She is not thriving, and cannot thrive in her present isolated position, without access to the markets of the Continent, as was shown by her readiness to embrace Lord Beaconsfield’s gorgeous but misty visions. We are her last resort, and it only remains for us to put our proposal into a shape which will confer lasting benefits upon the people of the whole Continent, instead of making one-sided proposals, expensive in their results, and with no promise of permanence.

“As to her competence, I may quote the words of Sir Alexander T. Galt:

“By the Confederation Act, the Imperial Parliament surrenders to us the complete control of our customs, excise, and every other mode and description of taxation. By that Act Great Britain voluntarily deprived herself of the power of negotiating for this country with foreign countries. She deprived herself of the right to say to Canada ‘you shall’ or ‘you shall not’ impose any particular class of duties. . . That Act has placed us *quoad* commercial questions in the same position as regards the Imperial Government as we stand in towards any foreign Government.’

“In these circumstances, would it not be timely to propose an International Commission with Canada, to negotiate a Treaty for the removal of the exciting restrictions on our mutual trade?”

I am, sir, with great regard,
Very truly yours,

WHARTON BARKER.

Phil., April, 27 1880.

The U. S. House Foreign Affairs Committee on Commercial Union. — The U. S. House Foreign Affairs Committee, on the 27th April last, agreed to the House joint resolution, requesting the President to appoint three commissioners to confer with other commissioners, to be appointed by Great Britain to ascertain and report on what to base reciprocal trade for the mutual benefit of the people of the United States and of the Canadian provinces. In speaking of the importance to this country of such an investigation, the committee state that Canada has recently erected a barrier against our productions, and is endeavouring to shut them out to a very great extent from her great territory.

The question which presents itself is whether this great country, contiguous to ours from the Atlantic to the Pacific oceans, separated from us for the most part by imaginary lines, with a large and constantly increasing population and facilities for production, traffic and

transportation, shall be constantly antagonistic to the United States, shall be forced into becoming independent of us, by building up within her own territory great manufacturing industries of all kinds, which will not only enable her to live within herself, but to compete with us in other markets of the world, or whether we can establish such mutual relations of trade, while properly protecting the individual interest of each country, as shall be of benefit to both ?

In other words, the object is to ascertain if, while there may be points of difference and adverse interests between the two countries which cannot be harmonized, there cannot be found, at least in some respects, a common ground upon which the two Governments may agree for their mutual benefit. Canada has a large and constantly increasing trade, which should not be wholly lost to the United States, if it can be retained or secured by any means wholly compatible with the interests of our own country.

The committee further say that the question is one which, in one form or another, has been pending for many years; that it is now time that it should be definitely settled, and that investigations and statements of the merits of the case should be so thorough that the settlement of the question, whatever it may be, may be regarded as a permanent one.

Thus will the all-important question of our commercial relations with the United States come officially before both Governments at an early day. Public opinion on the other side of the line, as well as in Canada favors a complete measure of reciprocity, under the auspices of a Custom House Union such as we advocate.

Emigration From Canada. — Last Tuesday morning an emigrant train left Ottawa, and by the time it reached Cobourg there were four hundred and forty-seven persons on board bound for Dakota and only three for the Canadian North-West ! Canada is losing the very flower of her hardy young men.

Thus does the "*Toronto Globe*" deplore the everyday loss of our population, which, unable to find profitable employment in Canada, is obliged to join the United States for a living. As long as we are separated from the great and prosperous people to the south of us by hostile tariffs, no hope can be entertained of bettering our circumstances.

The *Globe* must make up its mind to give up sentimental relations with the Mother Country, as the price of the prosperity of Canada, through a Commercial Union with the United States. As a business man, the Managing Director must know that the free market of the North American continent means the immediate resumption of business in every trade in Canada, a large increase of the value of property and stocks of every description, steady and remunerative employment for the laboring classes, a brisk demand for every article of Canadian production. Still the *Globe* is so thoroughly prejudiced against Canada, and in favour of British interests alone, that it will sacrifice that great future which is before us, rather than inflict the least possible damage to Imperial interests.

The *Globe* is just twenty-five years too late, and the people are beginning to lose confidence in its leadership. Let us hope that, under the new Managing Director, a new departure will be adopted, and that the great Liberal organ will be worthy of the party of progress, which it is its duty to lead and worthily represent.

Independence, Our Future.—In spite of the sentimental twaddle that some men delight to indulge in about loyalty, no one who has given the matter one hour's consideration could arrive at any other conclusion than this, that the day of Canadian independence will come as surely as to-morrow's sun. We have no reason to suppose that independence would lead to annexation, for we know that such a state would be no improvement to that in which we are now. And men

are not justified in supposing that we should fall an easy prey into the hands of our powerful neighbor.

