THE TORONTO WORLD

One Cent Morning Newspaper.

OFFICE: 20 KING-STREET EAST, TORONTO
W. F. MACLEAN, Publisher.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

One Year	$3.00	Four Months	$1.00
Six Months	1.50	One Month	35c

No charge for city delivery or postage. Subscriptions payable in advance.

ADVERTISING RATES.
FOR EACH LINE OF AGATE TYPE.
Display advertisements, fifteen cents per line. Financial statements, twenty cents per line. Condensed advertisements, one cent a word. Deaths, marriages and births, 25 cents. Special rates for contract advertisements or reading notices and for preferred position. The World's Telephone Call is 1231.

WEDNESDAY MORNING, SEPT. 21, 1887.

Things That Amuse Us.

The Globe has again and again stated that no commercial union is admissible which would not leave to Canada a due share of tariff-making power, a sufficient revenue, and existing political relations. It is for practical statesmen to arrange the terms of such a union. The part of a public journal is performed in defining the conditions which the arrangement must fulfill in order to obtain that journal's support.—Globe.

The Globe will please except The World from the list of public journals whose duty is performed in this imbecile fashion. The Globe may be half-witted, but The World prides itself on being all there. We would have as good a right to plead sanity if we should seriously present the following line of thought, as The Globe has when it pens the paragraph above quoted: The line of thought suggested might run thus:

We have shown that our farmers are desirous of getting two dollars a bushel for their wheat. The only conditions we attach to any scheme by which they may realize that amount are that the money be genuine coin and that the farmers will get the two dollars for every bushel they have. There is no doubt such a scheme would be a first class idea for our farmers and we have announced the conditions under which a scheme of that kind would be supported by us. Our duty as a public journal is performed. Let practical men come in and tell us how it can be done. We have pointed out the benefits to accrue from the scheme. Let them work it out.

There is just as much reason in that paragraph as there is in the Globe's. What's the sense in telling a tramp that there is a fine banquet of stall fed joints and roast goose all ready in the adjoining room, without enlightening him as to the method by which he can get within the door and find a seat at the table? What's the sense in every day proving that commercial union is 120 cents on the dollar for every man in Canada, without being able to show that it is a fact which may be materialized, and not a myth fabricated by theorists as a subject for meaningless discussion?

The Globe should know whether commercial union (with its limitations) is practical or not before it wastes so much of its breath in windy discussions. Is it practical? Yes. Then unfold the scheme. Is it practical? No. Then let the subject drop. The Globe will not answer the question straight, but again, if it did some weeks ago, it leaves it to alleged practical statesmen. Will The Globe please suggest the names of these practical gentlemen in order that an anxious country may hear from them. The tramp wants to get into that banquet room.

The Bell Telephone Knocked Out.

The public of these days is constantly apprised of new inventions, for some of which wonderful merits are claimed. We read the claims with a good deal of reserve. While not one-half or one-quarter of what is claimed by the inventor is ever realized, yet we are sometimes surprised with a new force or a new device that makes up for much of the bogus claims of inventors. Such a surprise was the Bell Telephone. The latest invention before the public is in connection with the telephone and is a device which is claimed will knock out the Bell people's patents. The invention is called the Fulison Telephone, in which they use no battery or electricity, operating through a wonderfully ingenious transmitter and a No. 18 tarn copper wire.

An experiment was recently made of its efficacy as a transmitter. In an orchard a single wire was stretched from a house to a tree, 1600 feet apart, with a loose end of the wire lying on the ground. One of the party went up to the house and spoke through the transmitter and another man took off his hat—a common straw—laid it on the wire, using it as a receiver, and held conversation in an ordinary voice. At the same time a gentleman took hold of the wire between the two speakers, to prevent any vibration and also to conduct off any possible electrical current. This had no effect whatever. During the talking three others of the party also heard the conversation by listening in hats placed on the wire at the end of a stick placed against the tree limb to which the wire was attached. A whispered conversation was plainly audible. All this occurred wholly out of door, and one-third of a mile from the speaker at the transmitter in the apple orchard. A brisk wind was blowing across the wire.

This is the kind of telephone we want to see brought forward, but we won't count on it just yet awhile.

This Vote and That Vote.

