

Pamph
HC
G

20

Glen, Francis Wayland

CONTINENTAL UNION

VERSUS

264224
3.2.32

RECIPROCITY.



Erastus Wiman Answered

BY AN

Ex-Member of the Canadian

Parliament.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

RESEARCH REPORT

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

(Copyrighted February 8, 1893.)

Continental Union versus Reciprocity.

Erastus Wiman answered by an Ex-Member of the Canadian Parliament.

There is no Canadian residing in the United States who has given as much thought and study to the question how best to promote the prosperity and development of Canada as Erastus Wiman. No other Canadian living here for the past thirty years has had equal opportunities. For the past ten years Mr. Wiman has given his native land his best thought; his heart's best efforts, and his wealth as freely as a spring gives forth its water. He freely asserts his claims to be an expert upon all questions relating to Canada, and as such was invited to appear before a Committee of United States Senators and give evidence. I do not question Mr. Wiman's sincerity, no one can who knows him; no one doubts but that in giving his testimony he was loyal to his countrymen and presented their case as strongly as possible. In financial affairs Mr. Wiman is a giant and as a collator of commercial statistics probably has no equal in this country. For these reasons his evidence before the Senatorial Committee deserves consideration at this time.

My good friend and myself were examined upon the same day by that Committee of United States Senators in a room in the Post Office building, in New York city, some time in January, 1890, as to our views upon the Canadian question. Mr. Wiman appearing in the interest of Canada, while I was present as a witness for the defence.

I had frequently discussed political union and its effect upon the value of the assets of Canada, and unrestricted Reciprocity and its influence upon political union with Mr. Wiman, and was most anxious to have the views he had expressed to me go upon record, if possible, as his sworn testimony before the Committee. I therefore suggested to one of the Senators two questions to ask him, as follows:

1st. What effect would political union have upon the value of the assets of Canada. Mr. Wiman replied frankly and promptly, "It would increase them one hundred fold." One of the Senators remarked, "Mr. Wiman, you do not mean that; you mean one hundred per cent., do you not?" He replied, "No, I mean just what I said, one hundred fold." I was delighted.

2d. If we grant Canada unrestricted Reciprocity, when will political union take place in your judgment? Mr. Wiman made answer as follows: "A large number of American citizens will go to Canada to investigate her boundless natural resources. Some will buy mineral lands and develop them. Some will buy water powers and build manufactories upon them. Some will purchase timber lands and erect great saw mills and manufacture lumber; others will invest in her fisheries; others still will build railways and other public works and operate them; thousands will go in and occupy her arable lands: while others will devote themselves to trade, commerce, and finance. That in time the majority of the population of Canada would be composed of citizens of the United States, and then political union would naturally take place." As I was present as a witness for the defence, his answer pleased me. When giving my own testimony, I was very careful to call the attention of the Senators to the fact that Mr. Wiman had upon a great many occasions, when addressing public meetings in Canada, frankly told his fellow countrymen in *all sincerity* that unless they could secure a treaty of unrestricted Reciprocity with the United States, political union was inevitable. It was the plain unvarnished truth, and I honor Mr. Wiman for having declared it openly. Mr. Wiman did not offer any objection to my statement going upon record as evidence.

Now let us examine Mr. Wiman's three statements beginning with number two. The present population of Canada is say 5,000,000, assuming an increase of ten per cent. each decade for twenty years in 1913 it will be 6,050,000 independent of any Americans who may go there from here. (It will not exceed that number if we do not grant Canada Reciprocity or political union is not consummated. During the decade from 1871 to 1881, the population of Canada increased nearly nineteen per cent., while from 1881 to 1891, it was only eleven and three-quarters per cent., with an enormous expenditure of public money upon public works, and an abnormal increase in her railway mileage, including the Canadian Pacific and many of its branches. During the latter part of the last decade immigration was less than during the early part of it, while the exodus was much greater. I predict that without reciprocity, or political union, Prince Edward's Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec will show a loss in population in 1913, with only a small increase in Ontario. At that time if our percentage of increase is as great for each decade as it was from 1880 to 1890, our population will be 105,000,000, or in other words, upon the basis of population our end of the whiffle-tree will be seventeen and a half times as long as the Canadian end. Whereas in 1890 it was about thirteen times longer, and in 1870 only eleven times longer.)

