

Canadian Courier

THE NATIONAL WEEKLY

VOL. 7

Toronto, May 28th, 1910

No. 26



REFLECTIONS

BY THE EDITOR

CERTAINLY, the coronation oath should be amended so as to be positive instead of negative. By stating what a Protestant believes, the King can be relieved of denying what Roman Catholics believe. If that amendment would satisfy the Roman Catholics it should be accepted by Protestants. As a matter of fact, it will not alter the circumstances to any great extent. If King George announces his allegiance to the Protestant faith in positive terms, he thereby declares that he does not believe in those doctrines which distinguish Protestantism from Romanism. Such a coronation oath would be fully as anti-Catholic as the present oath.

Roman Catholics who declare that a member of that faith married to a Protestant in a Protestant church is not legally or morally married, can make no strong plea to Protestants for toleration. When a Roman Catholic archbishop prevents a Roman Catholic judge from speaking in a Protestant church on temperance, the people who support that archbishop are not in a position to protest strongly against an anti-Romanist coronation oath. On the day of the King's funeral, Roman Catholic cadets taking part in a procession in a small Canadian town were warned not to enter a Protestant church, and remained outside; this is not toleration of the highest type.

Roman Catholics and Protestants are certainly living together in Canada in greater harmony than ever before. Nevertheless, there is much to be done before either side shows that broad Christian spirit which both profess. There is still the intolerant *Orange Sentinel* on the one side and still the equally intolerant *Catholic Register* on the other. If the coronation oath stands in the way of showing a spirit of religious toleration to Roman Catholics, the Protestants of Canada would be willing to have it changed. In doing so, they have a right to appeal to Archbishop Bruchesi and his fellow officials of the Roman Catholic church that they shall show an equally generous attitude toward mixed marriages and the attendance of Roman Catholics at semi-religious events, such as weddings and funerals, in Protestant churches.

MANY people are anxiously watching the attitude of the Toronto *Globe* on reciprocity matters. There is a reason for this. In the recent negotiations with the United States, and the consequent settlement, the editor of the *Globe* took a rather prominent if unofficial part. Indeed, gossip says that he went so far in his solicitous anxiety for peace that he forced the hands of the Canadian Government to an extent which was extremely displeasing to certain members of the Laurier cabinet. Under these circumstances the luke-warm editorial which appeared in the *Globe* of the 20th is quite interesting. It indicates that the *Globe* is not so anxious to improve relations between the two countries as it was three months ago. It has grown quite judicial.

It says: "But we would not be justified in making any treaty that would prevent us going forward without them (the United States) on every available opportunity (for freer trade with the world). Other treaties and agreements can do no harm and may be mutually beneficial." In other words, if we lower our duties on United States goods, this should not prevent us giving even lower duties to Great Britain or any one else. This is fairly reasonable—providing that we are in favour of lower duties.

Further, in the same article the *Globe* expresses the opinion, mildly of course, that if the United States wants more of our produce and goods, all that is necessary is to lower the United States tariff. This is really sensible. For the *Globe* it is somewhat remarkable. The logical conclusion from such an argument, though the *Globe* does not say so, is that Canada should refuse to consider reciprocity until the United States tariff is cut in two and is thus brought to the Canadian level. Perhaps the remoteness of such a possibility made the *Globe* feel that it would be useless to pursue the argument to a logical conclusion.

It is only fair that in all arguments on reciprocity we should

clearly remember that on the average United States duties are twice as high as Canadian duties. Furthermore, some United States duties are prohibitive, while none of Canada's are. Pro-

hibitive duties prevent importation and reduce the average duty paid on all dutiable goods.

THE *Winnipeg Telegram* comes to a somewhat similar conclusion by a different method of reasoning. Speaking of the report from Washington that the United States will "insist" that Canadian pulpwood shall be exported to the United States on better terms; the *Telegram* answers this "insist" by saying, "Let it remove the duties on paper and Canada will do the rest." Here again is an invitation to the United States to take the remedy which lies nearest to its hand and not wait for possibly unsuccessful reciprocity negotiations.

However, the *Telegram* weakens its editorial with its closing sentence, which reads, "If the object of the people of the United States is to preserve their paper mills we cannot be blamed for trying to preserve our forests." This is unwise. It would have been better to say that if the United States insists on having a tariff of 49 per cent., how can it expect to enter into reciprocity negotiations with a country with a tariff of only 24 per cent.

ONE great reason which is driving the United States to enter into reciprocity negotiations is its desire to get our pulpwood. The curious feature of the situation is that the Dominion Government cannot guarantee that our pulpwood shall be freely exported, even if the United States offered a *quid pro quo*. It is for the provinces which own the pulpwood to say whether or not it shall be exported as pulpwood or whether it shall be made up into paper before being taken across the line. The Ontario Government, not the Dominion, has the say as to whether Ontario pulpwood shall be exported or not. The Dominion cannot force the Ontario government to withdraw its present prohibitory law. The case is the same in Quebec. It would be the same, if New Brunswick or Nova Scotia took a notion to allow no more pulpwood from its crown lands to go outside the province until manufactured into paper.

Therefore it is useless for the United States to "insist" as a preliminary that pulpwood shall go out of Canada freely. The Dominion Government has not the power nor the authority to give such a guarantee. All the reciprocity treaties that can be framed by Ottawa and Washington will not be able to prevent the provinces which own the pulpwood making such regulations as they desire as to the form in which it shall be shipped. Our pulpwood is going to be manufactured at home in spite of all the pleadings of Ottawa or Washington.

OF course it is quite possible that the United States Government might go unofficially to these provinces and offer to remove all its duties on paper if the provinces allowed the free export of pulpwood. No reciprocity treaty would be needed in that case. No negotiations with the Ottawa government would be necessary. There would then be two separate and distinct propositions in the air—one unofficial with the provinces, and one official with the Dominion Government.

MR. WALLACE NESBITT, K.C., in an address to the Economic Club of New York, gave the New York business men much the same advice as the Toronto *Globe* and *Winnipeg Telegram*. He pointed out that if the United States, in its own interests, were to lower its tariff on Canadian goods that the cost of living in the United States would go down. Grain, flour, breadstuffs, animals, fish, poultry, eggs, butter, cheese, skins, and timber should be allowed to enter the United States free, so as to lower the cost of living and enable the United States manufacturer to compete more successfully with the