As an independent nation we should enjoy our rights, and have our rights acknowledged by the world. With grand aspirations our young men look anxiously forward to the time when they shall lift themselves out of a servile state, and proudly raise their country to its fitting position, and register its name in the catalogue of nations. Independent of the controlling power of Great Britain, we shall negotiate treaties of commerce with distant lands, and in the course of years become England's rival in the marts of the world.

I hear some men say, "Oh, I believe in Canadian Independence, but the time has not come yet, we must wait." But I maintain that it is not to our advantage to wait. Shall we like an indolent and helpless sycophant wait to be kicked overboard, or shall we adopt the more dignified course of nailing our flag of Independence to the mast of self-reliance, and boldly follow the dictates of our own clear reason. Peacefully we shall sever the weak bands that bind us, and glide smoothly into position. The attainable ideal is within our reach, and the upward struggles of toiling men shall not be in vain.

The obstructionist may hurl his declamatory vapors, and loudly boast of his loyalty to the Crown, while he forgets his duty to his country. The plea that internal reforms demand our consideration before independence is untenable, because we never expect to arrive at that state of perfection when no reform shall be necessary. Rather let us first lay the foundation whereon we intend to build, and all necessary reform will follow. All admit that Canada has in view a bright and glorious future, therefore a free and independent spirit in her sons will give an impulse to their energy and foster their ambition. As with an individual so with a nation, when depending on their own resources they shake off their slothfulness and persevere, cheered by the knowledge that industry and

independence are conducive to prosperity and happiness.

We have surely had sufficient experience to satisfy us that we shall never get beyond the snail's pace at which we are now travelling as long as we are connected with Great Britain, and we are as old in years as our neighbours, but in comparison we are like the mushroom under the tree. And why and wherefore should this difference be? Is it not plain even to the casual observer that by a single stroke we could divert that stream of humanity, or at least one half of it, from its present course into our own channel?

The majority of persons who leave the old land are heartily sick of monarchical principles and military despotism. They hurry away from the rich man's scorn, and make haste to escape the proud man's contumely. On this side of the Atlantic they expect to find a home and friends congenial with their sentiments. But a continual increase of royalty and nobility is very detrimental to the common weal, and the longer we cling to the skirts of royalty the further we shall drift from the consummation of that state which men call liberty.

The habits and customs of those we pay allegiance to will grow upon us. We have evidence of this in the last batch of knights. These are the Canadian aristocracy in embryo, and if not nipped in the bud will develope into full grown nobles adorned in all the paraphernalia of princely state, to be followed by homage-paying spiritless lackeys, and the favored noodle shall take precedence of the man of merit, and the difference between man and man under such rule would grow greater here as it ever has done in Europe. Those few men who advocate Imperial Federation care more for the welfare of old England than they do for Canada. They would bind us firmer than ever. But neither Annexation nor Federation has any charms for young Canada. Independence and Independence alone will make this country great. SYDNEY SMITH.

Our Ambassador at the Court of St. James.—The unsatisfactory condition of our present relations with Great Britain is abundantly shewn, by the discussion which took place in the House of Commons, at the appointment of Sir A. T. Galt, as our Minister in London. Sir John A. McDonald remarked that it had been found necessary that such an officer should reside in the vicinity of Her Majesty's Government. With the growth of Canada, its increasing power and population and its increasing interests, it was found that the present mode of correspondence between this and the Mother Country was altogether unsatisfactory.

Heretofore the Dominion had been to a great degree unrepresented, and it was believed to be of great importance in the present exigency to have in England a resident agent, who might be consulted in any negotiations going on between Her Majesty's Government and the European powers upon commercial matters. It was known that the duty in France upon ships built in Canada was \$8 a ton, while the duty on ships built in England was only two francs per ton, and an extreme disadvantage to Canada of having such a discrimination against her. He believed in all sincerity that the step they were about taking was not only a very important but a very wise one, that Canada should have a resident Minister in England representing our wishes, receiving instructions from us, and going at once into a position in the Corps Diplomatique which had not hitherto been accorded to any portion of Her Majesty's empire. He was proud to believe that the Dominion was assuming the position of being an auxiliary kingdom of the Empire, and from our population and wealth and probable future, we had a right to say that we ought to be taken out of the category of mere dependencies, looking after their little interests at the beck of a Colonial Minister. The future as well as the present of the Canadian Minister depended on the satisfaction he gave to the people of Canada, not to the Colonial Minister or to the Imperial Government.

This is certainly very strong language, evidently pointing to a desire, on the part of the Canadian Prime Minister, to assume, in the near future, all the rights and privileges of a free people.

Hon. Mr. Anglin, the late speaker of the House of Commons, regarded with apprehension the appointment of a representative to be placed under the shadow of the Colonial office, leaving the impression that Canada had already too much shadowing, and that her future prosperity depended upon the full sunshine of her independence.

