

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. 2

March 1880.

{ \$1.00 per year.
0.10 per copy.

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

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

WE ASK THE SUPPORT OF EVERY TRUE CANADIAN.

CANADIAN EMANCIPATION

AND

COMMERCIAL UNION WITH THE UNITED STATES.

MARCH 1880.

An authorized U. S. proposition of Commercial Union.—Mr. Wharton Barker, a prominent Philadelphia banker and Executive of the Industrial League of the United States, has addressed to the Hon. Geo. Brown, our late Reciprocity Commissioner at Washington, an authorized letter in which a Commercial Union is offered by the United States to the Dominion of Canada.

This proposition, which has the approbation of the leading men of both parties in the neighboring republic, is the most important document that has ever been offered to the consideration of our representative men in Canada. It now becomes the duty of the Federal Government, which has always expressed a strong desire for reciprocity, to approach the subject without delay. We are told what the U. S. are prepared to do, now let us know if the Canadian Government are willing to meet them half way. The abolition of all frontiers on this continent, from Mexico to the North Pole, would immediately raise this country from the despondency under which our industry and commerce are suffering so severely. We are told in what direction relief is offered, and no hesitation should be allowed in accepting it before it is too late. The following letter is the important document we refer to.

Philadelphia, February 23rd, 1880.

To the Hon: GEORGE BROWN, SENATOR. Toronto.

DEAR SIR :—

Permit me to convey to you, as briefly as I can, my deep sense of the need of a permanent and satisfactory adjustment of the commercial relations between your country and our own.

Americans on both sides of the border must feel that the relations of the Dominion of Canada to the United States form one of the largest questions for the consideration of each country. That speculation and discussion upon the *political* relations of the two countries, though natural and perhaps unavoidable, cause apprehension, and are regarded by many as unwarranted, may be conceded, but no such repugnance can be felt toward full discussion of their *commercial* relations.

We are not only neighbors, but neighbors of great importance to each other in many ways. And, as we are, each party is fully awake to the substantial advantages and disadvantages of any arrangement which can be made; we can have no permanent success in any by which either seeks to overreach the other.

I suppose that every one will agree that the state of public opinion in each country indicates a dissatisfaction with the present status of our relations. Speaking for our side of the border, I may say that all those who have been moved, either by business connections or by general reflection, to take an interest in Canada, feel this dissatisfaction. We see, with some concern, that every point of contact between the countries is becoming a point of irritation, and that their relations, —so far from improving by the close acquaintance which easy intercourse and rapid communication enable, and by the intimate social connections, so frequently formed between our people,—are becoming distinctly worse.

The late Reciprocity Treaty, your Tariff of 1879, the Fisheries Settlement, have all left behind them results of ill feeling. Your new Tariff had an evident

purpose to force a modification of our own commercial policy, in the adoption of a second Reciprocity Treaty, but the only result has been to evoke a threat of retaliation for the discriminating duties you have imposed upon our exports. The state of public feeling on both sides indicates an unhealthy sensitiveness, which is surely a most unfortunate circumstance for us both.

Some Canadians and a few Americans look to a second Reciprocity Treaty as an adequate readjustment. I regret this, because their expectation may tend to stand in the way of better arrangements. The prospects of the adoption of such a Treaty are exceedingly remote, and there is no likelihood of its permanence if it were adopted. If carried through Congress, it would be by a party victory, in which case any great change in the political situation would lead to its abolition; nor will any one who studies that situation count on a long continuance in power of the party which is regarded as especially favorable to Reciprocity. The opposition to such a Treaty is much more general than its friends in Canada are inclined to suppose; it is not merely the manufacturing portions of the United States which regard it with disfavor, but the great agricultural states of the West would also contribute to its overthrow, when they found it brought products into competition with their own in the Eastern markets, without securing any corresponding advantage to our own country.

Nor would a Reciprocity Treaty necessarily furnish a solution of the most vexed question which is still open between us,—I mean the Fisheries dispute. You cannot but have observed that the last of our temporary settlements of this question has produced a deep dissatisfaction in America. The money paid was paid under protest, and to maintain the good faith of our country as pledged by Treaty; but—whether rightly or wrongly—with a general conviction that we had been over-reached in the transaction. The irritation may be on the other side next time. There seems to be no possible solution, which will give com-

mon satisfaction, except one which will enable us to dispense with all discussion of the comparative value of the concessions required on each side.

A final objection is that no Reciprocity Treaty could be framed which would put an end to the necessity of maintaining a Customs frontier on our common border. So long as the two countries maintain different tariffs of import duties on their respective seaboards, that one which imposes the higher duties will have to maintain such a frontier to prevent smuggling across the border. And if, as is not unlikely, each Tariff should be found to impose higher duties than the other upon some articles, that circumstance would compel its maintenance by both, though perhaps at a cost far greater than the entire revenue from duties.

This fact of itself seems to point to the proper, the only feasible solution of our mutual difficulties. I mean a Commercial Union of the Dominion and the United States. If the two countries had a common tariff of duties, with the seaboard line as the only Customs frontier, and a distribution of Custom-house receipts proportional to population, or upon some other just basis, we could then extend to each other all the commercial privileges enjoyed by our respective populations, and leave all lesser questions to settle themselves. Such an arrangement, I believe, would not be effected on our side by any mere partisan vote, but would be accepted by our whole people as a finality, and carried by universal consent. It would leave no Fisheries Question to settle; it would throw open our Coasting Trade to the ship-building communities of the Lower Provinces; it would remove that line of demarcation, across which capital now refuses to flow Northward, but across which emigration continues Southward. Without trenching on the field of politics, it would make us one people in the great work of developing the resources of a new Continent, and building up free, prosperous and happy communities in a new world.

Some few persons on both sides the border maintain

that the political union of your country and our own, or at least your political independence of the British Empire, would be necessary as a previous step, but I am far from agreeing with them. The Mother Country has wisely and courteously withdrawn the claim to dictate the commercial policy of Canada ; and, if the Dominion is competent both to adjust her own Tariff, as she did in 1879, and to negotiate a Commercial Treaty with the United States, as has been proposed, she is surely competent to give such a shape to that Treaty as will secure an entire agreement in the Tariffs of the two countries.