The Rev. Mr. Milligan is quite correct in condemning the sordid motives of the annexationist agitators, who appeal to no noble sentiment, but confine themselves to unfounded promises of small gains upon a few articles—gains which could never compensate us for the inevitable losses involved. "There is something higher in life for nations and individuals than the dollar." Mr. Milligan is right, but it remains to be shown that this country would not lose more than she would gain by sacrificing her present political connections. Mr. Milligan further says: "I could understand these men agitating annexation on moral grounds as the one way out of the difficulties of the French question and this continual pandering to the Catholic vote—that interfere with the development of a true national spirit." When the reverend gentleman comes to look into the question more closely he will find that annexation would aggravate the evil of which he complains—the evil of masses of mixed voters open to special appeals. In the great country across the border there are millions of Catholics—French, Irish, German, Spanish, Mexican, and so on. Moreover, there is also there an immense colored vote. Minnesota, Dakota and Wisconsin are practically controlled by the Scandinavian vote. In fact there is no other country upon earth which can compare with the United States so far as mixed masses amenable to special pleas are concerned. Canada has her troubles and her difficulties, but these are not to be overcome by borrowing the many isms of a land which has "a thousand religions and only one gravy."

The Hon. James Young has rather rattled The Globe, which says: "We are not greatly concerned to traverse Mr. Young's whole argument." Because you cannot. Because Mr. Young has stated the facts of the case in a manner which forestalls the gang. The gang are whipped, which is the matter with the gang. The men who thought that there was money in selling out Canada have suddenly discovered their mistake. In fact some of them have suddenly discovered that anti-Canadianism is unpopular in Canada. See them jump! Canada and The World are doing pretty well, thank you.

In its controversy with the Hon. James Young The Globe makes the mistake of supposing that that gentleman has no backers. He has, and thousands of them. Mr. Young has only to lift his hand and the thousands will respond. What has the Deacon got? He has got himself and "a majority of one." The World has been telling the Deacon things until we are nearly tired, but the feeling has at last become such that he may go on—until something drops. When the drop occurs it will probably be in the neighborhood of himself. He has possibly heard of the engineer hoist by his own petard.

The Globe has turned upon the Hon. James Young, and has attempted to rend him, but we more than guess that James will get there. As between Mr. Young and The Globe there is no choice for any Canadian who is not either a traitor or a crank. The general public will have the pleasure of seeing one or more cranks bounced shortly.

The full text of Hon. James Young's letter dealing with the national and political phases of commercial union will be found elsewhere in this issue. While perhaps it contains no arguments that have not already been touched upon from time to time in these columns, it is yet a clear, interesting and comprehensive statement of the case, and worthy of attentive perusal.

The truly good Montreal Witness thinks that McGarigle the boodler cannot be extradited because "the United States Senate is afraid of the Irish vote." A temperance organ that not long ago supported a distiller for Parliament, ought to know how it is itself. McGarigle is amenable to the laws of this country, and when the laws fail to reach him hypocrisy is not likely to. John Dougall and his crowd have peddled their wares about long enough. He and they are frauds, concerning whom it is time to talk English.

The esteemed Mail denies that Mr. Wiman is a boodler. Is that why Mr. Bunting refused to appear upon the same platform with Mr. Wiman at Detroit and at Buffalo? People who play hide-and-seek in public life should not be surprised when the public infers that they have something to conceal, as members of every "brawling brood of bribers" seem sarily have.

There are things to be written and things to be done in this town, but one thing that can neither be written nor done with impunity is to sneer at Canada. Public opinion is with us and by us in our course against the wreckers and the strife-workers. Away with them! Pitchfork them! Any man who would assassinate his country deserves no better treatment, and from The World he will get none other.

THE EDITOR'S LETTER BOX.

The Devil Will Do His Part.

Editor World: While disposed to agree with your proposed disposition of annexationists and wreckers, as elaborated in your editorial on Mr. Young's views this morning, let me ask is it necessary to pitch them to both Hades and the devil. I doubt if even the mere scum of annexationists could sink so low as to land in regions without the devil finding out it was there, and once get them to the place of flames I think he may safely trust to the devil to hold down his end of the rail. CANADIAN.

Why Not Include Great Britain, Too.

Editor World: It was impossible for some of the more effusive American delegates at the recent Prison Reform Congress held in Toronto to refrain from biting at the adamantine cable which unites Canada to the British Empire. Gen. Brinkerhoff, a state comptroller of Ben Butterworth, told us in the name, to use his own spread-eagleism, "of the great Republic of the star-crowned banner" that we ought to shake down our wall of protection and unite in a commercial and political union of "the English speaking races, whose blood was thicker than water." But it was characteristic quite that Gen. Brinkerhoff's commercial union did not propose to include among "the English-speaking races" the great English nation itself. No! That was of course quite beyond Butterworth-Smith program, and shows the fallacy and selfishness of the whole scheme. F. F.

A Park for Parkdale.

Editor World: As my fellow townsmen in the Flowery Suburb are awakening to the fact that we need a public park, I would suggest that the strip of land lying south of Victoria-crescent and east of Dowling-avenue be utilized for that purpose. It has a splendid lake frontage, and a large number of shade trees, and lies very high. This the proper time for our Town Council to move in the matter, they being no buildings on this tract of land as yet. SUBURBAN RESIDENT.

QUERY BOX AND COMPLAINT BOOK.