The Hon. Mr. Blake, the leader of the opposition, did not exactly apprehend what the Government proposed by this plan, in the way of change or modification of the arrangements between this country and England. The Prime Minister had spoken of our assuming more the position of an auxiliary kingdom, and had suggested that the present Bill was calculated to forward our claim to such a position. He had suggested, more than once, the diplomatic position the new officer was to occupy, between Canada and England. He would say that he did not desire that under the appearance of a greater measure of control over their own affairs, given to the people of Canada, a less measure of control should be practically awarded to them. He was not anxious for any change which, giving greater power to the Executive, gave less to the people, to mould their policy upon our relations with the Empire. So long as the people of Canada had no voice in the foreign policy of the Empire, he would be opposed to raising forces in this country to engage in wars incurred in carrying out that policy.

The Hon. Mr. McKenzie, late Prime Minister of Canada, in the same debate affirmed his views in an equally forcible manner.

He did not believe in a standing army. He did not believe in what Sir Alexander Galt was pleased to say respecting our neighbour to the south, "that they were a hostile, or certainly, if not a hostile, at least an

unfriendly nation." He did not believe that any responsible Minister or representative of Canada had any right to so characterize the people of the United States. He was not aware that they had shown any disposition to manifest a hostile or unfriendly spirit in any direction, and it was clearly our duty to cultivate the most friendly relations with that people.

The Colonial Minister had stated that it would rest with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs to determine, in each case, in what precise capacity the services of our ambassador might best be rendered, in the event of any negotiations with a foreign Court, on subjects affecting the interests of the Dominion

What? Was the Foreign Secretary to deal with this Minister of ours in any way he pleased? He would send for him, get his opinion, and then dismiss him, telling him that he would send for him whenever he wanted him. When Sir Alexander Galt some years ago proposed a motion that, in commercial treaties with foreign countries, the views of the Canadian Government should be ascertained, the First Minister, in his vigorous way, told them that it was nothing but an attempt at independence. He sympathized with the hon. gentleman, in the view that we ought to have something to say with regard to our own affairs, and the late Government took the best possible means to give that principle practical effect, when they refused to accept, in the settlement of our fishery affairs, any one but a man appointed by the Canadian Government.

Evidently all our leading men feel the absurdity of their position as colonists, but they have not the moral courage to advocate openly their emancipation.

U. S. Opinion against Reciprocity and in favor of a Commercial Union.—We regret to see that the defenders of the Canadian Tariff are misrepresenting the state of feeling and opinion in the United States in their defence of that measure. They say, in substance, that we have been brought to our knees by its operation,

and that the present movement towards the restoration of Reciprocity, or the establishment of a Customs' Union, grows out of our discovery that we cannot get on without Canada, and must therefore remove the barrier to free intercourse which that tariff imposes.

In replying to this, we must distinguish broadly between the advocates of Reciprocity and the friends of a Customs Union. The former are a sectional group, chiefly of manufacturers in New England, who want Canada to get free access to our markets, in order to reduce the price of food and raw materials. This is the amount and the extent of American need of Canada.

Over against these champions of Reciprocity stands the solid vote of the great agricultural States of the West, who mean that if Canada gets access to our eastern markets, she shall do so on the same terms as the other competitors for those markets. And with the western farmers in this issue stand the great bulk of the manufacturers. There is no fiscal proposition against which so large a vote can be rallied as against Reciprocity with Canada.

The friends of a Customs Union desire a solution which will relieve the question of all sectional and partisan character. Just as no American would object to an arrangement by which Canada would become an integral part of the Union, so no one can fairly object to the complete assimilation of the fiscal systems of the two countries, and the removal of all the restrictions upon their mutual trade. That would be a fair and equal bargain, and a final settlement of all our disputes. There is great need of urgency in regard to such proposals at present, for the popular feeling toward Canada is not friendly, nor does it promise to become such at an early date, if our present arrangements are to continue.

American feeling is much better reflected in the restrictive and retaliatory legislation which is before Congress and its committees, and in the proposal to repeal the Clayton-Bulwer Treaty, than in Mr. S. S. Cox's report for a Commission on Reciprocity. And

when such urgency, though used in the interests of peace and good feeling, is interpreted to indicate an overwhelming sense of the importance of Canadian trade, it is simply and grossly misinterpreted. We can get on much better without Canada than she can get on without us. But people who look forward to the future of the continent, are struck with the fact that every year since the Dominion became a united and responsible country has yielded its own harvest of annoyance and misunderstanding between the two countries. "The beginning of strife," says the wise king, "is as when one letteth out water." A very little cleft in the dam to-day may mean a deluge to-morrow. The wise way is, to resist beginnings by removing all occasion for strife.—*American Exchange*.

Who is the Traitor.—It is becoming quite fashionable for the noodles who preside over some party papers, and who could not be accused of thinking, much less of producing argument, to hold up their "loil" hands and cry "treason" and "annexation" at the individual or journal advancing a national sentiment, or drawing attention to the absurdities and expensiveness of our present system of government.