To have a bare majority at that time of American born citizens in Canada, we should be compelled to part with more than 6,050,000 of our best, most ambitious, energetic, and enterprising sons and daughters, and all the capital they invested in promoting the various enterprises in which they engaged to develop the natural

resources of Canada, while she remains under the British flag, and take our chance of getting all back when Canada has grown strong, lusty and quite independent and ten times more valuable to England than at the present time. Unrestricted reciprocity according to Mr. Wiman's testimony means a very large exodus of our best citizens to Canada, while without reciprocity there *is now* a large and rapidly increasing exodus from Canada of her very best citizens to this country

Why should we attempt to reverse this happy (for us) condition of affairs.

Now let us examine statements one and three.

First then number three, "without unrestricted reciprocity political union is inevitable." Number one, "political union will increase the value of the assets of Canada one hundred fold." Mulhall gives the value of the assets of Canada in 1888 as \$964 per capita. The Canadian minister of agriculture estimates the total annual gain at one hundred million dollars. Therefore upon a basis of a population of 5,000,000, the value of the assets of Canada in 1890 was about five thousand millions. Which by political union according to Mr. Wiman would be increased to five hundred thousand millions, a sum greater than the combined wealth of Great Britain, France, Germany and the United States. Now if by refusing reciprocity, political union is inevitable, we shall secure the five hundred thousand millions without the loss of a single American citizen, or a dollar of capital.

After political union has been consummated, if our people go into what is now Canada they will still be ours and all the capital they take with them. By refusing reciprocity we gain all Canada, according to Mr. Wiman, while by granting it, in twenty years we invite and risk an exodus of over 6,050,000 of our very best citizens and a very large amount of capital; and at the same time enormously strengthen our greatest commercial rival at our very doors. I thought Mr. Wiman's estimate of the effect of political union upon the value of the assets of Canada just a trifle high, although I had read the Arabian Nights, but as it was not my duty as a witness for the defence to challenge evidence given by a highly intelligent and expert witness for the plaintiff, I did not question his statement. I am inclined to believe that had I been present as Mr. Wiman's counsel, after his three statements had been accepted as evidence, I should have advised him to withdraw his case from before that Court. Neither would I advise him now to submit it to a jury composed of the electorate of the United States, as I feel morally certain that the verdict would be for the defence with full costs; or had I been counsel for the defence I should certainly have advised my client not to call a single witness, but to let the case go to the jury upon Mr. Wiman's unquestioned evidence. In plain English there is neither rhyme, reason or justice in our building up British power on this continent, and at the same time expending large sums of money in constructing and maintaining a navy to protect our commerce.

It would be criminal on the part of any administration to promote such a policy, directly or indirectly, by a change in our fiscal policy towards Canada, or

by a continuance of the bonding system. When continental union has been consummated Canada will not only enjoy all the advantages of unrestricted reciprocity, and more forever, but will share with us all the benefits resulting from treaties we have entered into or may negotiate with other nations; or in other words, in all the benefits and privileges which inure to American citizenship for all time to come.

Mr. Wiman seems to think that it would be an act of disloyalty on the part of fair Miss Canada to leave her mother's house, and accept the heart and hand of Jonathan and become his wife. Mr. Wiman is a husband, to become such, a man must persuade some good woman to leave her mother's home and care, and become his wife for the express purpose of establishing an *independent* home and family of their own. Is it an act of disloyalty for a good woman to become the wife of a good man? Most certainly not. The moment Jonathan becomes the husband of Miss Canada he also becomes the son-in-law of dear old mother England, and the dear old lady becomes his mother-in-law, and fair Miss Canada her married daughter, and if we may judge from Queen Victoria's great anxiety to marry off her daughters and grand-daughters, far preferable to an unmarried daughter. The loyalty cry raised at Ottawa by the charlatans who have Miss Canada bound hand and foot, and are administering opiates to her, while they are mortgaging her future, selling the bonds in England, and dividing the proceeds among themselves is contemptible, hypocritical can't intended to divert public attention, while they secrete their swag and continue their crimes.

MARRIAGE IS HONORABLE BEFORE GOD AND MAN, AND SO WILL BE THE UNION OF JONATHAN AND FAIR MISS CANADA.

