

ney-General of Nova Scotia a man whose position implies a better knowledge of both Canadian and American political economy than is exhibited in his letter. Arguing against the necessity of the existence of the interstate lines of custom houses, he says: "If it is a good thing to have custom houses dividing territories, then it would be the correct policy to intersect Ontario with a customs line, and to guard Cincinnati from the dangerous competition of Cleveland by a customs line between Northern and Southern Ohio. If the inhabitants of Canada were Indians or Patagonians, then the United States might be indifferent in regard to all kinds of relationship. But when it is considered that the people of the two countries are identical in race, language, laws and institutions, then these barriers indeed seem absurd and unaccountable." Such stuff might be expected to emanate from a backwoods stump orator addressing an ignorant and inappreciative crowd, but surely not from an educated man, holding a high and responsible position, writing a letter for publication, and intended as an argument in a weighty and most important matter to intelligent readers. Mr. Longley's "argument" is two-edged, and applies with equal or greater force in the case of the United States as against Great Britain, than that of Canada as against the United States. The people of Great Britain and the United States are also identical in race, language, laws and institutions, and yet our Yankee neighbors actually keep up an even more extended and lengthy customs line, embracing both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of their country, against the admission of British products. If the customs lines between the United States and Canada is a Chinese wall which they want thrown down, why don't they prove the honesty of their convictions by removing their more extended lines of customs maintained along their sea coasts as against Great Britain? Mr. Longley probably understands why a customs line cannot intersect Ontario, and why a similar line cannot be drawn between Northern and Southern Ohio; but if perchance he does not possess that knowledge, why should he pose as a writer on important international questions?

Mr. Wharton Barker, of Philadelphia, furnishes a "Memorandum Concerning Canada." This gentleman is a lawyer of ability, and a writer and authority on maritime and international laws. Like the other contributors to Mr. Wiman's pamphlet, Mr. Barker thinks that "Commercial Union would furnish the best possible solution of the fisheries question - that perennial puzzle of our diplomats." Without showing wherein Canada would be in any manner benefited by such a union, in true Yankee style he enumerates some of the advantages which his people would derive from it. He says: "We should pay no price for the use of Canada's fishing grounds, and American fishermen would have the same advantages and facilities of all kinds as her own. No American interest would be adversely affected. We would begin to draw more freely upon the forests of the Dominion for our supply of lumber. Our forests are rapidly disappearing, and any arrangement that would check the drafts upon them would be a national benefit. The present (American) duty on all lumber but saw logs is a premium on the extinction of our American forests, whose removal would be a measure of national protection. Canada has enough for our use, and a drain which only implies the opening of her area to agriculture, means the detriment of

ours." It is the same old story - Canada is to surrender her fisheries for which no price is to be paid, and allow American lumbermen to denude our forests, as "the best possible solution of the fisheries question" - that perennial puzzle of American diplomats.

We suppose that the letters, papers and speeches contained in Mr. Wiman's pamphlet, and to some of which allusions are here made, embody about all the arguments that the annexationists have to say regarding the subject, though we are promised that the compilation will be added to from time to time. Considering the importance of the question, the small cost of paper and printing, and Mr. Wiman's excessive zeal in enlightening the "hopeless and helpless" farmers of Canada regarding it, we take it for granted that his supreme effort has been made, and that any further additions to his compilation will consist of cold victuals relished. Changes may be rung, but they will be but variations of the old tune. Canada has absolutely nothing to gain from Commercial Union, and everything to lose. If there is no other possible solution of the fisheries question but an abject and cowardly surrender of all our valuable possessions to the United States, and the sinking of our manhood and honor, it would be more noble and worthy our ultimate destiny, whatever that may be, to accept whatever fate Providence may have in store for us, and do without Commercial Union. If diplomacy fails to settle disputes, and recourse is had to war and violence, Canada will abide the issue. She may eventually be robbed and despoiled, but she will never willingly surrender her honor, or be forced into an alliance both distasteful and unprofitable.

OVER-PRODUCTION IN THE UNITED STATES.

SOME time ago mention was made of the fact that a hosiery manufacturer in England had moved his machinery from that country to the United States. He set up his plant in Providence, Rhode Island, and brought over his old workpeople to operate his machines. Recently the same concern, now known as the British Hosiery Company, posted notice of the probability of a reduction to half of the force, or a possible shut down, the reason assigned being extreme depression of trade and the large stock of unsold goods on hand. Many of the Free Trade and Commercial Union papers in Canada are relating the circumstance with great glee, calling attention to the fact that even under the protective tariff of the United States the concern has met with disaster. The information contained in the fact, however, is self-explanatory - "the large stock of unsold goods on hand," or in other words, over production. We call attention to the fact that nearly all lines of manufactures in the United States are in similar condition. Even with a population of sixty millions of people their productive capacity is greatly in excess of the consumptive capacity of the country. Large stocks of unsold goods are on hand, and either a curtailment of production at the expense of labor, or an absolute stoppage of operations are the alternatives. The only hope of these concerns is to find new markets for their goods, and to tide over the existing state of things they slaughter prices wherever possible. Canada has been the favorite abattoir grounds, and here these semi-bankrupt American manufacturers have been sending their goods selling them at what