We ask the intelligent reader: Who is the traitor? The startled citizen who, perceiving the rocks ahead, would save the ship of state by counselling a change of course, or the narrow partisan who cannot see beyond the limits of his own party, and comfortably sings "all's well" when all is not well?

Our Government, with its endless machinery, teeming representatives, vice-regal humbuggery, and ridiculous anomalies, is expensive enough for an empire of forty millions, yet every administration from the day of Confederation has piled up additional debt for the prosecution of the most chimerical schemes, until now we are on the very verge of bankruptcy. Hopelessly in debt, what would loyalty or British connection do for us? Our only salvation would be in

annexation, if the Americans would take us and shoulder a share of our burdens.

We agree with the *Chatham Tribune* in the above timely remarks. Let us be loyal to the best interests of Canada, and let the anti-Canadian party follow the unpatriotic course of building up the Empire at the expense of Canada.

An English Canadian on Independence and Annexation.—SIR,—In my estimation, it is folly to think of such a thing as independence, so long as the Americans are open to receive us. We are assimilated in commerce, language, customs and general character, and did reciprocity exist between the two countries, we would be virtually one nation. But Canadians do not want reciprocity, nor protection, nor independence, neither do we want to hang on to the coat tails of John Bull for the next century, but we wish to form a part, and no unimportant part, of the American Republic. Our old inhabitants, who still have the remembrance of their grey-haired grandfathers, who gave up their houses and lands, like foolish jackasses, and came to Canada to be under the protection of the British flag, when they might have been as well protected under the Stars and Stripes, are the only ones who fight against annexation.

The rising generation, as a rule, particularly those whose parents emigrated from the British Isles, favor annexation, and when these grow to be men, nothing will hinder us from forming a part of the United States. If we had annexation, Montreal and Toronto, as American towns, would receive fresh impetus to their growth, because the Americans, knowing that in benefiting our cities they were not benefiting towns under British rule, would join with us in promoting their growth. Montreal is no doubt better situated for export trade than New York, and nobody will dispute that the former city would in ten years double its commerce and population.

It would be characteristic of the Americans that they would strive as much as lay within their power to make us at home among them. American capital would soon push the Pacific Railway across the Rocky Mountains, and the Northern Pacific would be abandoned as a useless railway traversing a worthless country. Winnipeg and Fort William would grow into mighty cities. British Columbia and the Maritime Provinces would rest contented, and, as good Americans, join in increasing the glory and power of the great American Republic. ENGLISH CANADIAN.

A great many business men think that way, but the mass of the people are prepared for a commercial union only with the United States, involving of course the independence of Canada.

This would give us all the material advantages of annexation, and the United States are not desirous for more.

Let us open our Eyes to our Colonial Nothingness.—“The fact is, that the discussion of trade questions, developed by the introduction of the N. P., has made apparent the weakness of our system of Government in dealing with commercial questions, and is tending to ripen up that growing national feeling, which in all our institutions has set strongly for independence.

Our artful Premier, who deserves credit for detecting so readily every breeze of public opinion, thought to appease this feeling by having Canada recognized at London through a resident Minister. The result cannot but have the effect of opening the eyes of our most blind Imperialists to our *colonial nothingness*, and of hastening the day when Canada, in every other sense a nation, shall demand the right to deal as a nation with the nations of the earth.”

These sentiments of the *Lambton Advocate* are being echoed from every part of the Dominion. East and West, a general feeling is rapidly growing that we,

as the only colonists in Free America, are a blot on our continent.

That there should be now 100,000,000 of free men in America, the independent citizens of seventeen republics, while we are yet under the petty coat of the mother country, is perfectly unaccountable. Although repeatedly told to set up house for ourselves, we have not yet found courage enough to do so; much to the general disgust of the free people around us, as well as in England.

The Imperial Zollverein. the baseless Fabric of a Vision.—Just before the English elections, Sir Alexander Galt set out for London as the recognized representative of the Dominion of Canada in English Governmental circles. At a parting banquet in Montreal he told the public that he had a specific errand as well as a general one. He went to aid in the organization of an Imperial Zollverein, by which all commerce should be free within the bounds of the British Empire, while a common tariff should limit the transactions of each part of that Empire with the rest of the world. We do not believe that a proposal so audacious would have been announced by an official representative of Canada without some encouragement from Downing street. As we said some time ago, all signs go to show that Beaconsfield has been cherishing such a plan, as furnishing the true solution of England's financial difficulties, and as helping to consolidate the Empire itself into a magnificent political unity. But, unfortunately for Sir Alexander Galt and for Canada, it shares in the defeat of its imaginative author. No one who knows the character and position of the English Liberals will suppose that they will entertain such a scheme. All their interests all their convictions, and all their instincts, are hostile to it. Sir Alexander Galt may find useful employment in London as "Minister for Canada," but his Imperial Zollverein has vanished "like the baseless fabric of a vision."