An Income Assessment Question.

Editor World: (1) Can a person residing out of Toronto be assessed in Toronto for income? (2) What should be the amount of assessment for an income of $750 per year? PARKDALE.

(1) A person residing out of Toronto and whose place of business is in Toronto is liable to assessment here, but if he can show by certificate that he is assessed for his residence on this income then the Court of Revision would cancel the same. (2) $3.50.]

Bank of London Bills.

Editor World: Kindly tell me the prospects of Bank of London bills reaching par, and oblige [The prospects are good. A despatch from London says they will be redeemed at par after Oct. 1.]

(1) Yes. (2) 30 Days. (3) $20 and Costs.

Editor World: (1) Is it necessary to register the birth of a child? (2) If so what length of time is allowed? (3) In case of neglect what is the fine? SUBSCRIBER.

AT THE THEATRES.

"In Spite of All" and "True Irish Hearts" at the Grand and Toronto.

Miss Minnie Maddern and her company played "In Spite of All" to a large house at the Grand last night. There will be a matinee this afternoon and the charming actress will fare well to-night.

"True Irish Hearts" has caught on at the Toronto. It is a picturesque and typical representation of life on the Green Isle and is well staged. Matinee this afternoon.

The players in Rosina Vokes' company are in the city rehearsing for their performances at the Grand next week.

The first practice of the Tonic Sol Fa Society will be held on Monday next in Shaftesbury Hall. A program of high class music has been prepared, and it is proposed to give two concerts during the season.

"Alone in London" at the Grand.

Commencing to-morrow night, "Alone in London" ought to and doubtless will pack the Grand Opera House for the remainder of the week. This piece, from the pen of the clever and original Robert Buchanan, ranks far above the average melodrama, and in the hands of Col. Sinn's competent company will be produced in first class style. The play consists of a prologue and four acts. In the prologue is presented a happy rustic scene, wherein the heroine, Annie Meadows, refuses an honest, hearty miller for a city gentleman of elegant mien. In the first act, an interval of six years having elapsed, the gentleman is discovered to be an arch rascal, a burglar and professional villain. His elegance continues, but his victimized wife is in rags and supports herself and child by selling flowers on the street, having resisted the persuasions of her husband to become his accomplice. The loyal child sees the husband's blows, and four words have given place to fury. Finally the husband endeavors to murder his wife by imprisoning her in the sluice gate house and turning on the water—a superb scene, by the way—but the country miller having come to town to call on the wife, and having learned of her misery, happens in at the supreme moment and saves her life. The subsequent acts see all her wrongs righted and happiness is restored. Such is an outline of the general nature of the plot, which conveys no conception of the numerous incidentals that give it life and energy. There are a number of typical characters brought in, such as a rascally old fellow who pretends to be everyone's friend and sympathizer; a strong-minded, rough, cyclonic girl, but, withal, good-hearted; a London street singer, quite a clever character; Mrs. Maloney, from Cork, and others. All are bright, interesting people, and give a life picture of humanity in the metropolis of the world.

Miss Cora Tanner, a young and handsome lady gifted with historic talent of a high order, takes the leading part, in which she made a favorable and lasting impression on the patrons of the Grand last season.

Don's

let that cold of yours run on. You think it is a light thing. But it may run into catarrh. Or into pneumonia. Or consumption.

Catarrh is disgusting. Pneumonia is dangerous. Consumption is death itself.

The breathing apparatus must be kept healthy and clear of all obstructions and offensive matter. Otherwise there is trouble ahead.

All the diseases of these parts, head, nose, throat, bronchial tubes and lungs, can be delightfully and entirely cured by the use of Boschee's German Syrup. If you don't know this already, thousands and thousands of people can tell you. They have been cured by it, and "know how it is, themselves." Bottle only 75 cents. Ask any druggist.

Don't fail to procure Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup for your children while teething. It has been used by millions of mothers during the last forty years for their children. Cures wind colic, diarrhœa. Be sure and get Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup. 25c a bottle.

UTTERLY ANTI-CANADIAN.

HON. JAMES YOUNG'S VIEW OF COMMERCIAL UNION.

Annexation or Bankruptcy Would Surely Follow—The "Pooling" Arrangement Declared Untenable—Canada Would Become a National Hermaphrodite.

Following is the letter of Hon. James Young in which he takes up the national and political aspect of the question. It deserves the most careful perusal:

Turning now to the national and political side of the question, we have to consider the results likely to follow from the "conditions" which our neighbors have attached to commercial union. These conditions are that we unite in an American Zollverein, or, in other words, that we adopt a continental tariff against the world, and consequently discriminating against British trade. Nothing has surprised me more than that the advocates of this measure can profess to see nothing impossible in this country continuing British connection, while we join another nation in a league against British commerce. But before discussing that point, let us glance at another lion in the path, which, unlike old John Bunyan's lions, will have to be grappled with and overcome before we can proceed.

