

flood of their products would be unwise. But, in fact, population in Canada is sparse, and the reason the price of labor in Canada is low is not because there are millions seeking employment and crowding each other, but because business there is stagnant, money is scarce, and profits are low. They suffer for want of a market, for want of capital; enterprise not being encouraged, the price of labor is in some places lower than here. Those who lived in the Western States in the earlier days when we had no access to markets can remember a similar state of things, when abundance of land and raw material and a vague splendored future in sight were all ineffectual to bring good prices for anything. Labor was ill paid, wages were low, money was scarce, business was dull. But when the railroads were opened and the market came to our Western farmers, an era of good prices, general prosperity, and rapid, steady growth ensued, as it would to the vast depressed agricultural regions of Northwestern Canada if a market were afforded them.

The prosperity of our Western farmers did no injury to New England or any part of the East. It increased the prosperity of all, afforded them abundant supplies, gave to them a wider market for the products they had to sell, and promoted the growth of both the East and the West with immense strides. So the opening of the great agricultural regions of Canada, now sparsely peopled and depressed in business, will widen our market, give new regions to American enterprise and profitable investment, and benefit all parties. The price of labor in Canada as soon as activity and prosperity touched those lands would rise as in the Western States. This is not a question of admitting the millions of European pauper laborers to our market nor anything akin to it. I have faith that the capital and labor of the United States, sixty millions strong, can easily take care of themselves in the opening of the market with five millions of Canadians.

Would the adoption of a common tariff along the seacoast and unrestricted intercourse over the inland border lead to fraud? Would goods be admitted by Canadian custom-house officials without paying duty and thus evade our tariff? Would it be safe to allow a part of our custom-houses, those along the Canadian border, to be beyond the control and jurisdiction of our Treasury Department? I answer, what ground is there to apprehend fraud? The Canadian custom-house system bears a good name and is well administered. I know it is said that in the countries on the south of us there is much looseness in custom-house systems, and in any such arrangements with them much precaution might be necessary; but there is nothing in the history of Canadian administration to warrant a distrust of their officials by us any more than they might distrust ours. However, there is no practical difficulty in having officers of the United States revenue service in their ports with function of inspection to prevent losses to revenue, or injury to our merchants. That is done to-day by our Treasury Department, which has its officers at Vancouver, in British Columbia, and in Ontario, and in Quebec, and elsewhere throughout Canada, done with the permission of that Government, to protect our custom-house revenue from losses in the transit trade.

Commercial union is in substance a proposition to extend our tariff system, modified reasonably upon consultation, over Canada; to remove the custom-houses of both governments from the frontier and put them along the line of the sea; to have our protective system include the continent from the Gulf of Mexico north; to give to our manufactures and other products as free access to the markets of Canada as they have