Not only Beaconsfield, but the Canadian ministry must have given encouragement to this scheme. It is true that they abandoned their own professions of pursuing a National Policy for Canada in so doing, but consistency has never been the strong point of Canadian politicians. The McDonald Ministry are evidently not satisfied with the results of their national policy nor with the present industrial position of Canada. If they were so they would have paid no attention to such schemes. Their organs sometimes speak of Americans as evidently desirous of improved relations with Canada, and as showing more concern about it than is felt on the northern side of the line. Such insinuations are out of place since this last disclosure. It is no longer to be denied that Canada cannot maintain her present isolated position. She must have an outlet in some direction. The British Empire has failed her; its representatives offer her nothing. She has no direction in which to look, except that in which Providence points her—to the continent to which she properly belongs, and to the people from whom she can obtain far more solid advantages by a customs union than any promised by the castle in the air which has just been wrecked. She needs us far more than we need her, but no American will hesitate on that account to make the first approaches, which we can better afford than she. *American Exchange.*

The Canadian Question.—Readers of the public journals must have noticed of late a great revival of this subject, and we look forward to its being the one which will be the most prominent in the future. Many things conduce to this. The fact that a separationist Government is in power in England, must lead the minds of Canadians to think what is to become of our country, in case of any difficulty over the fisheries between England and the United States. There is at present a law being introduced into the American Congress abrogating the Treaty of Washington. When

that law comes into effect, we no longer shall have the right of exporting fish and fish oil into the United States free of duty, while no doubt the American fishermen will still continue to fish within the three-mile limit; so there is every prospect of very serious complications arising between the two countries.

The question for Canada is, what will she do in case England refuses to enforce her rights to the fisheries? The present Government of England would not go to war with the United States to enforce the rights of Canada in that respect. Indeed, we have been told very plainly, when the present men were in power before when they hauled down the British flag at Quebec and sold us the cannon as old iron, that the sooner we prepared to assume our independence and protect ourselves, the better they would like it. The present Government is more extreme and anti-Colonial than the one in power then.

Sir C. Dilke, now Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, has plainly given his opinion of us in his "Greater Britain," and Chamberlain, the leader of the anti-Colonial Manchester School, is far more against us than John Bright was. These two men, Dilke and Chamberlain, were not in the Government which treated us so cavalierly before, and consequently we may expect more extreme measures from this Government, especially considering the large radical majority at its back. The all-important question, therefore, for Canadians at the present time is what position we should assume in case of being deserted by England on the fishery question; shall we fold our hands like the Turk, trust to Providence and let ourselves drift? or shall we take our own part, assume whatever power is necessary, and protect our own interests, not only in regard to the fisheries, but everything else Canadian; in a word, shall we continue to dangle as the mere tail of an European kite, while our property is taken away from us, or shall we assume that status among nations which will enable us to protect ourselves and to in-

voke that public opinion against national wrong which is the chief protector of the weak States of Europe ?

As aids to a conclusion on this vital matter there have been many pamphlets published. At the starting of the Canadian National Movement some years ago in this city, a good deal was written on the subject. Among the many pamphlets written at that time the most important in our opinion was the "Canadian Question," written by Mr. William Norris, inasmuch as it went into the subject more extensively than any others. The others were chiefly founded on sentiment. This not only takes that into consideration, but also bristles with statistics. It is a book of nearly one hundred pages, divided into six chapters, and is a strictly argumentative treatise on the subject of the political destiny of Canada.

The first chapter is an historic and philosophical argument, going to show that all nations have their origin in the colony, and from that beginning develop naturally into independent self-governing communities. The second chapter is a careful analysis of the people of Canada, dividing them into their natural orders and origins, and showing beyond a doubt that they are abundantly able to sustain any change that may come. The third chapter is devoted to the future, discusses our present position, shows it cannot be permanent, and exposes the weaknesses of Imperial Federation. The fourth chapter examines the subject of annexation to the States, extensively and fundamentally compares the Canadian and American peoples together in their moral, business, and political aspects, also the geographical position of the two countries, and concludes that, unless something be done to prevent it, annexation is a moral certainty.

Chapter five is devoted to the subject of Canadian Independence. It shows the evils Canada is laboring under in its present condition, subject to the evils of any war England may have with the United States, or any other Power ; her \$50,000,000 worth of shipping

liable to destruction without any thing to say in the matter whatever; not able to make a British subject or to give a national status to immigrants; worse off than a foreign country as regards copyright, as foreigners can publish English books while Canadians cannot, even by paying for the privilege; her shipping liable to a tax of \$8 per ton in the French markets, while the ships of other British subjects only pay twenty cents per ton; her territory invaded and taken to pay for the wrongs inflicted by England on Ireland and the United States—the low political condition of colonists, and generally, that independence is the only thing that can prevent Canada from being absorbed by the United States.

