

would be comparatively easy to control the export, allowing the nickel to go only to Great Britain, France or Russia. As long as we export the unrefined ore the export should be confined to Great Britain or to places designated by the British authorities.

"The effect of this prohibition upon the industry of getting out the ore is of comparatively small importance. The supreme object is to prevent a necessary munition of war from getting into the hands of the enemy. We might just as well send soldiers to enlist in the German army as nickel to be used for the navy. Canada controls all the nickel in the world except the mines owned by France, and Canada should help France to starve Germany out of this material."

Even when we read "matte" for "ore" in the Star's editorial, the policy seems a ridiculous one. The bulk if not all, of the nickel exported from the United States is going to the Allies and not to the enemy. The Star in an effort to interfere with possible sales to Germany wants to adopt a measure which would certainly be more embarrassing to the Allies than to the enemy.

The Montreal Journal of Commerce had the following editorial in the Nov. 18 issue:

"The nickel question has been brought to public notice from time to time for quite a long period. In the past it has usually been a debatable question. Now it has assumed a form which hardly seems to admit of debate. An export duty on nickel produced in Canada has sometimes been advocated as a measure for obtaining revenue. But export duties for revenue purposes, involving, as they necessarily would, much interference with trade, have not commended themselves to Finance Ministers.

"Export duties on nickel 'matte' have often been advocated as a means of compelling the producers to refine the nickel in Canada. Such a policy would naturally commend itself to high protectionists who argue that all manufacturing shall be done at home. Three years ago much was heard of that kind of policy, the country ringing with the cry, 'Let us keep our raw materials at home,' but to-day one hears it not, and the foreigner remains as free as he was then to take our raw materials away to be manufactured abroad. As a purely commercial and industrial question the propriety of preventing the export of raw or semi-raw materials has always been, to say the least, open to debate. There was room for difference of opinion as to the wisdom of prohibiting the export of nickel in its 'matte' shape. Canada, while a large producer of nickel, had not a monopoly of it. The French island of New Caledonia had nickel. Interference with the export from Canada might close the Canadian industry and give the producers in New Caledonia the control of the business. A large sum of money had been invested in the Canadian nickel mines at Sudbury. It was nominally American capital. But foreign capital invested in good faith in Canada was entitled to the protection of Canadian laws. If prohibitive export duties would, as was alleged, close the operations at Sudbury, and transfer the nickel busi-

ness to another country, such regulations would be unjust to the men who had invested their capital, and to all concerned in the Canadian industry. Whether such would be the result was a debatable question. Those who opposed the suggested restrictions seemed to have some ground for their contention.

"Thus proposals for export duties in the case of nickel, either for revenue purposes or for the development of home manufacturing, came within the field of debatable questions. If proposals that are now being made in the press rested on the same grounds as the earlier ones, they would still be debatable. But they do not. The present proposals respecting nickel rest on an entirely new ground to which the objections of the past do not apply. The strictly economic question must stand aside. The question now is one created by the war.

"Canada's nickel has been going to the United States to be refined and then sold, to a very large extent, to Germany. There are those who will say that such a policy should never have been allowed. It is too late, however, to discuss that policy as respects the past. It is not too late to discuss it and deal with it as respects the present and the future. When the question was a purely economic one, the argument could be used that Canada could not control the nickel industry. Canada alone to-day could not control the industry. But Canada's rival, New Caledonia, is French territory. Canada, as a part of the British Empire, is an ally of France in the war. The Allies, then, can control the nickel industry and prevent Germany receiving this product so necessary to her war measures.

"Since the question was brought prominently to public attention a few weeks ago, a step has been taken at Ottawa which may lead some people to imagine that no further harm can be done. An Order-in-Council has been passed prohibiting the export of nickel from Canada to Germany or the enemy countries. But this order does not meet the case. No nickel has been sent from Canada to Germany. There are no nickel refineries in Germany. The Krupps have their interest in the refinery in New Jersey. The nickel in the 'matte' shape goes from Canada to New Jersey, where the refining takes place, and from the American refinery to Germany, and to any other country wanting it. That has been the course of the business in the past; that is the course now, and the new Order-in-Council, forbidding the export of nickel from Canada to Germany, does not touch the case at all. So far as the public can see, Germany is to-day as free as she ever was to take Canadian nickel and use it in her warfare against the British Empire. We send our soldiers to fight for the Empire, and we send our nickel to help the Germans make war upon us.

"In the past, the convenience of trade, the interests of the workers at Sudbury, the protection of capital invested in Canada, afforded some reason—or at least some excuse—for a policy of non-interference with the nickel business. But these considerations can no longer weigh