No young man in the city of Toronto in 1862, had more brilliant prospects than Erastus Wiman. He was manager in Canada for Messrs. R. G. Dun & Co., and Secretary of the Toronto Board of trade. He had the good will and confidence of the heads of all the financial and commercial institutions and business houses of Canada. No young man was better known or had more warm friends. Suddenly he received a higher call, which he promptly accepted, or in other words, an offer of a higher salary in a larger field of usefulness. He left kindred, neighbors, all his valuable business connections and the flag of old England and came to New York city to take charge of the City department of Messrs. R. G. Dun & Co.

From among all their managers they selected Mr. Wiman, an entire stranger, not only to business customs in New York, but to the people he was to meet, as the one most competent to fill that most difficult and trying position. He left his home under the British flag with alacrity to establish a new home under the stars and stripes, when this nation was involved in the most terrible civil war upon record. When United States six per cent bonds were selling at *forty cents* on the dollar in gold, and when the issue of the war was involved in doubt, and when the

Imperial government was manifesting a desire that the great Republic should be dismembered and was indirectly, at least, giving aid and comfort to the insurgents. He has prospered here beyond his most sanguine expectations, and in legitimate business enterprises has amassed an immense fortune. What has been the effect of his action? Why one million young men and women born under the flag of old England have followed in his footsteps. Not less than ten thousand of them have called upon Mr. Wiman during the past thirty years and sought his assistance, in finding employment, and I am prepared to assert that he never rebuked one of them for turning his back upon the Union Jack, but on the contrary, if satisfied that they were of good moral character he most cheerfully exerted his influence to find them good positions. Ten million immigrants have landed at Castle Garden from Europe since Mr. Wiman came to New York. I doubt if he ever crossed over from Staten Island ferry and urged one of them to go to Canada to settle. I am led to believe that ninety-five per cent. of Mr. Wiman's great wealth is invested in the United States; in all other countries, including Canada five per cent.

When discussing the boundless undeveloped natural resources of Canada, Mr. Wiman deals largely in glittering generalities and sentimentalities. He seldom descends to dry facts and figures. He appeals to the hearts of his hearers and not to their judgment. He loves Canada and is intensely anxious to serve his countrymen for which I admire and honor him, but I cannot adopt his conclusions after a careful study of his testimony before the Senatorial Committee.

If "without reciprocity political union is inevitable" then I am opposed to granting reciprocity. If "political union will increase the value of the assets of Canada one hundred fold" then I am morally certain that sooner or later the Canadian people will seek admission to the union. If reciprocity will cause during the next twenty years an "exodus of over 6,050,000 of our best and most enterprising citizens" then, again I am opposed to reciprocity.

Mr. Wiman also admitted, in giving his testimony, that the products of Canada exported to the United States formed so small a percentage of our consumption that they did not affect prices in this country; that the Canadian producer and not the American consumer paid the duty, and consequently that with free access to our market the price in Canada of all the products of the farm, the mine, the forest, and the sea would be increased by the amount of the duties removed.

An enormous gain to the Canadian producer but absolutely no gain whatever to the American consumer, and for this government a serious loss of revenue, or in other words a contribution from the treasury of the United States to the producers of Canada of several millions of dollars annually as an inducement to Canada to continue as a dependency of the British crown.

Now for a few dry facts and figures with which my good friend never wearies his hearers or readers when discussing the Canadian question.

The first blast furnace for the manufacture of pig iron in Canada was erected in 1737 (one hundred and fifty-six years ago), and was in almost continual operation until 1883. A grand total of five (5) furnaces was in blast during 1890. The same year 76,511 tons of iron ore was mined, 18,754 tons of it was exported to the United States, 57,304 tons was smelted in Canada, producing 21,772 tons of pig iron or one ton of iron to two and six tenths tons of ore. The grand total value of the exports of iron and steel and manufactures thereof (including scrap iron) for the year ending June 30th, 1892, was \$133,724, while the grand total of imports of iron and steel and manufactures thereof was \$13,835,493. It will be observed that upon a per capita basis the imports of iron and steel into Canada was equal to an import for the United States of \$179,861,493, whereas the actual imports of iron and steel and manufactures thereof into the United States for the same fiscal year was only \$31,520,654, and the exports of the same \$28,800,930.