The best chapter is an answer in the affirmative to the question, could Canada support independence? We have devoted more space than usual to a review of this pamphlet, as we believe it is in every way worthy of perusal, and is eminently adapted for the present time. When first published it was in advance of public sentiment, and it encountered the hostility of the *Globe*, which, in a column of its usual denunciatory rhetoric, condemned it as everything bad. We are far away from that period now. Canadians are assuming every day the full right to discuss and read everything that concerns the future of their country; and no where that we know of is the “Canadian Question” discussed in a more clear, comprehensive and intelligent manner than in the book before us.

The N. Y. Herald in favor of a Zollverein.—This great question of our commercial relations with the Dominion has at last come up in Congress in a practical though dilatory shape. Within the last few days an amended joint resolution has been reported from the house committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed, which starts in the safe direction of attempting to understand the subject before taking any action upon it. The proposed joint resolution

merely requests the President to appoint three commissioners to confer with other commissioners to be appointed by the British government "to ascertain and report on what basis reciprocal trade can be established."

A clear and judicious report sustaining this joint resolution has been presented to the House by Mr. Cox, the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The report wisely avoids any expression of opinion as to what the basis of the new arrangement should be. It merely urges that the subject is of great importance, both to the United States and the Dominion; that it is so complex and difficult as to require a more exhaustive inquiry than can be given it by members of Congress who have so many other duties; that the present is a fit time for the investigation, since the new Canadian tariff tends to create interests which will be hostile to reciprocal trade; that it is important that the business relations between these neighboring countries be established on some satisfactory, and, if possible, permanent basis. The expense of the commission will be trifling, and its report may be expected to shed needed light on an important question which has for many years excited deep interest on both sides of the border. We can conceive of no ground on which this moderate and cautious measure can be opposed.

If the proposed commission should be created it will be its duty to examine the subject in all its aspects. We are not convinced that a reciprocity treaty is the true solution of the problem. If the proposed commission is appointed, it should direct its attention to the advantages of a *zollverein* as well as of a reciprocity treaty. Previous to the investigation and in the present state of our knowledge we strongly incline to the opinion that a *zollverein* is the proper measure. Unless trade between the two countries is made absolutely free there will still be a necessity for a long line of custom houses on a frontier extending thousands of

miles, with infinite possibilities of smuggling across the border. With a *zollverein* there would be no necessity of custom houses, except at the Atlantic ports and a vast army of revenue agents and spies for the detection of smugglers. With all possible precautions smuggling could not be prevented on so extensive a frontier. If the Canadian duty on particular classes of goods should be less than the United States duty, or *vice versa*, smugglers would do a heavy and lucrative business in both countries. It would be better to leave trade across the border perfectly free in all kinds of goods, whether domestic or imported, and establish a uniform scale of duties to be collected on the coast.

We are aware that there are practical difficulties in a *zollverein* as well as in a treaty of reciprocity. If a uniform tariff could be established, once for all, the problem would be easy. But there is a constant necessity for changes of rates in order to adjust revenue to expenditures. But if it required the concurrence of two governments to make changes there would be danger of a perpetual deadlock. Great as this difficulty may be, we cannot think it insurmountable, at least not until after an intelligent commission possessing special qualifications shall have failed to discover any means of obviating it. There would be another difficulty in finding a just proportion for dividing the customs revenue. To apportion it in the ratio of population would give Canada more than its equitable share. The duties are ultimately paid by consumers, and the people of the United States being more wealthy than the people of Canada they would pay a larger proportion *per capita*, especially in articles of luxury, on which duties are usually high.

But we are confident that these difficulties can be overcome, and that a *zollverein* would prove an incalculable benefit to both countries.

Public Opinion on Commercial Union. — *Canadian Emancipation* has reached our table. From the first

announcement we were curious to see it. Its name embraces so much. We have carefully perused this magazine, and have come to the conclusion that its chief object is to call the attention and enlist the sympathies of Canadians in behalf of their own country.

To foreigners this may seem exceedingly strange, that the circumstances and conditions of Canadian political life should make an occasion for the upgrowth of a publication of such aims and ambitions. Such, however, are the facts of the case, and no facts were ever fraught with more importance to the Dominion than these.

Out of this righteous discontent must come a national sentiment, which, under proper guidance, will lift our country from Colonial babydom to a vigorous, proud and promising nation.

We wish that the *Canadian Emancipation Review* may find all the sympathy and support it can possibly merit, and that its merit will challenge the respect and command the attention of the common sense of the Dominion. We hope its mission is a high and a sacred one. Let it develop, and when "our seventy-six" will come, the glory of the satisfaction will appear to those who can appreciate the difference between semi-nothingness and equal rights among the nations of the earth. — *Chatham Tribune*.

