

"FROM ENVY, HATRED AND MALICE," ETC.

I HAVE noticed the following paragraph in the Chatham (Ont.) *Planet* of June 16th.

"In opposing Commercial Union the *Planet* and other Canadian journals are said to be held in the leash of Fred Nicholls, Secretary of the Industrial League, and ordered by him to do the work he desires. The silliness, not to say reckless falsity, of the insinuation is apparent when we say that the *Planet* staff or no one connected with it, has ever had any communication directly or indirectly with Nicholls, or know him, personally or otherwise, except by reputation, and never heard of him until his name became prominent during the last election. What grounds has the *Banner* for talking in that manner? If we were similarly inclined, we might accuse our contemporary of being subsidized by Erastus Wiman to advocate the principle of Commercial Union. Only we know that Erastus Wiman is not such a fool as to purchase an influence which is worth so little, we would almost be persuaded so to believe."

Of all the stupid assertions ever made for the purpose of manufacturing a little cheap political capital surely the above specimen betokens more than the average amount of imbecility. I admit that articles appearing in this paper have been freely and favorably commented upon by many Canadian and American journals which have exercised their privilege of reproducing them in whole or in part, but the editor of the *Banner's* contemptible insinuation of covert influence emanates from a brain as senile as the soul is small.

FREDERIC NICHOLLS.

WHAT COMMERCIAL UNION LEADS TO.

THE *Textile Record*, of Philadelphia, in an editorial discussing "Reciprocity with Canada," says that the proposition is of a kind that will work only one way—and that against the interests of the United States, and therefore there will be no reciprocity at all. It says:—

The enterprise will seem full of evil promise if we remember that such a treaty will make the Canadian custom house the gateway of Europe to our market, and the Canadian customs officer the interpreter of our tariff laws. The success of the reciprocity scheme, therefore, involves the surrender by our Government of control of the execution of the laws which shelter our vast industries and supply our revenues. We would invoke a flood of importations where our Treasury Department would have no voice, and our statutes no influence. The fiscal policy of our Government ought, as a matter of common self-respect, to be kept absolutely within our own control. To be dependent upon another Government for its enforcements, or to suffer another Government to interfere with it, or to regulate, interpret, or direct it would be a humiliation. Our laws are made for our territory. To affect to extend their operation beyond our borders is simply folly.

These arguments, adduced to prove the folly of the United States in submitting to such a state of things as our contemporary suggests, has equal or greater force as a converse proposition. It is a fact that under the proposed Commercial Union duties would have to be collected at all Canadian ports of entry upon all imports except those from the United States, and at all ports in the United States except upon imports from Canada. The tariff laws of the United States and of Canada

differ widely, and it is doubtful is equal duties and restrictions are placed upon any one article in the two countries. Who would harmonize these differences? And if they were harmonized and equalized, and made alike in all respects, who would collect the duties? And if this were agreed upon, to whom would appeals be made in case differences should arise between importers and customs officials? Such differences are constantly arising, and disputes regarding the construction of the laws are quite as constantly being referred for discussion in the United States to the Secretary of the Treasury or to the Federal Courts, and in Canada to the Minister of Customs or the judicial authorities of the Dominion. Under Commercial Union would the authorities of each side decide only such cases as arose within their borders, or would there be a commission to which all such cases would be referred? And would such decision be final and binding in both countries? Would the people of either country be willing to forego their right to appeal to their high courts of justice to settle disputed points of law or fact? Would there be any appeal from the commission? How would such commission be constituted—an equal number from each country with an umpire? Who would the umpire be—how would he be chosen? In the language of our contemporary, the fiscal policy of our Government ought to be kept absolutely within our own control; and to be dependent upon another Government for its enforcement, or to suffer another Government to interfere with it, or to regulate, interpret or direct it would be a humiliation which Canadians likely would not submit.

The natural and direct tendency of Commercial Union would be towards free trade pure and simple with all the world, and there are those both in Canada and the United States who would be glad to see such a result effected through such means. These are the ones who would rather see the manufacturing industries of both countries languish and become eradicated than that their fallacious doctrine should not prevail. That the United States are much further advanced in manufactures than is Canada is due to the high protective tariff which has prevailed there for so many years. That Canada has good reason to hope and believe that a similar advancement and aggrandizement awaits her under a similar policy is evident.

We particularly comment to Canadians the closing paragraph of our contemporary's editorial here alluded to which reads:—

"Our system of free trade at home and of protection against the aggressiveness of foreign industry was designed as an advantage for our own people. Free trade among ourselves is a good thing, and a fair thing, because social, political, industrial and other conditions are uniform from one end of the land to the other. We have the advantage of such unrestricted traffic because we are Americans. If outsiders wish to share in these things they can do so by coming in with us. The door is open. When an Irishman or a German wants our good things he comes and partakes of them. We do not reach across the ocean to grasp him. If Canada wants free trade with this great country she can get it, once and for all, by casting in her lot with ours. Nobody who has any sense would strike a blow to annex her territory to ours; but when the Canadian people, kindred to us in blood and language, and living in a land which nature has made a part of ours, wish to become incorporated with this great Republic, they will be cordially welcomed; and we may confidently affirm that they will never