If Canada chose to enter the Union as an equal she would be welcomed as such ; but I know that, in the existing condition of public opinion in the Dominion, it is useless to discuss such proposals. Without making the two countries one political sovereignty, without even sundering those ties to the Mother Country which your more recently adopted citizens still cherish, it would be possible for us to effect such an identity of *commercial* interests as would remove all our present occasions of dispute.

But while every consideration should be shown to the political sensibilities which connect your country with England, no such leniency is due toward those who would sacrifice the material welfare of your people to such sensibilities. The soundest of even the English economists would repudiate a proposal to determine the lines of your commercial relations by political considerations, and thus to sunder Canada from the continent to which she properly belongs, in order to unite her with one remote in position and alien in every commercial interest. All far-seeing and practical men on both sides the border must see that Canada cannot long remain in a state of commercial dependency upon England, and that all her interests draw her to close relations with the Continent of which she is a part. Sooner or later, the attractions presented by our own country will destroy the power of artificial arrangements to keep asunder two communities

so similar in race, in habits of life, and general sympathies.

I remain, dear sir,

Yours very truly,

WHARTON BARKER.

Our position as a colony of Great Britain is becoming a little irksome to bear, not because of any disrespect to honored England, but because of the consciousness of our own strength and vitality, and the desire to take our own destiny in our own hands. The conditions are favorable. We have a population of about 5,000,000; a people experienced to a large extent in self-government; a people which, in point of intelligence, compares well with any on earth; a people of earnest habits and healthy hopes. These things are the pre-requisites for a sound nationality. In tracing the history of the colonial policy of the different nations which have been famous for colony planting we notice this, that the policy has been imperial; the "Home Government" has always legislated for the first fruits, and the colony was obliged to take what it could get; whether, as with the more ancient nation, it was tribute money; or, as in modern times, the yielding up of a truly colonial policy for an imperial one, that jingoism, and the hungry ones on Downing street, might be fully satisfied. This policy can be tolerated so long as the Mother Country remunerates the colony by way of protection from foreign invasion, protection of colonial commerce, and practical sympathy in the workings of colonial government machinery.

Such a colonial policy could be tolerated; but when, on the part of the Home Government, can be seen a disposition of self-aggrandizement, and in some instances, an entire ignoring of the colony's interests, it is high time to look about and commence to do for ourself. Canada has nothing to fear from foreign invasion. Though her military is not so large as other nations, the equity of the nations would allow no

harsh procedure against a weaker power. Switzerland is as secure and more secure than Germany or France, Canada would be, likewise. Canadian commerce has so grown that the great lakes and even the ocean is whitened with her friendly sails ; and there is not a port on the globe which does not open its gates to receive her craft. The history of the last thirteen years is sufficient to convince any one, who is as much Canadian as Englishman, that our interests have been made secondary in each case where the interests of the Home Government have been placed in the balance with Canadian. So that it is proper we should consider the way in which we are travelling, and we are convinced that nothing would be lost by asking the folks at home for a deed of our farm, after which we will lose or win, on our own responsibility.—(*Chatham Tribune.*)

Would Great Britain attempt to defend Canada?

—We are told that, being a dependency of Great Britain, in case of war, we would be supported by the army and navy of the British Empire. No sane man will entertain that proposition. Some time previous to Confederation Colonel Jarvis, an Imperial officer, made a report on the defences of Canada. He recommended the construction of important military works in the Province of Quebec, and said : “ unless these works are constructed it is more than useless to continue any British force in Canada.” The works recommended have not been constructed, and England has withdrawn her forces.

What are the sentiments of leading British statesmen on the question ? “ Britain’s annual expenditure in defence of Canada,” said Mr. Gladstone, “ is a very heavy charge, and it is our duty in every way to get rid of it.” Sir Chs. Adderley said : “ I believe the Canadians are much more likely to involve us in a war than we are to inflict one upon them, and that Great Britain cannot undertake to defend the Colonies for the sake of the Canadians.” The Duke of Newcastle

said: "The cost of all war should be borne by those for whose benefit it is carried on."

John Bright asserted, in his place in Parliament, that "there is no statesman in England who will venture to bring about the shedding of one drop of blood in defence of British North America."

Mr. Aytoun said: "He never had met with any man, not a member of the Government, who considered that it was possible to defend Canada against an attack in force by the United States."

Sir C. W. Dilke says: "We defend the Colonies only during peace; in war time they are ever left to shift for themselves." Mr. Cardwell: "It is an almost universally accepted principle of English policy that it is no longer desirable to maintain a standing army to defend our distant Colonies."

The *London Times* says: "We are quite aware that, in the event of war, we should not be able to render effectual aid to our Canadian Dominion, and that our fellow subjects out there would either have to fight at a terrible disadvantage, or mortify our pride by anticipating defeat and yielding to terms. In a national point of view that would be no loss to this country."

The Globe on Colonial Emancipation.—"We do not believe that the movement for separation from Great Britain has assumed importance, but it would be mere folly to deny that the introduction of the National Policy has given it new excuses. It was inevitable that independence and annexation should gain adherents when such arguments were used as those which brought about the Protectionist victory. Appeals to the sentiment of loyalty to the Mother Country were hooted at as unreasonable by those who asserted that material interest would be sacrificed by the continuance of a revenue tariff. A feeling of hostility to England was engendered in the minds of those who were stung by the Tory taunt, that Canadians were "mere hewers of wood and drawers of water" to the

Mother Country. Our material interests, it was said, demanded imitation of American methods. A contempt for English opinion was carefully nurtured by the Protectionist journals. Canada was old enough and wise enough to perceive the course best for herself, and should be independent enough to follow it at all hazards.

During the campaign which preceded the elections of 1878 we frequently predicted that the effect of a Conservative victory would be toward annexation. Our opponents could not assert that a policy separating us commercially from England would draw us politically closer to England. But, they said, we are for Protection, whatever the consequences may be. As the *Mail* summed it up, "if British connection is endangered, so much the worse for British connection."