We receive the following from Kincardine:— Enclosed you will find one year's subscription to your paper. We are much pleased with the numbers sent us, and we wish you good success in your enterprise. It is astonishing to me that the Canadian people cannot see that their true interest lies with the United States and not with a foreign country beyond the seas. If they do not wake up to realize their situation soon the country will become depopulated and ruined. People are leaving here in droves, mostly for the States. X.

Independence or Annexation.—There are two solutions to our present difficulties. Either we must have

independence and Commercial Union with the United States, or we shall have Annexation pure and simple. We believe in the first proposition as the best of the two, but others will advocate the second, as will be seen by the following report of a meeting of Canadians in New York, which we clip from the *N. Y. Sun*.

A meeting of British-American colonists was held in a private residence in Union Hill, yesterday, to organize a society to agitate the annexation of Canada to the United States. Mr. Colin Macintire, of Arichat, Nova Scotia, presided, and made an address. He said that whatever glimmer of progress or show of advancement Canada may present is only a dim reflection of the greatness and success of American institutions, and that the Government of Ottawa is a puerile pomposity, a system of hollow formalities and crushing expenditure in view of the condition of a people overwhelmingly burdened with taxes. The speaker added :

“ We cannot be made dupes for the elevation of a scion of royalty when we are almost under the very canopy of the Government which, in the hour of iron rule and impending war in Europe, stands conspicuously alone as the greatest example of popular government. Upon us alone is imposed the last vestige of imperialism in North America. Unripe as we now are for the development of any exact plans, let us hope that gradually we shall reach precise methods of giving tone and force to our project, and by a definite and temperate course vitalize the scheme of the annexation of Canada and Newfoundland to the United States.”

The speaker was enthusiastically applauded, and Mr. Jacques Cartier of Quebec, a relative of the statesman of that name, arose and said :

“ Fellow colonists, I wish I had had a week’s warning in which to have prepared myself to do you justice in expressing my views on the important and intricate question we have assembled to discuss. Would to God that at this moment I could see a clear path

toward the fulfilment of the scheme of annexation. (Cheers.) I confess, and I only repeat the confession of all young men in the Dominion and Newfoundland, that I would sign with a vim a shipload of memorials about to go to England, praying for our peaceful cession to the United States. Corruptions have been concealed in Canada by the flimsy veil of aristocratic vanity which would have sent the perpetrators to the penitentiary in the United States. Representing a poor people, and a country largely wanting in modern improvements, the officers of the Government have assumed responsibilities and entered into contracts which are virtually criminal in the face of the resources or the possible resources of the Dominion."

Several other gentlemen spoke. Mr. Michael J. Daly of Newfoundland said he would be proud to see the American flag float over Cape Race and at the northern-most point of Labrador. Gentlemen from Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, St. John, New Brunswick; Montreal, Toronto, Halifax, Hamilton, and various other sections of British North America were present.

The members permanently elected yesterday afternoon were Mr. Colin Macintyre, Chairman; Mr. Robert Islington, of Toronto, First Assistant Chairman; Mr. George Vermyle of London, Ont., Second Assistant Chairman; Mr. William Henry E. Haughton of Montreal, Treasurer; Mr. Michael J. Daly of Newfoundland, Secretary. The society is to be known as the Annexation League.—*N. Y. Sun.*

The Opinion of the Press on Independence.—We detest any person or paper that howls for freedom of speech and of the press, and then jumps at the throat of the first man who dares to express an opinion or espouse a cause that does not agree with his or its manner of thinking. An individual will transfer his business to the district where he thinks it will thrive best; and we think it is the right and duty of a people,

at all times to sacrifice small sentiment to the general welfare. To struggle along in poverty for the sake of living under a particular flag, when a change would be beneficial, is an absurdity. A people have the right to do the best they can for themselves at all times, and no cheap sentiment should restrain them from making such changes as they consider expedient. (*Ottawa Herald*)

Mr. Perrault's new magazine, entitled "Canadian Emancipation," is out, brand new, daring its existence boldly, as the opening sentence of the first article indicates: "In unfolding to-day the flag of Canadian emancipation and commercial union with the United States we answer the earnest call of patriotic citizens and business men, all over the land." The new periodical is nicely written, well printed, and presents a creditable appearance, but it is Canadian Independence from first to last, and has a good stiff backbone. (*Montreal Star.*)

We are receiving, from every part of the Dominion and the U. S. letters of approval and encouragement. The following is a fair sample of many of them:

TOURNANDA, New York, May, 1880.

J. X. PERRAULT & Co.:

A periodical conducted by an able corps of writers, devoted to the great question of Canadian independence and closer commercial alliance with the United States, upon just and equitable principles, has been greatly needed.

He or they who are instrumental in bringing about this most desirable of all events will gain an imperishable name, and will bequeath inestimable advantages not only to the present generation, but its benign influence will be felt by millions yet unborn. Let the good work go on, and let Canada be free! *Interests: human rights; the right of Rulers by the consent of the governed is and should ever be the basis of true loyalty!*
A Canadian.