The Financial Phase.

One of the first results of commercial union would be the loss of nearly $7,000,000 of revenue annually collected by us from American imports. The total customs revenue of the Dominion for 1886 was $19,373,551, and notwithstanding our high taxation, there was a deficit of $5,834,000. How could we pay our public creditors and prevent financial embarrassment if we gave up our control over the tariff, and at the same time threw away $6,769,000, or over one-third of our total customs receipts, which was the amount collected from United States goods last year?

It will not do to "pooh-pooh" this question instead of answering it. It is a matter of the most vital consequence. The solvency or bankruptcy of the Dominion may depend upon it. The seven millions of revenue would have to be raised, and how could we do it? We could not raise it by higher duties on imports, for we would be under the Continental tariff which would be fixed by the majority, and if we even trebled our inland revenue taxes, it is exceedingly doubtful if the amount would be forthcoming, for the rates would be, in many cases, prohibitory, inducing smuggling and other evasions of the revenue. But even if we could easily raise the $7,000,000, what class of Canadian tax-payers, least of all our farmers, who have the brunt of the burden to bear now, would be the cream of taxing themselves for commercial union to such an extent?

Perceiving this dilemma, and that it alone would be fatal to the whole scheme, the commercial unionists have made the somewhat extraordinary proposal that the United States and Canada should have a joint purse for customs revenue, and they have published a calculation to show that a division of the revenue per capita would during the last year, at least, amount. Assuming that this were correct, there would still remain the strongest possible objections to a joint national purse, for we would have little or no control over the purse-strings. But, as a matter of fact, the figures advanced as to Canadian revenue under this proposal are not even approximately correct.

The sum of $210,000,000 is taken as the basis of this calculation, being the average of Canadian customs receipts for the past four years. But as their war expenditure disappears their customs duties are being gradually reduced; last year they only realized, in round numbers, $192,000,000, and there are loud calls all over the Republic for further reductions. Assuming, however, that their revenue did not fall lower than that the last-mentioned sum, it would reduce Canada's share from $3.60 to $2.92 per head, or by the sum of $1,500,000. Moreover, our inland revenue is set down in the calculation at $11,500,000. But unless they propose to extend the United States inland revenue system over the Dominion, or we have ourselves to adopt similar laws to theirs, which would be much the same thing, our inland revenue would only amount to $6,000,000, which was more than ten millions less last year. In these two items, therefore, the calculation aforesaid comes short to the extent of $7,000,000.

The broad fact is that Canada exposed, according to the late Finance Minister's statement, to realize $22,500,000 from customs during 1887-8, whilst under the proposed joint-purse arrangement at $3.60 per head for five millions of people, we would not receive more than $18,000,000, is sufficient to prove that commercial union is impossible unless the people of the Dominion are prepared to put their hands in their pockets and raise annually some six or seven millions of additional revenue.

Since the above argument was written my attention has been called to Mr. Butterworth's letter of Aug. 6 to members of Congress in which he suggests "some modifications of the internal revenue system on each side of the line." This is the first time I have observed any proposal of this kind, and if it had been any proposal of this kind, and if it had been any force of my argument it adds to additional taxation. Under any circumstances Canada would have to tax herself for the deficient millions.

Discrimination Against Great Britain.

The most striking and objectionable feature of commercial union is the fact that our neighbors require Canada, although a British colony, to shall adopt a joint tariff with the United States, discriminating against British trade. Without dilating on the unusual character of this "condition," I may say that the Dominion has no constitutional power to make any treaty, much less one hostile to the mother country. That British benefit could accrue to a discriminating commercial union is by no means certain, as under the "most favored nation clause" of her treaties with such countries as France, Germany and Italy, she might be sharply taken to account for discriminating in favor of her United States. But waiving this point, what Canadian statesman, unless he had lost all regard for British connection, would seriously propose to direct Britain to negotiate a treaty, or even consent to legislation, discriminating against her own commerce and building up Germany and France?

"Yes," says Mr. Goldwin Smith, "Canada already levies duties avowedly protective on British goods, and the adoption of the Annexation policy would make no great difference, as it appears to me, either practically or in point of principle." With all respect to Mr. Smith, a greater fallacy with more specious glare never penned. There is a fundamental difference between the two cases. Under our present tariff, however objectionable in some respects, British and American manufacturers stand upon equal terms. But under commercial union, Canada would open her doors free to all American goods, but bar them against those of Britain by duties ranging from 50 per cent. anywhere up to 100 per cent. This is a wide difference from our present tariff, "both practically and in point of principle," and its far-reaching effects would speedily appear. It would, indeed, give a ruinous blow to British trade with Canada, and to represent John Bull, as some are coolly doing, as being rather willing than otherwise to perform a sort of commercial hari kari of the nation, proves that the age of credulity has not yet passed away.

