

The Week.

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF POLITICS, SOCIETY, AND LITERATURE.

TERMS:—One year, \$3.00; eight months, \$2.00; four months, \$1.00. Subscriptions payable in advance.

ADVERTISEMENTS, unexceptionable in character and limited in number, will be taken at \$4 per line per annum; \$2.50 per line for six months; \$1.50 per line for three months; 20 cents per line per insertion for a shorter period.

Subscribers in Great Britain and Ireland supplied, postage pre paid, on terms following:—One year, 12s. 6d. stg.; half-year, 6s. 6d. stg. Remittances by P. O. order or draft should be made payable and addressed to the Publisher.

All advertisements will be set up in such style as to insure THE WEEK's tasteful typographical appearance, and enhance the value of the advertising in its columns. No advertisement charged less than five lines. Address—T. R. CLOUGH, Business Manager, 5 Jordan Street, Toronto.

C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher.

THE Commercial Unionists did well to accept the resolution offered by Mr. John Macdonald, at the Board of Trade meeting. While not going so far as they might wish, it went quite as far as could be expected at this stage of the discussion. It affirmed the desirability of the freest commercial intercourse with the United States, which no reasonable man can indeed deny; and if it can be shown, as the Commercial Unionists profess to be able to do, that Commercial Union would not give undue prominence to one interest (the natural industries, such as agriculture, mining, lumbering, fishing, shipping) to the neglect or to the injury of any other (the artificial, or manufacturing), and that Great Britain will be quite willing to be discriminated against by Canada,—then, to carry the day, they have only to persuade the large majority now against them that admitting American manufactures duty free would not injure our artisans and manufacturers, and would enrich all other interests; and, further, to show that a colony discriminating in its tariff against the mother country, and in favour of a foreign country, would not probably be drawn from its allegiance from one to the other. These are debatable points, on which no one can feel an absolute conviction without fuller information, and perhaps more experience, than is now possessed. Of the political effect of the more intimate relations between the United States and Canada proposed by Commercial Union, few among us are competent to speak dogmatically; and we regret that one of the speakers at the meeting somewhat weakened his case by ascribing to the German Zollverein an effect on German unity that did not belong to it, against the opinion of a gentleman to whose historical knowledge all might readily and with the utmost self-respect defer. Mr. Goldwin Smith is unquestionably right in holding that the Zollverein did not bring about the political union of the German States, several of which indeed, though included in the Zollverein, are still outside the Empire. The Zollverein was indeed an outcome of the necessity felt by the free cities for freer intercourse; but the modern German Empire had its beginning with the rise of the house of Hohenzollern. The building of the edifice completed sixteen years ago at Versailles has been progressing since the days of Napoleon I., the motive being chiefly the necessity of defending the Fatherland against the continual intrigues and devastation of the French, enkindled and ennobled, however, by a strong sentiment of nationality among the German States then lying in wreck. Not to any commercial consideration whatever, but to the menace of another French invasion, was due the gathering together and consolidation of these States into the German Empire; and to instance this case in order to show the political danger of Commercial Union, is to use an unsound argument.

BUT little importance can be attached to the self-denying utterances of American statesmen respecting Annexation. Mr. Darling quoted the Hon. Mr. Hitt's reminder that the United States had refused the Island of St. Thomas and the Republic of San Domingo, which both flung themselves into the lap of the great Republic; but it must be remembered that these do not adjoin the United States, as Canada does; they are islands distant from the continent, inhabited chiefly by a race whose presence in the United States has already cost the country a war of life or death, and will for many years prove a most serious problem in domestic government. It is a well understood principle of American policy to have no colonies; the fathers of the constitution left that as a precept to their successors, a precept which has always been observed, except, perhaps, in the case of Alaska—if that may be considered a colony—where the desire to take the British North American possessions in flank proved too strong for American statesmanship. Does Mr. Hitt or Mr. Darling mean to tell us that Canada would be flung out, as St. Thomas and San Domingo were, while Alaska was accepted?