The *Globe* believes that the supreme ambition of every Canadian must not go beyond the humiliating position of a colonist. That is the bold and manly policy of the great leader of the Liberal party in Canada. Well, we will tell the *Globe* that if he is willing to remain, on all fours, the humble subject of the British people, we of the younger generation are determined to stand up, as the equals of the citizens of any other country, claiming for Canada all the rights and privileges of a free people.

The Liberal party in Canada is now reduced to the degrading occupation of distant followers of the Conservative party, on all national questions.

Canada's Desperate Financial Situation.—Sir Francis Hincks, in 1842, when we had no appreciable government debt, borrowed \$7,000,000 for Public Works. On the 1st of July, 1878, the federal debt amounted to \$174,957,268. Deducting the amount paid for the North West, it leaves about \$173,000,000 incurred for our Public Works. If we add the interest paid since 1842, it makes a round total of \$280,000,000 paid and to pay for Public Works, valued by the

Government at \$98,414,450, or about one-third of the actual cost to the people.

These \$280,000,000 paid for our Public Works amount to only about three-fifths of the vast aggregate debt we owe to Britain alone. In 1873, the interest paid in England on loans to Canada, not including Prince Edward Island, amounted to \$18,000,000 in round numbers, the capital represented amounting to \$301,561,200. From 1873 to 1878, our over-importations amounted to \$170,000,000. By adding \$30,000,000 for the debt of Prince Edward Island, we arrive at the fearful total of \$500,000,000 owed by Canada to Great Britain, on which the annual interest averages \$25,000,000.

According to the Hon. George Brown, our over importation from 1850 to 1873 was \$345,511,517. These over-importations have all been balanced by loans, bonds, mortgages and stocks. The assessable wealth of the whole country is calculated at \$700,000,000, of which \$500,000,000 is mortgaged to Britain. Bank statements of November last return \$120,000,000 of debts to them. If we add all the other debts or claims upon the people accruing or due, it is evident beyond a doubt that Canada is indebted for more than the whole assessable wealth of the country. In short, we are in the position of a bankrupt people.

That is a proud position for this great Dominion to be in. Will our loyalist press tell us if that is one of the great advantages we derive from British connection? Is it not evident that the Imperial policy, which has so long prevailed over the best and sole interests of Canada, is the direct cause of our bankrupt position? While we were rushing in debt, the United States were paying off \$1,000,000,000 of their national obligations. If we wish to rival the nations of the world, we must above all be a free people, with the determination of framing our commercial policy in the sole interest of Canada, not in the interest of the Empire.

Mud Throwing at our Neighbors.—A hundred years are a long time to look back, and yet it does not appear to have been long enough to wipe out the bitter recollections of the struggle of our neighbors from the minds of some of the loyalty-howlers on this side of the border, who would force the United States back into its old position of a dependency of the British Crown tomorrow if they had the power. But the people of this continent, who are all descended from the same parent stock, are drawing closer to each other, and ought to be able to look back over the deeds of their great-grandfathers without flying in each other's faces and calling bad names.

Our neighbors fought out a great struggle in which everybody now admits they were in the right, and the fact that they won is no reason why a perpetual ill-feeling should be fostered between two countries whose borders are conterminous and whose people are of the same blood, simply because they happen to live under different flags. The best friends the United States have to-day are Englishmen, and when we see men like Gladstone and Bright doing justice to the progressiveness of the people of the American Union, and wishing them peace and prosperity, it looks very small for a few aged Europeans in Canada to be throwing mud at our neighbors, and endeavoring to embroil the natives of the same continent in international difficulties and misunderstandings.

The Necessity of a Foreign Market.—The time has come for all men to put aside party feelings and sentimental opinions, to save the country from utter ruin. The Government have pledged themselves to relieve us from the present distress by a new policy. We will give them the credit of being sincere in their pledge, and we will ask them to give Canada a foreign market for the relief of home industries. This very day, if the Canadian manufacturers could supply other nations with ships, woollen and cotton goods, boots and shoes, sewing machines, iron-ware, wooden-ware,

implements, and other productions, our workshops would be kept busy, and, with renewed employment, prosperity would once more dwell amongst us. The Government have undoubtedly given artificial life to our manufactures by an increase in the tariff, thus stimulating over-production. But when we have opened new factories, and doubled our products, how will these goods be disposed of, if we have no foreign market to receive them, if Canada alone, with a population of 4,000,000, is bound to consume them? The difficulty now is that our factories are not able to dispose of their products, how much more will that not be the case when protection will have induced new parties to rush into manufactures?

The Press on Independence.—The Canadians can pursue any experiment of independence they may want to try without the slightest apprehension of unfriendly feeling from their big neighbor. In fact, their relations with the United States as an independent nation would be more cordial than they are now, because we should respect them more if they had the manliness to let go of the apron-strings of the Mother Country, and we should settle our little diplomatic difficulties in the generous spirit which a great country can afford to show toward a little one.—*N. Y. Tribune.*

It is not difficult to make a pretty shrewd guess as to what the English journals will say, the upshot of which will probably be that, if Canada desires to set up business on her own hook, she is quite welcome to do so, and that the maternal blessing is ready. Not very long ago Sir George Campbell, a member of the British House of Commons, said it was humiliating to England to maintain the connection with a country that showed its gratitude for Imperial protection by imposing high duties against British goods—as if Canada's first consideration should be the interests of the iron-workers of Sheffield, or the cotton-workers of Manchester, rather than the interests of her own people.—*Toronto Telegram.*

One thing should be thoroughly understood, and that is that, whatsoever we may think of either independence or annexation, no man shall be gagged because he thinks differently in regard to either the one or the other. Every man must be allowed to hold his own opinion, whether it be in favor of independence, annexation, or the maintenance of British connection. *Toronto Telegram.*

A Continental Union.—It must be admitted, that the smallness of the population of Canada and of her home markets, the exclusively northern character of her productions in contrast with the almost unlimited variety of those of the U. S., and the immense extent and expensiveness of her customs line, render her an unfavorable subject for a separate experiment. Moreover, her system will be incomplete and ineffective if it does not protect her against the Transatlantic competition.

A commercial union with the continent, of which geographically Canada is a part, and with which she is connected by identity of race, would afford her large and unrestricted markets, free participation in the coasting trade, with other commercial advantages too numerous to specify; and, at the same time, give her the needful protection against that European competition, from which her rising industries have most to fear; it would, in fact, afford to her what the U. S. already enjoy, all the practical advantages of both Free Trade and Protection.