In 1891 Canada manufactured one twelve-hundredth part of the world's production of pig iron, while the United States produced thirty-three per cent. of the total product. The world production of pig iron increased from 14,119,263 tons in 1878, to 25,124,544 in 1890, or seventy-eight per cent. There was not any increase in production in Canada.

There was more than ten million net tons of pig iron produced in the United States in 1892, or about five hundred times as much as in Canada, although our population is only thirteen times greater than that of Canada.

The *stimulating* effect of the *blessed Gospel* of a "tariff for revenue only," upon the iron industry of Canada, and the very depressing effect of the unconstitutional American policy of protection upon the iron industry of the United States is *clearly* and most *emphatically* disclosed by these statements all taken from late Canadian official reports. In 1890, there was 3,117,661 tons of coal mined in Canada and 3,299,026 tons imported. 772,441 tons mined upon Vancouver's Island was exported to the United States, and 172,684 tons mined on Vancouver and in Nova Scotia was exported to other countries (chiefly as ballast) for the year ending June 30th, 1892. It will be observed that Canada consumed 1,126,490 tons more of imported coal than she did of coal taken from her own mines. 54,000 tons of the imported coal came from Wales as ballast the balance from the United States. 1,819,222 tons of it was subject to a Canadian duty of 60 cents per ton. There was mined in the United States in 1890, 140,874,729 tons of coal and in Great Britain in 1891, 185,479,126 tons.

In 1889 the United States produced 105,774 tons of copper Canada produced 2,500 or 2 1-2 per cent. of our production.

The value of gold produced in the United States in 1890 was \$32,845,000, in Canada \$1,495,000. Silver was produced in the United States to the value of \$70,405,000 in Canada \$495,000. There was consumed in Canada in 1890, 9,236,621

gallons of Canadian refined petroleum oil and 5,075,650 gallons of American oil; duty upon American oil imported into Canada 7 1-2 cents per Imperial gallon or about 100 per cent. For the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1892, there was 5,698,092 gallons of American oil imported. There was exported from Canada in 1890, 420,492 gallons of petroleum oil valued at \$18,154.

The foregoing facts clearly indicates that the "boundless undeveloped natural resources of Canada" upon which my good friend delights to dwell in general terms is suffering badly for a change in administration and that without it they will remain for ages undeveloped.

Mr. Wiman, in a contribution entitled "Remove the barbed wire fence," published in "TRUTH," March 12, 1891, wrote as follows :

"The measure of development which is possible for the whole continent is that which has actually taken place in the southern portion of it, and which is found in the creation of a commerce, and the development of wealth giving forces for the good of man, which in the United States has actually taken place. The comparisons given by the late Mr. Windom will illustrate the extent of this growth. FOR INSTANCE: THE TONNAGE OF THE DETROIT RIVER, A NARROW STREAM IN THE NORTHERN PART OF NORTH AMERICA, REACHED IN 1890 AN AMOUNT EQUAL TO THE COMBINED TONNAGE OF LONDON AND LIVERPOOL. THE TONNAGE OF THE SAULT STE. MARIE CANAL, IN SEVEN MONTHS, WAS GREATER THAN THE TONNAGE OF THE SUEZ CANAL IN AN ENTIRE YEAR. THE VALUE OF A SINGLE COTTON CROP GROWN IN 1890 IN ONE SECTION OF THE UNITED STATES REACHED 400 MILLION DOLLARS, A SUM EXCEEDING THE TOTAL OUTPUT FOR FIVE YEARS OF ALL THE GOLD MINES OF THE WORLD. THE TOTAL MANUFACTURES OF THE COUNTRY AMOUNTED TO 1,500 MILLION DOLLARS MORE THAN THOSE OF GREAT BRITAIN, 2,000 MILLION MORE THAN THOSE OF FRANCE AND 2,300 MILLION MORE THAN THOSE OF GERMANY. Canada, as the greater half of the continent, has had no progress at all comparable with the progress of the United States. THE TWO NATIONALITIES SET OUT SIDE BY SIDE 120 YEARS AGO ON THE RACE FOR CONTINENTAL SUPREMACY. THE UNITED STATES HAD AN UNTRIED FORM OF GOVERNMENT, HAD NO CAPITAL, NO BACKING, AND NO PREVIOUS EXPERIENCE, WORKING OUT ON A VAST SCALE A PLAN OF SELF-GOVERNMENT, AND AN EXPERIMENT IN FINANCE AND DEVELOPMENT. CANADA HAD BEHIND HER GREAT BRITAIN, STABLE INSTITUTIONS, ENORMOUS SUPPLIES OF MONEY, AND EVERYTHING TO MAKE HER GREAT. YET, TO-DAY THE TWO COUNTRIES ARE WIDELY DIFFERENT IN THE RESULTS ACHIEVED. ONE HAS A POPULATION OF 64 MILLIONS; THE OTHER A POPULATION OF BARELY 5 MILLIONS. Everything else is in proportion. A single State in the Union has as many people, and far greater wealth than the whole of Canada. A single house in New York and one in Chicago sells more dry goods in a year than Canada imports. MEASURED BY EVERY STANDARD OF COMPARISON, THE EXPERIMENT IN CANADA OF SELF-RELIANCE AND SELF-DEVELOPMENT IS A FAILURE. Beyond all question, the cause of this has been that the free-