The Cotinental and Anti-Continental Policies.—

The great and pressing question of the day is that of commercial relations and of public works in connection with them. There are two policies, either of which a statesman may take without forfeiting that title, but between which every statesman is called upon to choose, and which may be called the Continental and the Anti-Continental. The Anti-Continental policy is that of the present government. It is the commercial corollary of Jingoism. Its cardinal principle, frankly enunciated the other day by its ambassador to England, is that the people of the United States are to be viewed and treated commercially as "a hostile or, at least an unfriendly people." and that Canada is to be cut off as much as possible from the continent inhabited by them and to which she geographically belongs.

It is the policy of a party here identical with the Tory party in England, and endeavouring, in the interest of Toryism, to create a power antagonistic to democracy on this continent. It regards Canada not as a community of the New World with interests and a future of her own, but as an "auxiliary kingdom" to be governed by a quasi-aristocracy of Knights. In commerce, as in everything else, it shuns the contagion of the Republic. Its instruments are the political railroads destined to weld together Provinces widely separated by nature, and to prevent their inhabitants from using the natural routes, which lie through American territory; a sharp customs line severing Canada from American markets; commercial treaties to connect her with other parts of the Globe; and, if possible, an Imperial Zollverein.

Its adherents contemplate, not with unmixed horror, an actual war with the United States, and advocate the diversion of roads from the line of trade, as well as the increase of military expenditure, with that view. Setting aside any question as to the general object, which is a matter of opinion, this policy is proving itself to be

economically impracticable. It condemns Canada to a commercial atrophy, the inevitable effect of severance from her own continent, and commits her to an expenditure on Public Works which, especially when suffering from that atrophy, she is wholly unable to bear.

The Continental policy, on the other hand, is akin to the political spirit which has just triumphed over Jingoism in England. It accepts for Canada the position of a community of the New World, though bound by the strongest tie of affection to her parent in the Old World, and refuses to sacrifice the interest of her people in any way to that of the European Reaction. It regards the American Republic not as an object of everlasting hostility, but as a friend and neighbour. It welcomes partnership with her in all the commercial advantages of this continent, and in the construction and use of its necessary highways. It abjures the idea of wasting the substance of the Canadian people in works otherwise unnecessary and unremunerative, for the purpose of forcing commerce out of her natural routes, in order to save her from political contagion. It cherishes a sound financial position as the only real guarantee for general independence.

A war with the United States it refuses to contemplate as a ground for denying to Canada great advantages or imposing on her heavy burdens. Let the Knights say what they will; let conventional opinion applaud the Anti-American eloquence of Governor-Generals on the stump as loudly as it may, there is evidently nothing in the Continental policy repugnant to any strong or deeply-seated sentiments in the breasts of the commercial classes, or in those of the people. No Canadian man of business ever refuses dealings with Americans which he thinks will be profitable to himself. Canadian Banks have their branches and loan tens of millions in the United States. The management and ownership of the railway system is coming daily to be more in common:

When the road from the Maritime Provinces to Quebec through Maine is opened, it will be seen that shippers and passengers are not disposed to describe a vast curve to the northwards for the purpose of maintaining a military line, or of avoiding temporary contact with a nation which has no Knights. As to the people, they show their intense hatred of Republicism, and their readiness to sacrifice their material interests to its extinction, by migrating into its domain whenever they have the slightest material inducement to do so.

They are now flocking to the States by thousands: four thousand went from one Province in April. Even such of them as are farmers go in greater numbers to Minnesota and Dacota than to the territories which we are spending so many millions to incorporate. While all this money is being squandered, and these risks are being incurred for the purpose of securing perfect and everlasting separation, the people of the two countries are quietly blending with each other, and if we may believe the current statements, a sixth of the Candian nation is already on the south of the line.—*Bystander*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

JUNE, 1880.

Commercial Union with the United States	129
Mr. Wharton Barker's Letter to Hon. G. A. Garfield.....	130
The U. S. House Foreign Affairs Committee on Commercial Union.....	135
Emigration from Canada.....	136
Independence our Future.....	137
Our Ambassador at the Court of St. James.....	140
U. S. Opinion Against Reciprocity and in Favor of a Com- mercial Union.....	142
Who is the Traitor?.....	144
An English Canadian on Independence and Annexation.....	145
Let us Open our Eyes to our Colonial Nothingness.....	146
The Imperial Zollverein the Baseless Fabric of a Vision.....	147
The Canadian Question, by Wm. Norris.....	148
The New York <i>Herald</i> in Favor of a Zollverein.....	151
Public Opinion on Commercial Union.....	153
Independence or Annexation, a N. Y. Meeting.....	154
The Opinion of the Press on Independence.....	156
The Continental and Anti-Continental Policies	158

