

## Dumping and Slashing

Questions that have arisen at Ottawa in connection with the sugar trade seem to have caused confusion in the minds of some people respecting the purpose of the clause in the Customs Act known as the anti-dumping clause. There may be phases of the sugar question which, apart entirely from the anti-dumping clause, require consideration. But there is no room for any dispute as to the purpose and meaning of the section respecting what is known as "dumping". It appears to be assumed in some quarters that if there is a "slashing" of prices of a commodity in the United States, resulting in its sale at a substantial reduction on previous quotations, the anti-dumping clause of the Customs law can properly be invoked to prevent or check the importation of that commodity into Canada. This, however, is not what the law intends or provides. The law was not designed to prevent the Canadian people sharing any cheapness enjoyed by the people of the neighboring Republic. If from any cause—no matter what it may be—the people of the States are able to buy an article cheaply, it is the right of Canadians to import that article at its American price on payment of the ordinary duty. It is only when the American seller quotes for shipment to Canada a price which is not available to the American citizen that the anti-dumping clause comes into operation. In such a case the law assumes that the transaction is an illegitimate one that may be designed to crush a Canadian competitor. If through any circumstances the price of a commodity in the United States is reduced,—that is, the price at which the article can be purchased by American buyers for home consumption—then the price so fixed is the fair market value of the commodity, and the anti-dumping clause cannot apply to imports at that price. The Canadian Customs authorities are not called upon to consider the causes of the reduction,—whether it is the result of the ordinary business operations or of some special "slashing" of prices. Slashing of the price to the Canadian buyer while maintaining a higher price in the States is dumping. Slashing of prices which are open alike to the American and Canadian buyer is not dumping.

## A Separate Foreign Policy

In the recent discussion of the Irish question much has been said about the necessity of Imperial unity as respects action in foreign affairs. Mr. Asquith, in advocating the granting of Dominion Home Rule to Ireland, refers to this phase of the subject, "No British Dominion" he says, "claims the right to a separate foreign policy of its own."

Is Mr. Asquith quite correct? His words would have unquestionably been true a

couple of years ago. But they are open to question now.

One of the strange situations brought about by the scheme for the formation of the League of Nations is that the overseas British Dominions have claimed and received places in the League Assembly as nations separate and apart from the United Kingdom. From that viewpoint these Dominions have a right to separate foreign policies of their own. It is quite conceivable that, in the discussion of foreign affairs which will naturally engage the attention of the League, Dominion delegates may assume a position entirely at variance with that of the representatives of the mother country. In the eyes of the foreign representatives in the League Assembly, each of the Dominions clearly has now a right to a separate foreign policy of its own, if it sees fit to exercise the right. Let us hope that in practice there will not arise that conflict of opinion between the mother country and the Dominions which the constitution of the League makes easily possible. For Ireland or any other part of the Empire to attempt a separate foreign policy of its own would be a foolish course.

## Why Fuss About It?

Mr. Edward Salmon is a prolific writer in the British press on Imperial affairs. He is an intense believer—a sincere believer, evidently—in the greatness of the British Empire. His zeal in this regard commands respect and even admiration. The weak point of his writings is that he is persistently in a state of alarm lest the Empire will fall to pieces. Most people within the territories over which the Union Jack waves, and practically everybody outside, feel that the British Empire is a pretty solid and substantial institution, which has more than held its own, an organization which has in recent years increased its influence, its power and its glory. But while the rest of the world is reflecting on this outstanding fact, and most people are finding satisfaction in such reflection, Mr. Salmon and a few others in England are proclaiming that the Empire will go to smash unless it is saved by the instrumentality of some new-fangled constitution. One would suppose that this group of alarmists, reflecting on their gloomy accounts of the Empire's condition before the war and on the record of the Empire when the day of trial came, would cease to draw their lugubrious pictures. But they persist in crying out that dreadful consequences will follow a failure to accept their notions.

Mr. Salmon's latest contribution appears in the British Empire Review for September under the caption "The Constitutional Conference of 1921". In his mind the holding of this conference is a matter of supreme importance. "In a very short time", he writes, "arrangements for the holding of

the next Imperial Conference should be well advanced. Statesmen in Whitehall, in the Dominions, and in India will be busy turning over the problems to be discussed and, if possible, solved." Mr. Salmon is pained to observe that other people are failing to manifest any of that interest in the coming assembly that he so keenly feels. "Have the British peoples, whether at home or overseas, the democracies, who are the heirs, administrators and assigns of the greatest secular trust known to mankind, given thought to the issues which will turn on the assembly? Have they formulated their views as to the precise conditions which should govern the relations of the Old Country with the younger notions who keep the flag flying throughout the Seven Seas?" Again he asks, "Have the people of Australia or Canada, any more than the people of Great Britain, decided how far they would go next year towards the realization of some definite scheme of Imperial unity?" Mr. Salmon finds that the peoples referred to are not thinking of these things and therefore he is sad. "It has been", he says, "a cause of genuine surprise to me to meet excellent Imperialists—men who are inspired by the adjective Imperial, even as Sir George Foster confesses to being inspired—and to discover that they either have not read or have not grasped the significance of Lord Milner's statement in the House of Lords in June last." All these people, Mr. Salmon says, are fully alive to the importance of the English cricket championship and the sculling contest on the Parramatta. "But," he proceeds, "ask the same energetic students of Imperial sport what their view is of next year's Imperial Constitutional Conference and they will confess that they have never given thought to it."

We are glad to be able to confirm, so far as Canada is concerned, Mr. Salmon's estimate of the condition of public opinion on the subject that so disturbs him. The Canadian people are not worrying about such things. Latest reports indicate that so little importance is attached in official circles to the proposed conference that it will be abandoned entirely for the year 1921. Probably those who have the responsibility of deciding such questions found difficulty in preparing any programme of really practical questions for the consideration of the assembly.

Why should anybody in Canada worry about the Imperial Conference? What grievance has Canada that calls for a remedy? What resolution has the Canadian Parliament passed, or been asked to pass, calling for any constitutional change?

There are many questions of real concern to the people of Canada to which they may well give their attention. But there is no earthly reason why they should fuss about constitutional changes that nobody is asking for and that nobody understands; and there is no reason why they should encourage anybody in England to do so.