

articles of merchandise as are imported from Great Britain, and yet that tariff does not prevent such importations, although the same lines of goods are also manufactured in the United States. The payment of nearly \$700,000,000 for these importations was almost entirely in agricultural products, and no doubt both parties made money by the transaction. There is no duty on any of these exports, and those who produced them sent abroad only that for which there was no demand at home. These exports were but a small portion of all that was produced, and all the balance of them, excepting what was actually consumed on the farms, were sold for consumption at home. Why did not the farmers who produced all this wonderful amount of grain, butter, lard, beef, pork, etc., send all that they had to sell to foreign markets for sale? Probably not exceeding one-tenth of their produce went to foreign lands, and nine-tenths of it was consumed at home. Who consumed it? Why the millions of busy toilers in the workshops, factories and mines; those engaged in transportation on railroads, rivers, lakes and oceans; draymen, carpenters and bricklayers; those engaged in buying and selling merchandise, and those employed in all the thousand avocations of life. Nine-tenths of all that the agricultural classes produce is consumed at home by the other classes indicated; and if these classes did not exist, or were not so numerous as they are, there would not be such a consumptive demand for agricultural products, and those who produce them would be compelled to accept much lower prices for whatever they had to sell. Further—if the consuming classes were decreased in numbers—if there were fewer mouths to feed—that fact would tell strongly against the producing classes; but if in addition to this the decrease of consumers became an increase of producers, the situation would become intensified and aggravated to the sorrow and dismay of those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits.

What are the conditions prevailing in the United States which make it possible for American farmers not only to sell \$700,000,000 worth of their products a year to foreign consumers, but ten times as much to people who live in their own country? The answer is in the words "Protective Tariff." Before the inauguration of that system in the United States that country was just as boundless, as fertile and as capable of production as it is to-day; but agricultural pursuits were at a comparatively low ebb, and not as remunerative as they are now. The country was always in debt, and financial panics were of frequent and painful occurrence. Now the most valuable and productive agricultural districts are those contributory to manufacturing centres, and the more numerous the workshops, factories and other industrial establishments, and the larger the numbers of working men and their families connected with them, the more prosperous the farmers and more valuable their farms. As between the producers of agricultural merchandise in the United States, and the consumers of it in foreign lands; and as between the manufacturers of foreign merchandise and the consumers of it in the United States, "no man on either side would wish to sell or buy unless he knew or believed he would be benefited by the deal," yet this international trading is carried on between highly protected America on the one hand, and free trade Britain on the other.

The same conditions which brought such wonderful wealth and prosperity to the United States prevail in Canada, and if

they are allowed to remain unmolested Canada may reasonably expect similar results. These results are now fast advancing from their incipency in proportions and at a speed of which Canadians should be proud.

But the conclusion at which the *Times* arrives is illogical and insulting to the perception and good sense of Canadians. The protective policy of the United States is "peace-providing," for that nation to-day is at peace with all the world, and more prosperous than any other nation of the world; and when Canadians are told that their refusal to abandon their protective policy implies that they are unjust, that they do not love peace that they do not know what they talk about, are disloyal, and that they ignore the best interests of their country, they are most grossly insulted. Abuse is not argument.

GALL.

THE concentrated and unadulterated gall of some of the would-be leaders of the Commercial Union party is worthy of passing note. On the arrival of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain in New York, although that gentleman was fresh from the Foreign Office and consultations with Lord Salisbury, the Premier, and acquainted with the objects of the mission on which he had been sent, Mr. Erastus Wiman took it upon himself to write that gentleman a letter in which he intimated that Mr. Chamberlain was not acquainted with the sentiments of Canada anent the matter at issue, and offering to enlighten him. Mr. Wiman's language was: "I think I might contribute to your information in regard to this whole subject if I could be allotted an hour to suit your convenience before your departure for Washington." The government of Great Britain thought it necessary to appoint three of its wisest statesmen to conduct the negotiations with the United States, Sir Charles Tupper, a man most thoroughly versed and posted in Canadian affairs, being one of them. Such negotiations, involving such vast interests and intricate political and international questions, usually require long and patient investigation and discussion, yet this Mr. Erastus Wiman has the flippancy to suggest that he could solve and adjust the whole matter in an hour. He seemed to attach some importance to the action of what he designated the recent "Canadian Inter-Provincial Conference," which approved of Commercial Union between the United States and Canada, but he failed to state that the "Conference" was composed of self-appointed men, who had no other authority for their meeting than their own sweet wills, and that they represented none but their individual selves.

Another and equally delectable exhibition of assinnity is that of Mr. Goldwin Smith's Commercial Union Club of Toronto, which, at a meeting held last week, resolved to send a deputation of members to Washington to represent to Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Tupper what they claim to be the views of a very large portion of the people of Canada regarding Commercial Union. Mr. Goldwin Smith should restrain the impetuosity of his young men and not allow them to make themselves and him so conspicuously ridiculous.

Mr. Goldwin Smith himself, however, seems to appreciate that his new party will be weighed and measured at its true value, for with an amount of gall not exceeded by either Mr. Erastus Wiman or the nurslings of his Commercial Union Club, in his inaugural address as president of that club, he attempts to throw dust into the eyes of the public by saying that as Commercial Unionists they intend to be and remain unconnected with political partyism. But Mr. Smith is a party man nevertheless, notwithstanding his disclaimer, and aspires to have his new Commercial Union party hold similar relation to the Conservative party of Canada as that of the Mugwumps to the Republican party in the United States.