Delivered Over to the States.

Another overwhelming objection to every Canadian who has any proper spirit or regard for his country must be, it appears to me, that the control of fiscal, commercial and discriminating tariff would practically be in the hands of our neighbors. I know it is urged that a joint commission, in which Canada would be fairly represented, would regulate changes in the tariff from time to time. Mr. Wiman is reported to have said at Detroit that the basis of this commission would be population, and that the proportion would later point to the States for every one for this country! However, this might turn out the odd Canadian every ten years, that is, if we could so fall out of respect to wag the dog, and so, practically, the control of the taxation would pass out of our hands. If Congress ever needed to give the control of the tariff into the hands of any commission, which I can hardly believe, they would at least insist that they should appoint the commissioners who were to represent the Republic. In controlling the commissioners, they would control what they did, and, consequently, this condition of commercial union would practically place the taxation of the people of Canada in the hands of the United States Congress. A century ago our neighbors began the Revolutionary War rather than to submit to "taxation without representation," and I cannot understand how any Canadian who desires the continuance of the present independent position of Canada could ever consent to hand over the tremendous power of taxation, not only without representation, but into the hands of a nation with which we are not even politically connected.

Now, suppose commercial union to be actually in force, what would be the position Canada be? We would be under the continental tariff, nominally controlled by a joint commission, but practically by the States. Our inland revenue would be similarly controlled. There would be a joint purse for the moneys collected, but as our neighbors would put in say two hundred to our twenty millions, naturally the purse aforesaid would be kept at Washington, and if we did not draw the whole of our per capita allowance of revenue from the American capital, whatever deficiency there was at our own ports would certainly be drawn from there. Can any one imagine a more dependent and pitiful position for the Dominion and its Government to occupy? We would occupy a position wondrously like being supported by an annual grant from the United States, and our Government would be like Samson shorn of his locks. As they no longer controlled the tariff or its revenues, they would be impotent to discharge many of the functions of Government. They would be unable to undertake new public works and improvements so necessary to the growth and prosperity of a country like Canada. If an Indian rebellion broke out they would be at their wits' end for money to put it down, and Canada would occupy a position at once painful and comical in case of trouble arising between Great Britain and the States.

Whenever the tariff was changed at Washington our Parliament would have to cry "ditto"; when new rules and orders were issued as to customs, our Government would have to cry "ditto" again; and when they altered their inland revenue taxes, "ditto" would again be our cry. Our merchants and all others affected would have to conform to these changes, and we may rest assured that in a commission composed of ten Americans to one Canadian, their policy would at least now be to build up the trade of Montreal and Toronto at the expense of Boston and New York. If the tariff was raised we would have to pay higher taxes. If it was lowered our subsidy might decline so that bankruptcy might stare us in the face, and then, indeed, we might be forced to "look to Washington" whether we liked it or not.

It is needless, I feel assured, to press this point further. Even if the United States Government would alter its anti-British policy in this matter with perfect good faith, the proposed arrangement as to the tariff would place our trade would give rise to constant differences between the two countries and in all such cases, as the weaker party, we would have to knuckle under. Place ourselves once in such a position and our experience in regard to the fisheries and other questions abundantly proves, that however just and generous Americans generally are, the average Congressional politician and all whom he could influence, would use their vantage ground for all it was worth to realize the national dream of the Monroe doctrine:

"No pent-up Utica contracts our powers,
The whole boundless continent is ours."

Many in Canada who have expressed themselves favorable to commercial union are under the belief that it is compatible with the continuance of British connection, but I think it must be apparent from the foregoing reasons, not to mention others, that the combination of the two things is quite impracticable. And this leads me to notice the statements frequently made by Mr. Goldwin Smith and others, that "all Canada was enthusiastic over commercial union," that "everyone admits its benefits," etc. If it had been said that all Canada was enthusiastic for reciprocity, and freer commercial relations, it would be correct enough, but there are no solid grounds for saying that of commercial union. A few meetings, most of them sparsely attended, furnishes little evidence of Canadian opinion, more especially when most of those present were under the belief that they were only voting for reciprocity of a rather more extended character than before. Besides, in almost every case, the resolutions passed contained a saving clause in favor of British connection, which fact indicates what the opinions of the masses of Canadians will be when the true bearings of the question are fully discussed and understood. Our people are warmly in favor of reciprocity or any fair and square measure to secure freer trade between the two countries, but instead of being enthusiastic for commercial union," it is my firm belief that Mr. Smith will find, when the people of Canada thoroughly understand the question, which is not the case at the present moment, that it will prove but little more popular than his abortive wine and beer agitation.

Annexation Would Follow.