Obviously, no policy of tariff legislation hostile to the United States can long be sustained in Canada, since her chief markets for barley, lumber, fish and other products, as well as her indispensable access to the sea across our territory, can be cut off at pleasure, whenever her tariff policy shall have become sufficiently annoying to provoke retaliatory legislation from our government.

When she shall ask for commercial union and equality, under our tariff system, it will doubtless be

to our interest that her advances shall be met by a frank acceptance; but, meantime, no project for a delusive Reciprocity Treaty should be entertained for a moment; our former unsatisfactory experiment in that direction tended to the estrangement of two populations who are remarkably free from such animosities as often embitter the inhabitants of opposite sides of a frontier line, and whose real interests and aims are, to a great extent, intrinsically similar and accordant.

In a similarly broad spirit should our intercourse with Mexico be treated. That spacious and magnificently endowed region, capable of yielding to us all that has been hoped for from Cuba and Brazil, and of taking from us vast quantities of the various fabrics which we desire to sell, must soon, by an inevitable extension of railroads, be brought into intimate connection with this country. Her naturally not unfriendly people may be taught, by fair and profitable traffic, to forget the suspicions born of their disasters during our dark period of slaveholders' rule, and they also may propose a full and free commercial union of the basis of her adopting our tariff system in its entirety as towards all other countries, and abrogating the customs frontier between us. If this should be asked under circumstances which would guarantee the sufficiency and integrity of her customs service, might it not be granted, and might not our vast existing area of absolute Free Trade be thus extended to the still wider proportions of the North American Continent?

JOSEPH WHARTON, HENRY C. LEA, WHARTON BARKER,
Executive Committee of the Industrial League of the U. S.

A Business View of the Situation.—To intelligently discuss the very grave subject of the situation, when bankruptcy is doing its frightful work all over the land; when values of all descriptions have fallen 50 to 75 per cent. within a few years; when millions of the people's money have been swept from existence; when no prospects of better times are in sight, there is no

room for sentimentality. A business view of the situation alone can afford a practical solution of the difficult problem now before the country : the relief of the present overwhelming distress, the building up of our future prosperity. Starting from the fact that there is something radically wrong in our position as a manufacturing and commercial people, we maintain the following propositions, which will lead any business man, unbiased by prejudice, sentimental or otherwise, to the same practical conclusion. 1. Our exclusion from every foreign market, by differential prohibitory duties against Canada, is the main cause of the present depression. 2. The Canadian Government is powerless to remove these differential prohibitory duties, now paralyzing Canadian industry and commerce. 3. The commercial policy of the British nation is to keep for herself the whole trade of the colonies, and to discourage rather than foster colonial manufactures. 4. In the interest of the empire, as well as of Canada, political and commercial independence is the only practical solution of the situation. These several propositions have been the topic of general conversation for some time past, and, as a general rule, men of both political parties, without distinction of nationality or creed, have come to the same conclusion : " We must have the power to negotiate our own commercial treaties."

Trying to Dam up the St. Lawrence with Bulrushes.—In an article on the subject of annexation, a subject nobody discusses but itself, the *Globe* says:—" The unsettlement of men's minds, caused by a radical change of commercial policy, has set many thinking of other changes," and that " though the N. P. is directly an alteration of Canada's trade policy, it is indirectly a change of her political relations." The *Globe* is quite right in saying that the commercial change has set people thinking about the possibilities of a political change, although that journal has done all it could to keep men's minds from running in that direction. It

is well that the *Globe* has brought itself to recognize the fact that people cannot be prevented from thinking about the future of their country, despite the readiness with which it pitches epithets at their heads and pursues them with malignant abuse. The N.P. set a good many people thinking about Canada's future who troubled themselves little about the subject before; and, once having begun to think, they will go on thinking to the end, for trying to tie up men's minds is like trying to dam up the St. Lawrence with bulrushes.

Let us Sail under our own Colors.—The *Globe* like Jove, hurled its thunder-bolts but they were of non-effect. Just like Rodger, the *Globe* claims to have shaken the life out of the Political Economy Club, and, by the concussion of its heavy artillery discharges quieted the voice of Young Canada. But all this is mere vapping, for, although the voice may be hushed for a while, the yearning within is not weakened, neither is the desire cooled by the pouring on of loyal sentimentalism.

No one expected to bring about an immediate revolution, but men claim the right to discuss the present and future prospects of their country unmolested, and the more the *Globe* strives to stifle discussion and to stem the tide of patriotism the more eager will men be to join in the battle, and more rapidly will flow the tide of independence. Boasting loyalists may roll up their barricades of weak and musty traditions, and their gallant knights take shelter behind them, and with their pop-guns fire away their flimsy balls of sycophantry, but Canada's spirited sons have put on their coats of Democracy, which are proof against all the batteries of flattery that may be opened upon them.

Their desire is to stand alone, unfettered, free to manage their own affairs, political, commercial and social. Namby-pamby tales of being a limb in the great emprial chain has lost all its charm. We aspire to something more than a link—we would be a chain

complete. As long as we remain as we are, we shall be subject to hard rubs and severe friction of that chain, which continues gathering up and adding to its length, that the weight of itself will some day snap asunder.

As Rome stretched forth her strong arm, and grasped and gathered into her fold many lands and various people, which strained her muscles and weakened her resources, and eventually eat away the core of her once brave heart, so will it be with England. Let us prepare not to fight England's battles as mere mercenary troops who enjoy all the fighting but none of the glory, but rather let us prepare to sail under our own colors and to fight our own battles.