Is Mr. Darling quite sure that with Commercial Union Canadian timber "will no longer be exported?" If Political Union also is not to take place, what new influence is to induce the Michigan lumberers to act differently from the course they pursued a year ago, when, according to the *Lumberman's Gazette*, of Bay City, Michigan, the American purchaser

of 500,000 acres of standing white pine in the Georgian Bay district announced his intention to carry the logs over Lake Huron, and saw them in Michigan? "We are Michigan men," he said, "and hope to make our purchases enure to the advantage of our people here. Notwithstanding our investments in Canada, we still stand by protection for Michigan lumber." Again, in the same paper, another American, the Hon. Mr. Weston, criticising the Morrison Tariff Bill, says: "We now admit Canadian logs free of duty. On the north shore of Lake Erie the Canadian saw-mills are in ruins, but the mills at Tonawanda, N. Y., are employing thousands of American workmen, manufacturing Canadian logs towed from the Erie north shore. The Saginaw mills are running out of American stock, and already they are looking to Georgian Bay for Canadian logs to cross the Huron Lake, and keep their mills and men at work." Now, we beg the farmers, to whom all the actors seem now to be playing, to observe the spirit displayed here. Is it a spirit that is likely to be changed by giving the Americans freer access to what they covet? We are told by the advocates of Commercial Union that the political connexion of Canada with Great Britain will not be endangered by Commercial Union with the States; but is it not abundantly manifest from the utterances of these Americans, that while we are under the British flag we shall be regarded as lawful prey for the American exploiter? We believe the position of the country would be intolerable with Commercial Union with the United States and Political Union with Great Britain. Trade follows the flag: *perhaps* the arrangement of Commercial Union might be regarded by Great Britain favourably, as enabling a portion of the Empire to enjoy free trade with the United States; but it is manifest from the speech and acts of these American lumbermen that it would be regarded by these favourably, as enabling them to keep their mills going and their men employed at the expense of a portion of the British Empire. It is an error to suppose that Ontario would be as favourably considered as a State of the Union: while the two are under different flags, Canada would be regarded as foreign, and no patriotic sentiment would stand in the way of using her as a boa constrictor does a rabbit.

AT Capelton, near Sherbrooke, in the Eastern Townships, are rich copper mines, owned by an American company, from which, notwithstanding there is every facility for smelting on the spot, all the ore is carried to New Jersey to be smelted. It is dug out of Canadian soil, but that is all: no part of the manufacture is done here, and the paying of a few miners is Canada's share of that portion of her wealth as it is developed. The Company give as the reason that they can produce so much better results in New Jersey that a profit on the operation is left after paying freight on the rock-ore from Capelton. We cannot complain of their carrying on their business in any way that pays them best; but would they establish their smelting works hundreds of miles from the mines, if the mines were in the States? That is an important question, for whose solution such light as may be thrown on the subject by the action of the saw-millers mentioned above need not be ignored. We are told by the Commercial Unionists that the cheaper labour of Canada will enable us to at least hold our own against the American manufacturers; yet it does not in this case. What possible change can be brought about by Commercial Union alone, in the absence of Political Union, to promote the preparation of raw materials in Canada? Canada is extremely rich in mineral wealth, in forests and fisheries, and she has vast areas of wheat lands that have not escaped our neighbours' notice. There is immense undeveloped wealth in this country; and we are quite ready to admit Americans to a full share with our own people of the profit that may be realised in developing it; but they must trade fair, and not treat the country as a preserve whose sole use is to supply them with the raw material of their industries. What profit is it to Canada, beyond the payment of the lowest kind of labour, to have her wealth carried off abroad in this shape? Its conversion into a merchantable commodity ought to give employment to the Canadian people. The employment of a few in digging or hewing this raw material for shipment is not the way a nation is trained in the industrial arts and sciences, whose use among a people marks the difference between civilisation and savagery. Canadians have surely a higher ambition than to remain for ever hewers of wood and drawers of water for their neighbours to the south.

WE concede fully that if Canada were under the same Government as the States, unrestricted trade intercourse would confer great benefit on her, as the poorer country, just as the similar Union between England and Scotland benefited the latter country. But it must be observed that there is this vital difference between the two cases—that the commercial union of England and Scotland took place *after*