However, annexation some may be in thinking otherwise, commercial union is inconsistent with the continuance of British connection or a national future for Canada. John Bright, in his recent letter, says that protection was a first step towards separation of Canada from England and that commercial union would be "another and more serious step" in the same direction. There can be no doubt of the correctness of Mr. Bright's view, and those Canadians who have heretofore thought differently—and many have honestly done so—have only to read the accounts of the Detroit meeting to learn "whither they are drifting." Mr. Goldwin Smith knows quite well that annexation, and Mr. Butterworth, though still employing ambiguous phrases, clearly indicated annexation as the final result when he said: "It is apparent to all that in the consummation of what is now proposed, the Monroe doctrine becomes an accomplished fact throughout all this continent."

There can be no uncertainty as to the meaning of the language used by the leading commercial unionists at Detroit, and yet we have frequently asserted on this side of the lines that to support commercial union is the best way to prevent annexation. It is remarkably curious if this be correct, that every annexationist in the land is doing his level best, in talking or writing, in favor of the Butterworth scheme! And in using the very arguments which not one intend to convey any reproach. I have no fault to find with any one who holds that or any other view, but I do complain when such men cry out, on the other hand, that I sympathize with sneers at loyalty, as if it were a crime for a Canadian to be loyal to his own country. But whilst treating annexationists with all respect, it is the manifest duty of those who hold, like myself, that Canada has a brighter and better future before her, to warn our fellow-countrymen that annexation is the natural and logical result of such a grave step as commercial union, and that to prevent the latter would prevent the former is not less preposterous than to say that the best way to prevent your boat going over Niagara Falls would be to shoot it over the Chippawa Rapids.

Cannot be National.

In our circumstances, as part of the British Empire, commercial union is an impracticable national position. We would no sooner be there, to use a current phrase, than it would be apparent to everyone that, united with Britain politically but with the States commercially, Canada had become a sort of national Hermaphrodite, half British and half Yankee; that such a position was at once inconsistent and intolerable; and that we must either go forward to annexation or try to retrace our steps, regretting the folly of which we had been guilty. That Canada could adopt the latter course if thoroughly united might be possible, but we would not be united upon it, and we would find that, having slidden half way down a precipice, it is very hard to scramble back to the top and very easy to slide down to the bottom. For my own part, I do not believe we would ever find it practicable to draw back, for I regard political union as the natural sequence of commercial union. But that we could either go backwards or forwards without embroiling Great Britain and the United States in a dangerous civil disorder in Canada, and possibly bloodshed, is open to the very gravest doubts. I hope my fellow-Canadians will weigh well all the consequences, political as well as commercial, likely to follow such a far-reaching measure as commercial union before deciding upon it. I have written very briefly and perhaps at too great length, it is because I feel it to be a question of momentous importance to the future of Canada, and therefore of a life-long interest to me. I regard it as a great—perhaps fatal—mistake if the Liberal party became committed to the Butterworth scheme. Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Blake, Mr. Mackenzie and Edward Blake—a noble trio—never at any time expressed themselves favorable to a Zollverein. Mr. Brown, we know, was strongly opposed to it, as being antagonistic to the continuance of British connection; and as a political weapon, whilst its advantages are attractive on the surface, when the people come to understand its numerous commercial drawbacks and political consequences, in my humble judgment any party adopting it would find it a veritable boomerang in their hands. For after all, although the electorate have made great mistakes, the people generally warmly love Canada, and if this question ever goes so far as to be threshed out and sifted at the polls their good sense can be trusted to say to our American neighbors—"We ardently desire friendly commercial relations with you; we are warmly in favor of a new Reciprocity Treaty or any other fair measure, dealing out even-handed justice to both, and doing no injury to either; but we are not prepared, under the guise of commercial union, to surrender our country for commercial advantages which would be just as beneficial to you as they would be to us!"

And It Is Anti-Canadian.

As we stated in another letter, commercial union is utterly anti-Canadian, and leads directly away from the national feeling which ought to be and is worthy to be the hope of every true Canadian. There exists throughout Canada the kindliest feelings towards the United States. For my own part, I admire the great Republic with its noble work for humanity and freedom, and like the American people. But as a nation they have their dangers. They have still unsolved the their negro problem, the Mormon scandal, the Socialistic conspiracy, which steadily becomes more dangerous, and lynch law, which continues to prevail over a large part of the Union. The Continental Sunday, too, with its open theatres, concert halls and baseball matches, is becoming alarmingly common. Canada doubtless has its dangers and difficulties also, but I firmly believe that for the present we occupy a better position than any other nation, inheriting Institutions under British protection, and, when the circling wheels of Time bring this connection to an end, that we have territories vast enough, resources immense enough, institutions good enough and a people with character enough to establish and maintain a Canadian nationality which will be honored and respected all over the world. JAMES YOUNG.