Weak, indeed, are the arguments which are advanced by pretended loyalists for clinging to the motherland. Better by far shape our own course, and manfully follow the dictates of our own free will, than to childishly simper beneath that irreconcilable motto so lately inscribed on the flag of the Empire: "*Imperium et Libertas.*"—*Goldwin Smith.*

We Advocate a Distinct Canadian Nationality.—What we advocate, is a distinct Canadian nationality; for we believe it would be better for as Canadians, and better for every one with whom we as a nation should be called upon to deal; better offensively; better defensively; better commercially; better socially, and, of course, better religiously. We will never have a literature worthy the name while we are a dependency. We can never love our country as a dependency. We have no hope for anything like a ripe and rich development in national characteristics while we are a colony. It does not follow that because we are four, and the United States forty millions, that we will be attracted to them. Any reader of history will know that such does not inevitably follow. As for a colonial empire it is beyond the region of possibilities to work out the best interests of the Anglo-Saxon race by any such scheme.—*Chatham Herald.*

Reform Debating Club.—This is a terrible thing that has happened. The Reform Debating Club, an institution designed for the education of young Reformers, of which the Hon. George Brown is the Patron Saint, has not only had the temerity to discuss the question as to whether the separation of Canada from Great Britain is desirable, but has actually decided the question in the affirmative. Once when Mr. Brown was delivering one of his favorite speeches in the back townships, and after he had exhausted the catalogue of offences which he charged against "John A." and the Tories, a staid old Reformer on the back benches, whose heart was fired and whose soul was in arms, rose up and declared that there was nothing left but rebellion. Somebody ought to have risen up in the Reform Debating Club and declared the same thing, seeing that the spirit of the Patron Saint was not on hand to silence the daring debaters. In default of that, it would seem to be the duty of the chief loyalty-howler to take the members of the Club to task and demand an explanation of their treasonable conduct in discussing a subject that was tabooed, and reaching a decision that will bring all loyalty-howlers to their individual and collective feet. It is right and proper, of course, from our point of view, that all subjects involving the future of the country should be discussed—the more the better; but it is rank treason, in the eyes of the loyalty-howlers, to speak of them at all.

Take the case of the Political Economy Club of Montreal for example. This Club had the sublime assurance to discuss the subject of Canadian independence, without committing itself either for or against a change in that direction, whereupon its members were denounced by the *Globe* as annexationists and everything else that was bad. Now we submit that if the young men who comprise the Reform Debating Club may discuss the question of separation, resolving that it would be beneficial to Canada, and not be impaled upon the horns of a Bow Park shorthorn for so

doing, the members of the Political Economy Club, or anybody else, should be allowed to exercise the same right without being subjected to insult and abuse. But in these days of lip loyalty and sham patriotism it looks as if, while it is larceny in one man to look through a knot hole in the fence, it is positive virtue for another man to steal the horse, provided the other man is of the right party stripe.—*Telegram.*

Official Precedence.—The social fabric was very nearly disrupted in Ontario on one occasion through somebody of secondary rank going into an official dinner before some other body of primary rank; so that the importance of the new orders of precedence cannot be over-estimated. What would happen if the orders of precedence should unhappily get turned upside down at an official gathering, and the guests should begin to file in from the wrong end, nobody can tell. It is a possibility of such alarming proportion and so big with fate, that the mind fails to grasp it, unless you stand up on a chair, and even then you can only get hold of the outside edges of it. The waiters would probably conceal themselves under the table, that is, if the table itself did not get up on its hind legs and walk out in disgust. But the melancholy feature of the new orders is that they fix the places for the lieutenant-governors of the four chief Provinces only. The lieutenant-governors of the other Provinces will presumably fall in line after their gubernatorial brethren, unless the dignitaries who are billed to come next should try to get ahead of them and elbow them to the rear. A procession formed in strict accordance with the rules of precedence, filing in to dinner, would be a very solemn thing, and it will be the duty of the authorities to see that if anybody attempts to pop into a place ahead of that to which he is entitled, he be unceremoniously hustled out.

But the new orders of precedence are not complete unless they apply also in Great Britain. We would like to know what is the position of a governor-general

of Canada in the Mother Country. He is called here by the Jingo Press a Vice-Roy. Now what does a Canadian Vice-Roy amount to in England? Does he rank immediately after the Queen as her representative? Let us know all about it. We maintain that the governor-general of Canada is simply an employee of the Colonial Department in London, and that in Great Britain he ranks nowhere, that is to say at the back of the smallest baronet of the Empire. As to our lieutenant-governors, they are plain Mr. Jones, the official correspondence refusing them the modest prefix of Honorable. Our Federal and local ministers, of course, are nobodies or simply colonists, in the order of precedence in Great Britain.

What M. Potter saw in the U. S.—John Bright, in a speech made in England, refers as follows to Mr. Potter's report on his American tour:

Mr. Potter says he only saw four drunken men in the United States, but he did not see the Emperor [laughter and cheers] or Empress, or King, or Queen or imperial or royal princes and princesses. [Cheers.] These high dignitaries, to whom we pay such great, and often well-deserved respect [cheers] were not to be found in that country [cheers], and I have no doubt that, where men are intelligent enough and moral enough to sustain a government like that they have in the United States, though there may be in some particulars great perils, yet, on the whole, the government is one that is entitled to their entire confidence [Hear, hear!]

I think some one said that they had no great army. [Cheers.] There are persons who come to this country from Germany, France and Russia who are surprised, and perhaps delighted, to find how few soldiers are to be seen in England compared with some of the European nations; but in America they disbanded their great army of a million of men—they now have a force of about twenty-five thousand men. It is not maintained for the purpose of war abroad [cheers].

nor is it maintained for the purpose of suppressing liberty at home. [Cheers.] And yet there is no country in the world which is more universally respected throughout the globe than the United States, and there is no country where, on the whole, the laws are better obeyed and public order more constantly maintained.

Another thing in which they differ from us well is that they have almost no political treaties. [Cheers.] Washington, the first great President, advised them to have no political treaties. "Commercial treaties if you like—as much trade as you can—have with all countries." They have not followed his advice in that so much as I should like; but, with regard to political treaties, in the main, they have followed his advice; and yet I believe there is no country with whom all other countries are more friendly at this moment than the United States. [Cheers.]

They have no bishops in their Senate. [Laughter.] I have no doubt there are people in this country who commiserate their position in that respect, but I don't. [Laughter and cheers.] They have not constructed a machine, mostly political and partly religious, in which the State bolsters up Religion on the condition that Religion will bolster up the State. They have got no favored government, Church or organization, which lends to the crimes of monarchs and statesmen, sanctioned by the simulated voice of God, an approval, and by which the voice of Christianity is demoralized and degraded. [Cheers.]