dom of trade, which between the commonwealths has built them up, and which has been denied to Canada. By a policy of isolation, restriction and exclusion, she has been shut out from the great growth on this continent which has challenged the wonder of the world. IF THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE HAD TAKEN IN THE WHOLE CONTINENT, THE SAME RELATIVE PROGRESS WOULD HAVE TAKEN PLACE NORTH OF THE 45TH PARALLEL —THE LAKES AND THE ST. LAWRENCE—THAT HAS TAKEN PLACE TO THE SOUTH OF THEM, AND THE WORLD WOULD HAVE BEEN ENRICHED TO DOUBLE THE EXTENT OF THE CONTRIBUTIONS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

IF, THEREFORE, THE POLICY WHICH HAS HITHERTO PREVAILED IN CANADA HAS BEEN ONE OF RETARDATION, OF SLOW DEVELOPMENT, OF DECLINING VALUES, OF AN EXODUS OF POPULATION, OF INCREASING INDEBTEDNESS, AND DECREASED POWER OF PAYMENT, IS IT TREASONABLE TO BEGIN TO TALK OF A CHANGE OF CONDITIONS—NOT A CHANGE IN POLITICAL CONDITIONS, FOR THAT IS ENTIRELY UNNECESSARY, BUT A CHANGE IN FISCAL POLICY, WHICH WOULD REMOVE THE BARRIER BETWEEN THE TWO PEOPLE.

IF THE VAST MINERAL WEALTH OF CANADA LIES SILENT AND DORMANT AND DEAD BECAUSE OF THE WANT OF A MARKET, WHAT WOULD STIMULATE ITS DEVELOPMENT SO GREATLY AS THE OPENING UP OF THE GREATEST MARKET FOR MINERALS UNDER THE SUN? IF THE AGRICULTURAL FORCES OF CANADA ARE RESTRICTED, UNPROFITABLE AND INSIGNIFICANT, WHAT BETTER CONDITION COULD PREVAIL THAN TO OPEN UP ACCESS TO FEED THE GREATEST MONEY-MAKING, MONEY-SPENDING AGGREGATION OF HUMANITY IN THE WORLD? IF ILLIMITABLE FORESTS OF TIMBER ARE ROTTING AND BURNING EVERY YEAR TO AN EXTENT GREATER THAN THE CONSUMPTION.—IF THE GREAT COAST LINE OF FISHERIES, FIVE THOUSAND MILES IN LENGTH, ARE WASTING FOR WANT OF USE, IF IN EVERY DIRECTION THERE IS SLOWNESS IN GROWTH OF WEALTH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND ALL THIS COULD BE REMEDIED BY AN OBLITERATION OF THE CUSTOMS LINE BETWEEN THE TWO PEOPLE THAT HOLD THE CONTINENT IN COMMON, WHAT IN THE NAME OF COMMON SENSE SHOULD STAND IN THE WAY OF SUCH A CONSUMMATION ?