A Break in Sugar Looked For.

As an experment and in order that a test of the quality may be made Mr. W. M. Milligan, the well-known grocer at 99 Queen-street west, has ordered a cargo of Scotch granulated sugar which will be sold at a small profit. Should a break in the price of sugar come, as is confidently expected, the holders of the cheap lines will assuredly reap the benefit. Mr. Milligan deserves encouragement in his endeavor to provide a good article at the lowest cost, and his customers will doubtless appreciate his enterprise.

"Queen City" and "Hand-in-Hand."

—Fire and Plate Glass Insurance Company's A rebate will be allowed to all policy-holders placing their insurance direct with the above companies. No. 24 Church-street, Toronto. Scott & Walmsley, Underwriters. 613

THE QUEENS OF THE SEA.

VOLUNTEER AND THISTLE PREPARING FOR THEIR GREAT RACE.

Toronto and Jersey City Divide Honors Yesterday—Winners at Prospect Park—Donohue Outrows Curran—The Woodstocks Forfeit to Orillia—Sailing at Midland—Other Sports.

NEW YORK, Sept. 20.—Gen. Paine is having a great deal of trouble preparing the Volunteer for her naval duel next week with the Thistle. The trial trip of the champion yesterday convinced all on board that the new boom, which was shipped Saturday evening, is entirely unsuited to the vessel. It was unshipped to-day and replaced by the old boom. Gen. Paine intends to make a number of alterations to the vessel's spars and rigging before the first race next Tuesday, but the nature of these he refuses to divulge at present.

The Thistle's Secrets to be Disclosed.

NEW YORK, Sept. 20.—After to-morrow morning the great secret of the shape of the Thistle's hull under water will be no longer concealed, as she will be hauled up high and dry in Henderson's yard at the foot of Van Brunt street, South Brooklyn, and all those who have indulged in useless speculation as to her model will have a chance to view her to their heart's content.

Those who claim to know say she will not differ materially from the ordinary cutter, and the most experienced in this model of yacht say that she is built on exactly the same lines as a small three-tonner, by the same designer, which is now racing in England and making it as lively for boats in her class as the Thistle did in hers.

Even then the lines of this small cutter vary but little from the ordinary cutter, and do not lean toward the American sloop, as the Thistle is supposed to do. One thing is almost certain, and that is that she was built as a light weather boat, and in light breezes is almost unknown on this side. The only times she was seen in light breezes, and they were very light indeed, was on Tuesday and Thursday and she showed herself to be extremely fast.

On the first named day, before the wind, for a short time she plainly outsailed the Volunteer, and on each day showed that she was a boat to be feared under like conditions. The only thing, therefore, left for loyal Americans to do is to pray for a steady thirty-mile breeze next week in order that the Volunteer, whose designer has not failed in two years to produce the fastest loop in the world.

The Thistle lay off Tompkinsville all day and will not go outside until she has been on the dry dock. The usual crowd of admirers visited Staten Island but few were allowed aboard. Mr. Bell and his charming wife came to the city in the morning, but were not aboard of their yacht in the afternoon. Mrs. Bell has, perhaps, attracted almost as much attention as the pretty yacht, whose deck she graces, although not quite as much of a sailor as Mrs. Henn was, is just as enthusiastic in everything pertaining to yachting.

The standing and running gear of the Scotch yacht was thoroughly overhauled, and her topmast, which was housed in the morning, was set in place during the afternoon.

Sailmaker Ratsey and his two assistants were busy at the silk spinnaker, which is larger than the one the Thistle carried last year. It is the lightest and strongest fabric ever seen on any vessel that has ever visited this country, and from its took promises to do good service when the cutter is before the wind. Ratsey is extremely careful to pick up every clipping cut from the sail, as he thinks the Americans are a very smart people and that the sail might be duplicated for use on the Volunteer.

Captain Coffin in The New York World.

The questions most frequently asked of any and all persons who are supposed to be informed on yachting matters are: "What are the Thistle's chances?" and "Will she capture the cup?" They began to be asked when the news of her victories over the cutter Iren, the smartest yacht in British waters, reached this country, and have continued to be asked ever since.

They are very difficult to answer. In fact, it may be said that it is impossible for any one to answer them correctly, for there is nothing in the shape of sport that is so much the subject of chance as a yacht race. All old yachtsmen remember that in the annual regatta of the New York Yacht Club some years ago the very slowest vessel of the lot not only won the race, but distanced the fastest boat by a mile, namely, the schooner Ianthe, owned by Mr. Herreshoff, the Bristol builder, and when all the schooners of the fleet had rounded the Sandy Hook lightship and were returning they met her on the bar bound out. They all became becalmed in the lower bay and drifted far to the west with a strong flood-tide. She went over the mark, and returning caught a light air at the Spit buoy, fanned over to the eastward near Coney Island, and so came home. Her defeat would be easily explained by the fact that she was not even in good cruising form and was not in the race, while if under such conditions she beat the Volunteer he might as well claim the America cup at once, without racing for it.

