

only on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle, namely unrestricted reciprocity. If unrestricted reciprocity means what it says, that is, free and unrestricted mutual interchange, is it not evident that this cannot be secured unless Canada and the United States have the same tariff against the rest of the world? For the Americans would certainly not interchange while our tariff was fifty per cent. lower than theirs; such a back door, three thousand miles wide, would not be to their taste. Is it not obvious, therefore, that if we are to have unrestricted reciprocity, our tariffs to outsiders must be identical, and equally obvious that they must be fixed by the Americans? In other words unrestricted reciprocity does not seem practicable except in the form of commercial union, which would be more humiliating to Canada than annexation; for under annexation Canadians would have a voice in determining the fiscal policy of the united countries, while in commercial union they would have to accept tariff changes made by a government in which they were unrepresented.

\* \* \*

Leaving the political and turning to the economic aspect of the subject, we do not share the apprehension, real or feigned, of those who urge that unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union (for we cannot but regard the terms as synonymous) would lead to annexation. The only ground for this fear is the very curious one that the greater prosperity consequent on commercial union would lead Canadians to desire the permanent establishment, by political union, of the commercial relations with the States that had been found so advantageous. But would commercial union be economically advantageous? We think it may safely be said that it would not. It is no doubt quite true, as the Liberals point out, that protection has bedevilled this country, retarding its own proper development, diverting the energy and capital of our people in false directions, and fostering a mushroom growth of exotic manufactures of no permanent advantage either to those engaged therein or to the country. The Liberal remedy for the economical ills engendered by protection, however, is based apparently on the homœopathic principle—*similia similibus curantur*. What they pre-

scribe is a larger dose of the very nostrum which has agreed so badly with the body economic. For reciprocity is but another form of the old mercantile theory of which protection is also a form—the theory exploded a hundred years ago by Adam Smith that international trade is a sort of warfare in which a country's commercial advantages are to be protected against the commercial operations of its neighbors as jealously as its territory against their military designs. Reciprocity, in all its forms, is simply a more complex form of protection. Protection, as we ordinarily know it, means the taxing of the community for the benefit of some class in the community, which class is supposed in return to render some service to the community. Reciprocity with the States would mean taxing this country for the benefit of the American manufacturers (a higher tariff being imposed on British and foreign goods) in return for our securing certain commercial privileges in their markets. Protection and reciprocity are alike humbug. Of course it would be a good thing to get free access to the American markets both for buying and selling, but not at the price of a heavy discriminating duty against the cheap goods of Britain. There is but one way of improving our economic condition, and that is the way of free trade as far as revenue requirements will permit, or full free trade, raising our revenue by direct taxation. An application to countries as to individuals of the idea of the division of labor would clear men's minds of all the economic dust which it has been the interest of party demagogues on both sides to stir up.

---

## LITERATURE.

### TEXTUAL CRITICISM AS IT IS DONE.

OF all the subjects which, during the present century, have much developed for better or for worse, perhaps textual criticism and the editing of classical authors take the palm. Scarcely has one edition been issued from the press when another makes its appearance, and of course the editor is sorry for not having had the benefit of his illustrious rival's work, though after all he sees little in it to make him change his opinion on the cruxes of his author. Shades of Euripides, Sophocles, and Æschylus! what agony you