I have said also that they have no land monopoly and no system of law which is intended to maintain great families in the possession of vast estates. We have conferred upon these families great political powers, which may be used—and have been almost always used—in opposition to the true rights and interests and freedom of the people. [Cheers.] They have not preferred—as we have preferred in this country—to maintain a thousand great houses and great properties when we might have had hundreds of thousands of

comfortable and happy homesteads to adorn the land.
[Cheers.]

I wonder whether it occurs ever to the crowned heads of Europe to think what will become of the policy they are now pursuing. Everywhere government armies eat up the comforts of the people, and everywhere military exactions are becoming more and more unendurable—everywhere menaces, acts of warfare, extravagance and growing debt. These things create discontent, invite disorder, and make insurrection almost certain—if it be not absolutely necessary—and lay the foundation of fundamental changes in States, such as we have witnessed in France and America.

Ontario Talk to Hissing and Hysterical Ganders.

—The following is taken from one of the leading organs of public opinion in Ontario :

If England determined to cut the colonies adrift, as many of her leading men have more than once suggested she should do, this colony for one would not wait to be kicked out, but would go. In regard to annexation, there is no wisdom in newspapers sticking their heads in the sand and pretending that they cannot see any evidences of annexation when evidences of annexation really exist, as they do in Canada. No man should be prevented from thinking about the future of his country, even if our inevitable destiny should be independence or annexation to the United States. As for the talk about loyalty, the less said by the *Globe's* howlers the better, until they shall have learned that there is a difference between loyalty and servility, and that a man's first duty is to be loyal to his own country.

As we have repeatedly said, our sole object is to force the door wide open to the fullest discussion of all subjects of interest to the people of Canada, no matter how many moral footpads may be behind the door, ready to fly out and attack us with their favorite weapons, be these weapons slungshots or abuse.

The *Globe* knows very well that what we object to

is not that Mr. Brown and a few other senile old men are determined that this country shall be tied neck and crop to Great Britain forever—for they have a perfect right to use all their efforts in that direction if they please; but that they cry “traitor” and “horse thief” after those who dare to step out of the beaten path of political thought and take a different view, and that, ever since they have found an asylum in the country they have used the means accident has put in their way to repress anything and everything that savored of Canadian nationality. It is enough that any movement should be tinctured with the least essence of nationalism to bring these aged Europeans down upon it like so many hissing and hysterical ganders, as if it were a crime for people to put the social interests and the commercial welfare of their own country, whether it be their country by birth or adoption, above the social interests and the commercial welfare of a distant land, which would not hesitate twenty-four hours to cut the connection if it be found to be to its advantage so to do.

Leading British Statesmen favor Canadian Independence.—Mr. Huskisson, Colonial Secretary, said: “He thought the time had come for the separation of Canada from the Mother Country, and an assumption of an independent state.”

Lord Howick said: “There could be no doubt that in time all our foreign colonies would become independent of the Mother Country. Such an event was certain, and we ought in time to prepare for the separation, not by fortifying Canada, but by preparing her to become independent.”

Cobden said: “There will be no repetition on our part of the policy of 1776 to prevent our North American Colonies from pursuing their interests in their own way.” The Earl of Ellenborough said: “He hoped the Government would communicate with the North American Colonies with the view to separation.”

Lord Brougham: “He was one of those who desired

a separation of Canada from the Mother Country. The idea was not novel; it had been entertained and pressed by many eminent men. It was an opinion shared in by Lord Ashburton and Lord St. Vincent."

A member in the House of Commons on a recent occasion declared: "What the relation between Canada and Britain was rotten and mutually deceptive." A Cabinet Minister said: "He looked forward without apprehension and without regret to the separation of Canada from England." In 1864 Lord Derby, a former leader of the Great Conservative party in England, said: "In British North America there is a strong movement in progress in favor of federation, or, rather, union of some shape. We know that these countries must before long, be independent states."

Mr. Gladstone, when leader of the British Government, in 1870, in advocating the separation of these Colonies from the Empire said that: "The present government do not claim the credit of adopting or introducing any new policy, and persons of authority of every shade of politics have adopted it."

Mr. Lowe in a recent speech in Parliament said: "We should represent to Canada that it is perfectly open to her to establish herself as an independent republic; it is our duty, too, to represent to her that if, after well weighed consideration, she thinks it more to her interests to join the Great American republic itself, it is the duty of Canada to deliberate for her own interests and happiness."

Lord Grey, in the House of Lords in 1870, said: "The principles laid down by successive Colonial Secretaries must necessarily lead to a dissolution of the British Empire."

Lord Russell said: "If the North American Colonies felt themselves able to stand alone, and showed their anxiety either to form themselves into an independent country, or even to amalgamate with the U. S., he did not think it would be wise to resist that desire."

Hon. Joseph How, when in England, heard a noble

marquis say: "those British Americans may go and set up for themselves when they pleased; they may annex themselves to the U. S., and no power will be used to prevent them." Not a man rose to contradict this statement.

Lord Monck, our late Governor-General, said, from his place in the House of Lords: "It is in the interests of the Mother Country that Canada should be taught to look forward to independence. He believed that the policy of the Government tended towards such independence, and it was on that account that he gave the Government his support." He alleged that the tie which connects Canada with Britain was a mere sentimental one, that the connection had ceased its uses, and that the colonial relations to Britain were dissolved when Confederation was consummated, and that the true mission of Canada was to proclaim its independence.

Sir George Campbell said: "Canada has grown to maturity. I would let it go free without more delay, and would relieve this country of the many embarrassments to which the connection may give rise. Canada I believe to be, under present arrangements, a burden and a risk to us."

The Right Hon. W. E. Foster said: "The common belief is that Canada must some day become independent, and this common idea will become one of those which realise themselves."

Lord Derby, in 1876, said: "Many plans have been proposed for connecting Canada more closely with this country, but never yet one that looked as if it would work." Mr. Gladstone pronounced the proposition as "altogether visionary." He said "We cannot overlook the countless miles of ocean rolling between Canada and us."