“Great Britain would have been infinitely better off, because while she is receiving 25 millions of dollars in interest every year from her possessions in North America, she is receiving 200 millions of dollars in interest from the revolted colonies that declared their independence of her fiscal interference. The British goods used in Canada are no greater, per capita, than the English goods used in the United States. The population from the British Isles in the Union is ten times that in the Dominion, and, so far as material advantage is concerned, the United States is, to-day, one hundred times more important to the commerce of Great Britain than is Canada.”

Could Mr. Wiman have expressed in stronger or more explicit terms the fact that British connection had stunted and blighted the development of Canada for the past one hundred and twenty years, and yet he would continue its blighting embrace while beseeching the people of the United States to come to the relief of Canada. It would seem to most minds after reading Mr. Wiman's statement, that if after a trial of one hundred and twenty years, measured by every standard of

comparison, the experiment in Canada of self-reliance and self-development is a failure, that something more radical or substantial and permanent than a treaty of Reciprocity for a short term of years would be required to retrieve the terrible mistake made in 1776. Mr. Wiman's statement that British goods used in Canada are no greater than English goods used in the United States is not correct. For the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1892, the imports into Canada from Great Britain was at the rate of \$8.20 per capita, while the imports into the United States from the same country was only \$2.40 per capita.

If free trade with the United States for a term of years under a treaty of Reciprocity will give unbounded prosperity to Canada, why will not political union which insures to the Canadian people every benefit, blessing, facility or privilege which inures to American citizenship, for all time to come, place the development and continued prosperity of Canada upon a more sound and stable basis. Reciprocity by treaty is like building upon a foundation of sand while continental union is building upon the rock—one is child's play, the other the incarnation of sound common sense.

So late as October 9th, 1892, in a paper contributed by Mr. Wiman to the Columbian issue of the Press the unhappy condition of Canada is described as follows :

“ The greater half of the continent, included in the British possessions in North America, are still developed only to a partial degree. Larger than the United States in area, richer in the resources which have made this country great, possessing potentialities of wealth beyond the dreams of avarice, Canada lies in this day of rejoicing a disappointment to the world. With natural means of intercommunication exceeding those of any other land, in variety and extent of minerals, in magnitude of forests, in length of coast line fisheries, and above all, in the possibilities of agricultural output, she is one of the richest of nations by nature, but one of the poorest by policy. Isolated from the marvelous growth of the United States by a line of demarcation which, while imperceptible, is as high as a mountain and as broad as a sea, she has had a growth so stunted and a development so slow as to make a comparison with the United States seriously detrimental to the estimate which ought to be formed in the world at large as to her position among the nations of the earth.”

I am confident that Continental Union would increase the *convertible* value of the assets of Canada within ten years after its consummation one hundred per cent, or in other words five thousand million dollars, and that after ten years the annual increase in convertible value would be enormous compared to the present rate, estimated by the Minister of Agriculture to be twenty dollars per capita. The difference between Mr. Wiman's estimate and my own is only four hundred and ninety thousand millions. Not a large sum when discussing in “glittering generalities” the “enormous undeveloped natural resources,” the “unlimited possibilities” and “boundless potentialities” of half a continent with five million

of inhabitants. According to Mr. Wiman political union will increase the per capita wealth of Canada from one thousand to one hundred thousand dollars," and yet he told the Senators that it would be ruinous for a public man in Canada to propose political union, and that political union was so far away in the future as to be unworthy of consideration at this time. If the per capita wealth of Great Britain and Ireland was one hundred thousand dollars the total wealth would be \$3,800,000,000,000, and that of the United States upon the same basis would be \$6,500,000,000,000.

The Honorable Edward Blake, the peer of Gladstone and the late Mr. Blaine, the late leader of the liberal party of Canada, the greatest, truest and noblest living Canadian, and the only living Canadian who declined knighthood at the hands of Her Majesty, (now a member of the Imperial Parliament, and selected by Mr. Gladstone as one of a committee of three to draft the Home Rule bill now before the House of Commons of England) describes the result of the present policy of Canada in the following caustic terms, in his celebrated Durham letter of Feb. 6, 1891.

"Its real tendency has been, as foretold twelve years ago, towards disintegration and annexation, instead of consolidation and the maintenance of British connection.