In all human probability, then, in wind and weather such as prevailed last Friday, the Volunteer will always be able, barring "flukes," to beat the Thistle, and should the conditions of wind and weather be worse than they were then, the Thistle will probably be worse beaten, and in such conditions of weather as prevailed during the outside Portland Genesta race Thistle will be farther astern at the finish than the Genesta was.

The contest, however, is going to be a close one, and although the chances are, as has been shown, in favor of the Volunteer, the Thistle has by no means a hopeless job in hand and a very moderate-sized "fluke" will give her the cup. It will be interesting to note the sailing of these two yachts in very light winds, which as much be met with in the course of the series; and if the sailing of the Volunteer under such circumstances during the cruise be any indication as to the probable result, there can be no doubt that she is as good as the Thistle is in a drifting match, and she will most probably be found in the lead when the race is called off.

VICTORY AND DEFEAT.

Toronto and Jersey City each Win a Game—Brotherhood of Ball Players.

Toronto and Jersey City played two games yesterday afternoon and it fell to the lot of Powers' men to check the Torontos after the latter had won fifteen straight victories. The home team barely escaped defeat in the first game, several decisions of Umpire Emslie favoring the visitors. In the second game he was equally at fault and was hissed time and again. Emslie's failure to make Shaw face the batter is hard to account for, as he has been umpiring long enough to understand the rules.

The First Game.

Shepherd was in the box for the home team in the first game and was supported by Traffley. The Jerseyites got only seven hits, four of which were made in the second innings which, with disastrous errors, enabled the visitors to score five runs. Thereafter they failed to get a runner across the plate. The Torontos earned a run in the first inning on Decker's single and Faatz' double. In the third inning they tied the score, making four runs on Albert's phantom, Slattery's single, Hiland's fumble, Faatz' single and Brady's failure to stop Kearn's grounder. They secured the winning run in the next inning, Traffley reaching first on Corcoran's error and scoring on Slattery's triple. Score:

TORONTO.	R	H	O	A	E	JERSEY CITY	R	H	O	A	E
Albert, s.s.	1	1	2	2	0	Hiland, 2b.	0	0	3	0	0
Slattery, l.f.	1	1	2	0	0	Brady, 1b.	0	1	2	0	0
Decker, c.f.	2	2	0	0	0	Fritz, l.f.	0	1	2	0	0
Faatz, 1b.	1	2	19	0	0	Corcoran, 3b.	1	1	1	4	1
McCormick, r.f.	0	2	1	0	0	Brown, r.f.	0	1	0	0	0
Hickey, 2b.	0	2	2	1	2	Sowders, c.f.	1	2	8	0	0
Kearns, 3b.	0	1	0	4	0	Hoffers, s.s.	0	0	4	1	0
Shepherd, p.	0	1	0	6	0	Shaw, c.	1	2	1	5	0
Traffley, c.	1	1	5	0	1	Lang, s.s.	1	0	5	2	0
Total	6	12	27	15	4	Total	5	7	26	12	5

Jersey City	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0—5
Toronto	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0—6

Passed balls—Hoffers. Wild pitches—Shaw. Two base hits—Faatz (2). Three base hit—Slattery. Total left on bases—Toronto 3, Jersey City 4. Bases on balls—Albert, Slattery, Traffley, Hit by pitcher—Hiland. Struck out—Decker, McCormack, Hickey, Farrell, Brady, Brown, Sowders, Hoffers, Lang, Shaw 3. Jersey City 1. Double plays—Lang, Hofford. Umpire—Emslie. Time of game—2 hours.

The Second Game.

The second game was started with Daly, the Jersey City left-hand twirler, in the box, but he retired with a sore arm after striking out Albert, Corcoran taking his place. This all-round player managed to hold the heavy hitters down to a few scattering hits, and was given splendid support. On the other hand the Torontos fielded miserably, and timely hitting of Hoffers, Brown and Sowders's family umpiring allowed the Jerseyites to win. Score:

TORONTO.	R	H	O	A	E	JERSEY CITY	R	H	O	A	E
Albert, s.s.	1	1	0	1	2	Hiland, 2b.	3	3	4	0	0
Slattery, l.f.	1	1	1	0	0	Brady, 1b.	3	2	1	2	0
Decker, c.f.	1	1	2	0	0	Fritz, l.f.	1	1	2	0	0
Faatz, 1b.	1	2	8	0	0	Corcoran, 3b.	1	1	0	5	0
McCormick, r.f.	0	0	0	0	0	Brown, r.f.	1	1	0	0