When the leading British statesmen look upon emancipation as the necessary result of confederation, how can the great and powerful leader of the Liberal party in Canada stand back, and even repel every attempt to secure for Canada all the rights and privileges of a free people?

The Slavish Sycophancy of the Loyalty Howlers.—

The Canadian journals, as a rule, took the Canadian view of the proposal to establish a Court at Ottawa, and condemned it from the outside. But here and there a newspaper spreads butter all over the Princess, and seems to think it is paying her homage by so doing. Nothing can be more offensive to high-bred people than the slavish sycophancy or fulsome flattery of those who make themselves their menials—a hint that one or two of our contemporaries might bear in mind when they are tempted to metaphorically prostrate themselves before vice-royalty. There is probably very little danger now of a Court being set up at Ottawa in imitation of the Court in London, although signs were not wanting when vice-royalty landed in this country that the establishment of a Court was in view. The good sense of the Canadian people has saved them from making themselves a laughing stock, by trying to ape the manners and customs of royalty. Let there be less servility in the press and we shall all be the better of it.

We are told that Her Royal Highness is thoroughly home sick. Well, we do not wonder at the news. In fact, we are at a loss to understand how Princess Louise has been able so far to stand the sickening exhibition of low servility which has met her everywhere. No doubt when Her Royal Highness accepted the position which she now occupies with so much grace and distinction, she expected to dwell in the midst of a proud people. We may imagine her disappointment, when, in place of this proud population, she was surrounded on all sides by the prostrate forms of her humble subjects. The fulsome flattery of the many addresses presented to Her Royal Highness was enough to make anybody sick, and ten times worse than the sea sickness from which Her Royal Highness has so much suffered. Let the menials of royalty in Canada remember, that nothing is more offensive to well-bred people than to be slobbered over by persons who make themselves their menials, and that there is

as much difference between respectful homage and sycophantic servility as there is between chalk and cheese.

The Second Number of The Bystander is out, and will no doubt be read with absorbing interest by all who care to look at the broad and liberal side of all questions, in preference to looking at them from the narrow party point of view. We hear that the demand for the first number was so great that a second edition had to be struck off—a fact that says something for the growth of the desire in Canada to rise above the dead level of partyism and look at all questions from the higher ground of independence—a desire that is evinced as well by the steady progress of our own paper. The difficulty with most partizans is that they read only the side of the case presented to them by their own party journal, which naturally enough puts every incident and circumstance in the light to do its own party most good, and the rival party most harm. But *The Bystander* rises above partyism and deals with all questions on their merits, and in language that is of itself a treat to every lover of pure English undefiled.

Our Exclusion from every Foreign Market—By differential prohibitory duties against Canada—is the main cause of the present depression. This proposition is so self-evident that it requires no argument. In these days of cheap and rapid communication, the manufacturer can keep the home market to himself, only on condition of having this machinery, labor and capital employed, all the year round, on specialties. To do this he must be able to relieve the home market, if necessary, by the exportation of his surplus goods all over the world, where an inexhaustible demand will readily consume all he can produce at a certain price. That is the position of the manufacturer of every other country but Canada, which now stands in the position of a plague-stricken country, whose

products are systematically excluded from the civilized world ; met at the frontier of every European nation by differential prohibitory duties similar to the following, taken from the French tariff, and published by the undoubted authority of the Franco-American Convention :—

Articles.	Duties paid by Europe Nations.	Differential Duty against Canada.	Per Cent. more.
Ships, wood or iron, per ton	\$ 0 40	\$ 8 00	1,900
Cheese, per ton	8 00	36 00	350
Fish, Lobsters, per ton	8 00	60 00	200
Soap	12 00	Prohibited
Starch	3 00	50 00	1,750
Alcohol, per hct.	30 00	60 00	100
Cotton Cloths, per cent.	15	Prohibited
Cotton Clothing, per cent.	15	do
Carpets, per ct.	10	60c per lb.
Blankets, per ct.	10	24c do
Saddlery, per ct.	10	Prohibited
Leather Gloves, per cent.	5½	do
Hemp Cordage, per ton	30 00	60 00	100
Steam Engines, per ton	12 00	80 00	550
Agricultural Implements, per ton	12 00	36 00	200
Machinery, per ton	20 00	192 00	900
Sewing Machines, per ton	20 00	192 00	900
Scythes, per ton	40 00	228 00	620
Sickles, per ton	40 00	192 00	450
Circular Saws, per ton	40 00	280 00	550
Cutlery, per cent.	15	Prohibited
Articles of Cast Iron, per ton	10 00	do
Iron Beds, Chairs, &c., per ton	10 00	do
Wrought Nails, per ton	16 00	do
Locks, Hinges, per ton	24 00	do
Buildingware, per ton	24 00	do
Wood Screws, per ton	16 00	do
Iron Kitchen Articles, per ton	28 00	do
Copper Utensils, per ton	40 00	280 00	600
Carriages, per ct.	10	Prohibited
Hats and Flowers	Free	14 p.c.
Woodenware, per cent.	10	18	.80
Furniture, per cent.	10	18	.80
Clothing, per cent.	10	36	260
Boots and Shoes, per cent.	10	Prohibited
Leather, per cent.	10	54	440
Woollen Goods, per cent.	10	Prohibited

This distressing list, already too convincing, might be continued till every man in the country would feel that his business is ruined by it.

Canada can not possibly be prosperous till she is

granted all the rights and privileges of the most favored nation, and her present exclusion from commercial relations with the civilized world can alone account for the general depression.

The Canadian Government is Powerless to remove the differential prohibitory duties now paralyzing Canadian industry and commerce. We will admit that the British nation is, above all, practical, cool, self-possessed, calculating, strong-minded, and specially free from all sentimentality on business matters. While other nations were agitating the world, and rushing into disastrous wars about philosophical questions, the British nation was quietly at work, building up that tremendous Colonial Empire, which has accumulated in the British Isles more wealth than can be found in any other part of the globe. We in Canada are only a small portion of that Colonial Empire, and our population of 4,000,000 does not amount to a row of pins, thrown in with the 250,000,000 of our fellow-colonists. We are simply the subjects of the people of England. We are of all nationalities, creeds and colors, from the jet black of the African to the bright complexion of our Canadian wives and daughters, from the bronzed-faced Hindoo to the lighter hue of our North-west Indian. In one respect only do we resemble one another in this motley crowd of colonists: it is, that we are equally powerless to settle our own commercial matters, to negotiate our own commercial treaties. The British people, whose subjects we are, have always taken good care to reap all the advantages involved in the possession of such a fine domain. As practical men, they have kept to themselves the treaty-making power, which alone can secure to their manufactures the markets of the world, on the most favorable terms. That power they have been specially careful not to extend to any of their colonies, which would thus become dangerous rivals. A sound colonial-policy can have no other object than to keep colonists in the tri-

butary position of consumers, not producers, of British fabrics.