It has left us with a small population, a scanty immigration, and a North-west empty still; with enormous additions to our public debt and yearly charge, an extravagant system of expenditure, and an unjust and oppressive tariff; with restricted markets for our needs, whether to buy or to sell, and all the hosts of evils (greatly intensified by our special conditions) thence arising; with trade diverted from its natural into forced and therefore less profitable channels; and with unfriendly relations and frowning tariff walls ever more and more estranging us from the mighty English speaking nation to the South, our neighbors and relations, with whom we ought to be, as it was promised that we should be, living in generous amity and liberal intercourse.

Worse; far worse! It has left us with lowered standards of public virtue, and a death-like apathy in public opinion; with racial, religious, and Provincial animosities rather inflamed than soothed; with a subservient parliament, an autocratic executive, debauched constituencies and corrupted and corrupting classes; with lessened self-reliance and increased dependence on the public chest and on legislative aids; and possessed withal by a boastful jingo spirit, far enough removed from true manliness, loudly proclaiming unreal conditions and exaggerated sentiments, while actual facts and genuine opinions are suppressed.

It has left us with our hands tied; our future compromised; and in such a plight that, whether we stand or move, we must run some risks which else we might have either declined, or encountered with greater promise of success."

Discussing Mr. Wiman's scheme for unrestricted Reciprocity, Mr. Blake says, as follows :

“ Of the financial problem presented by Unrestricted Reciprocity I have seen no solution which would leave us without a great deficit.

I have said that any feasible plan involves differential duties ; but it does more. It involves—as to the bulk by agreement, and as to much from the necessity of the case—the substantial assimilation, in their leading features, of the tariffs of the two countries.

The absence of agreement would give to each country power to disturb at will the industrial system of the other ; and Unrestricted Reciprocity without an agreed assimilation of duties is an unsubstantial dream.”

When considering a treaty of commercial union, at that time clearly the most practical of all propositions before the Canadian electorate, Mr. Blake writes as below :

“ Whatever you or I may think on that head ; whether we like or dislike, believe or disbelieve in Political Union ; must we not agree that the subject is one of great moment, towards the practical settlement of which we should take no serious step without reflection, or in ignorance of what we are doing ?

Assuming that absolute free trade with the States, best described as Commercial Union, may and ought to come, *I believe that it can and should come only as an incident, or at any rate as a well understood precursor of Political Union ; for which indeed we should be able to make better terms before than after the surrender of our Commercial Independence.”*

Of the vital importance to Canadians of free access to the market of the United States for all their surplus productions, Mr. Blake says with great frankness, that,

“ While that free market which the United Kingdom, on a just conception of its own interests, opens permanently to all the world, is to us of very great value ; and while every prudent effort should be made to enlarge our exports there and elsewhere beyond the seas ; yet the results of all such efforts must be far below those to flow from a free market throughout our own continent.”

In judging of the opinions expressed by Mr. Blake and Mr. Wiman, it must not be forgotten that Mr. Blake has since Confederation was consummated in 1867, been the foremost statesman in Canada, while Mr. Wiman has been for a larger period a resident of New York and for the most part *deeply* absorbed in business enterprises in this country.

It is to be feared that when Mr. Wiman's countrymen read his testimony before the Senatorial Committee and his frequent contributions to the American press, they will question his loyalty to Canada or his good judgment in presenting their case before the electorate of the United States.

The late Henry Ward Beecher was a stupendous moral power in politics and religion, but in the administration of his private financial affairs a child.

As I have said Mr. Wiman is a giant in finance, and as a collator of financial and commercial statistics has no rival in this country, but in the domain of practical statesmanship I fear I must class him as an unweaned babe.

Five millions of more industrious, intelligent, ambitious, progressive, enterprising, conservative, peaceful, law-abiding, home-loving, moral people, thoroughly versed in the art of self-government, than our Canadian cousins does not exist in any part of the world, therefore I would secure to them forever every advantage, every opportunity, every privilege, every benefit and blessing, which inures to citizens of this republic upon exactly the very same conditions which the Republic exacts from each one of us, viz., that they should assume all the duties, obligations, and responsibilities of American citizenship, and swear to defend the American flag, and upon no other terms.

FRANCIS WAYLAND GLEN.