Thus, this great Dominion of Canada, with its vast natural resources, railways, canals, extensive manufactures and commerce, intelligent population, local and federal parliaments, lieutenant-governors and mighty ministers, is only, after all, a dependency of the people of England, with no power whatever to remove the differential prohibitory duties now paralyzing her industries and commerce, with none of the most valued liberties and privileges of a free people. In fact, we are only subjects, not citizens, of Great Britain, and the Privy Council of this grand Dominion has no more right to settle our commercial policy or foreign trade than so many savages, in council assembled, in some Crown colony of the coast of Africa or Fiji Islands.

The Montreal Post on Independence.—“Canadian Emancipation” is the name of a new magazine or review which we received yesterday from the publishers, Messrs. J. X. Perrault & Company. It is, as its name indicates, devoted to the independence of Canada, and is certainly well worthy of perusal both by those in favor of such a scheme and those against it. It bristles with facts, figures and statistics, wherein the matter is entirely original, it is singularly lucid in the premises it advances, and forcible in the deductions drawn from them.

There is no use in disguising the matter. The time has come, if not for Canadian independence, at least for full and free discussion on a subject fraught with so much that is important to Canada. It cannot be frowned down; its advocates must be heard, and heard with the same amount of attention bestowed on the statesmen who, in their generation, were instrumental in bringing about such changes as those involved in the abolition of the Seigniorial tenure, secularization of the Clergy Reserves, Confederation and the National Policy.

If leading journals such as the London *Times*,

Daily News, Standard, and Pall Mall Gazette thought fit to discuss the question of Canadian independence, why should Canadian organs of public opinion, who are much more interested in the matter—who are vitally interested in the matter—be debarred from following their example? And here may be the proper place to remark that while not one public man in Canada that we wot of, and certainly not of any newspaper of any influence, has suggested the advisability of annexation to the United States—a great many of them favor independence. The late Hon. Mr. Howe, of Nova Scotia, Sir A. T. Galt, the Hon. Mr. Huntington, the Hon. Wm. McDougall and many others of our most distinguished men have at different times pronounced themselves in favor of Canadian independence, but none of them ventured to pronounce the word annexation.

Driven at last to the wall for a valid argument against independence, the *Toronto Globe* has it that one is merely a precursor of the other, that independence will inevitably lead to annexation. Now, it appears to us that the men who are bold and honest enough to express their views regarding the one, would have no hesitation in declaring themselves in favor of the other did they entertain it. The *Globe* and its satellites seem to forget that a great change has even taken place in the minds of Canadians since the Hon. George Brown, when young and curly (comparatively speaking), was defeated at Haldimand by an avowed Republican Independent, William Lyon McKenzie.

The young men of the present generation neter-tain a sentimental regard for their country, and the old men, many of whose hopes and fortunes have been wrecked through connection with the Mother Country, entertain the practical idea that Canada will never be prosperous while in a state of vassalage. If a man is a fool, and owns a shop, it is better for him that some outsider run his business for his benefit, but Canada is not a fool, and, therefore, should act for herself. Her

trade is restricted by Great Britain and Ireland, she has no voice in the making of a war, which may mean ruin to her commerce, her place is not recognized among the nations. Everyone confesses that Canada possesses immense resources within herself; why, then, is she so poor? Why are there yearly so many bankruptcies; why are so many people suffering from want?

Why are there such miserable villages on our shore of the great lakes, and such magnificent cities on the other. Why have we not such centres of commerce, trade and manufacture as Chicago, Cleveland, Toledo, Buffalo, and Detroit? Why is there a steady exodus going on from Canada to the United States? Simply because we are colonists governed by red tape rules manufactured in Downing Street. Lord Beaconsfield is the most enlightened of the Imperial Ministers, except, perhaps, the Duke of Argyll, and we may realize what Downing Street knows about Canada or its interests from the late famous speech of his Lordship, wherein he makes the startling announcement that hundreds of thousands of American farmers were leaving their country and settling in the Northwest. We would advise every one to read the *Canadian Emancipation*, it may do them good and can certainly do them no harm.—*Montreal Post*.

Canadian Independence.—Sir: We are told that if Canada set up in business for herself our more powerful neighbor would gobble her up. But if they are so very grasping, why do they not seize two or three of those small republics south of them? Or why not annex Mexico? In what a humiliating position some men place Canada, clinging to her mother for protection from her big brother, who has offered her no violence.

S. S.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

MARCH, 1880.

An Authorized United States Proposition of Commercial Union...	33
Our Position as a Colony of Great Britain.....	38
Would Great Britain Attempt to Defend Canada?.....	39
The Globe on Colonial Emancipation.....	40
Canada's Desperate Financial Situation.....	41
Mud Throwing at our Neighbours.....	43
The Necessity of a Foreign Market.....	43
The Press on Independence.....	44
A Continental Union.....	45
A Business View of the Situation.....	46
Trying to Dam up the St. Lawrence with Bulrushes.....	47
Let us Sail under our own Colors.....	
We Advocate a Distinct Canadian Nationality.....	
Reform Debating Club.....	
Official Precedence.....	
What M. Potter, M.P., saw in the United States.....	
Ontario Talk to Hissing and Hysterical Ganders.....	
Leading British Statesmen Favor Canadian Independence.....	
The Slavish Sycophancy of the Loyalty Howlers.....	
Our Exclusion from every Foreign Market.....	59
The Second Number of The Bystander.....	59
The Canadian Government is Powerless.....	61
The Montreal Post on Independence.....	62

