

but very different would the case be were there no canals to perform this good office for us. How much the canals really do for us in this way no one can tell; but we may safely conclude that, as a means of keeping down railway freights, they are the best investment the country ever made. It is said that if there were no canals connecting with the lakes, either on the Canadian or the American side, the high cost of freight would stop the large exports from the west, raising the prices received by farmers in the east, and this is called the *raison d'abandon* of protectionism. Ruled out by high freights the wheat and corn of the west, and then what high prices and large profits eastern farmers would obtain, it is said. And this, it is contended, would be protection. The Ontario farmers, it is further argued, are taxed to provide the means of cheap transportation of produce which competes with their own and lowers prices. The answer to all this is that it is based on an utter misrepresentation of the end and aim of National Policy. It is of the essence of a true National Policy to give fair play to all interests; and if this be not done the name is misapplied. While Protectionists demand that American producers and operators shall not have the advantage of an open market on our side, while we have to pay heavy customs tolls on theirs, they can with perfect consistency support all reasonable means for securing cheap transportation. The main object of National Policy is to protect our own producers, of course, but this is to be sought, not by closing up channels of transportation, but by making foreigners who desire to sell in our market pay for the privilege. Such a policy is based on the principle that, to the extent to which the duties we impose are really protective, they are paid by the foreigner who seeks to sell in our market. The objection that Protectionists, to be consistent, should be in favour of high freights as an effectual means of Protection, is as far-fetched and ridiculous. The business of buying western produce and carrying it to Europe is a legitimate one, and should receive the best of fair play; but we may still in all fairness make foreigners who seek to sell their produce in Canada pay for the privilege. It is not an argument against the National Policy, but, on the contrary, one greatly in its favour, that it includes the development of transportation and commerce as well as of production. The argument that we have expended millions for the purpose of giving cheap freights to American farmers is not a strong one. After objections have enhanced their array of figures, people will still remain convinced that Canada gains by carrying for the States, and vice versa. If this be not true, then the whole railway and canal policy of both countries is a gigantic mistake, and DAVID CRISTON and WILLIAM HAMILTON MANLY, in particular, deserve not the thanks but the execration of posterity. Quite recently it was contended, on the Free Trade side, that by a Pacific Railway policy different from that now adopted the grain trade of a large portion of the North-Western States might have been secured to Canada. But if there was to be no gain to Canada from having this trade pass through within our borders, what object could there be in trying to secure it? It is on the side of Free Trade objectors to a liberal canal policy that the inconsistency lies. Protectionists wish to see all done that we can afford to do to draw the grain trade of the west through Canadian channels, taking care at the same time that our home market be safely guarded for our own producers. We do not need at all to sacrifice either one of these objects for the other; because we can quite easily secure both. But Free Traders who object to a liberal canal policy on the ground that we would thereby be favouring foreigners so much do in effect deny their own principles. On their theory, a large stream of cheap foreign produce flowing through Canadian channels should be a benefit to us, by making this "a cheap country to live in." Or we may state the difference in other words, thus: Both sides agree that it is a gain to the country to have American freight in large quantity carried on our railways and canals; we say both, for we hold the opposite opinion a mere pretence on the part of those who appear to profess it for the occasion. But, while on the National Policy side provision is made that our own producers shall not lose their home

market thereby, the Free Traders would do nothing to protect the home market at all. The former would take measures for developing the transportation business in Canada, at the same time taking care that no damage should come thereby to any producing interest. The latter, in adding the transportation interest, would simply go that length and they stop, without hitting a finger to prevent any damage which might come to the producing interests in the process. Between the two policies there seems to be an essential difference.

**AN IRISH PROTEST.**

Probably the fact as Free Traders in the United Kingdom and Canada may. It is nevertheless true that people in the former country are beginning to question the wisdom of a trade policy which gives all the advantage to foreigners and places all existing disadvantages at the doors of the home manufacturer. Illustrative of the growing feeling on the subject we quote from an article in the Belfast (Ireland) *News-Letter*, suggested by the action of the Tariff Committee of the local Chamber of Commerce on the terms of the proposed new Anglo-French Commercial Treaty. "We are sorry," says the *News-Letter*, that these terms will press heavily on our linen industry, already in a very depressed condition. Several other local industries will be seriously affected; but our staple trade will suffer most should the proposed French duties on imports become law. We believe the tariff on linen goods will be increased 24 per cent., although the present tariff of 10 to 15 per cent. is considered by those in the trade much too high. Under such circumstances some means ought to be adopted to let public opinion on the subject be made known to the Government. If our manufacturers and merchants cannot hold their own in the French markets with a conventional tariff ranging from 10 to 15 per cent., what will be their position when the specific tariff comes into operation, and 24 per cent. is added? Our staple industry was never in as bad condition as at present, and greatly against their wish employers are unavoidably compelled to reduce the wages of their workmen. Wherever we send our goods they are met by imposts which are almost prohibitory; but the foreigners are not content unless they can exclude our products altogether from their markets, while our rulers go on blindly clinging to *one-sided trade laws which threaten to leave us no trade at all.*" After referring to the probable effect of the new French tariff on the Bradford (England) industries, the *News-Letter* proceeds to say: "With respect to the shipping trade of the United Kingdom, the French propose a bounty for their mercantile navy, which will have a very injurious influence on the British shipping interest. Through means of bounties they have effectually destroyed the British sugar manufacture; and it is believed that the encouragement which is offered to French shipping will exclude 'English bottoms' from all their ports, while competing severely with them in all foreign ports. For example, it is proposed by the French manufacturers to establish a line of steamers between Marseilles and Australia, for the special purpose of obtaining their supply of wool direct, instead of, as heretofore, buying at the quarterly sales in London, to which the whole of the wool from Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa was shipped. Hitherto, the French element at the quarterly wool sales was a most important one; but henceforth that element will be missed and the French manufacturers will gain considerably in their purchase of the raw material, while their grain will be still further increased when their tariff almost prohibits the import of British woolen manufactures. No one can reasonably blame the French for taking care of their own industries; but why do our people sit quietly by and allow our national industries to be sacrificed to the system nicknamed 'Free Trade'?" The *News-Letter* concludes as follows:

"Why should we have any commercial treaty at all with France, or with any other country, when the effect must be the annihilation of our trade? Linen, woolen, cotton, silk, shipping, the story is the same. Foreigners everywhere are taking care of themselves, building up their industries and increasing their treasures by duties on imports; but (our Government) affecting to be so very 'open our ports free to the manufacturers of the world, not seeming to care what comes of our own manufactures—of the capitalists who have sunk their money

in them, or of the working classes, whose earnings are diminished through the ruinous effects of a single importation. There is no reason why we of the United Kingdom should be so unwisely generous to the people of other kingdoms, when they do not seem at all disposed to reciprocate our generosity. It can not be too often repeated that when Mr. Robert Peel introduced the free trade system, he admitted its one evilness, *that it would kill itself and its opponents.* It is a national motto, and a comprehensive truth, that *the world is a workshop, and the nations are workmen.* They allege that they require import duties for revenue as well as to create, foster, and promote their national industries; and, therefore, they will not relax their tariffs, nor offer us any equivalent for our liberal trade laws. Surely it is time to look this question fair in the face. *The manufacturers and most other manufacturers are calling out for help, and the only help that we can give is that Free Trade may be the rule all round.* There could be no harm, certainly no injustice, in telling the to-be-taken that we will deal with him on his own terms, be they what they may. If he admit our products free, or nearly free, then we will admit his products free; but if he must tax us, then we must tax him to some extent. *There is nothing for it, unless we are prepared to let our linen industry, and all other national industries go to ruin, and our fame as a manufacturing country be destroyed.*"

Similar sentiments have been expressed by other journals as influential as the *News-Letter*, all of which goes to prove that the country is beginning to find out to its cost that the too-generous policy pursued at present cannot be followed with advantage.

**NEWFOUNDLAND FINANCES.**

We have received a copy of the Budget speech of the Receiver General of Newfoundland, delivered on the 8th of March, 1881. The total amount of revenue received for the year 1880 was \$297,473.84. The following is a comparative statement of the revenue for 1879 and 1880:—

Source of Revenue.	Year 1879.	Year 1880.
Customs	\$281,075 22	\$257,241 53
Overs Land	6,700 78	4,410 81
Timber Dues	71 31	185 65
Postal	17,000 00	17,300 00
Licenses	7,938 75	6,940 21
Fines and Penalties	1,000 00	1,795 13
Gifts of the Prince		300 00
Port		111 00
Abolition Fee		1,115 00
Court of Civil Cases		905 92
Court of Criminal Cases		124 00
Debtors		2 00
St. John's Hospital		1,374 44
Leaside Asylum		628 00
Kyussene Oil Store		300 00
Block House		124 00
Harbour Master's Dues		1,877 00
Certificates to Masters		130 00
St. John's Bazaar		3,461 00
General		5 74
Separation		463 74
Print Fee		13 00
Profit on coin imported for the use of the Colony		4,417 02
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$297,473 84</b>	<b>\$297,473 84</b>

The deficiency in the Customs revenue rose chiefly in consequence of the short importation of molasses and sugar, and partly from a short importation of tobacco, spirits and wines. The floating balance at the debt of the colony on the current account for the past year amounts to \$77,228.71. The amount to the credit of the Halifax Fidelity Award is \$746,277. The interest to be received on this amount for the year 1881 will be \$29,738.78. The consolidated and debentured debt of the colony on the 31st December, 1880, amounted to \$1,450,990 44. But since the commencement of the current year this sum has been reduced to the extent of \$100,492.15 by the cancelling of debentures held by the Savings Bank to this amount. During the past year 132 vessels, giving an aggregate tonnage of 4,998 tons, were constructed in the Island. A drawback amounting to \$14,896 was paid to the owners. The aggregate of the shipping after allowing for all losses of last year, amounted to 1,836 vessels, of 86,561 tons. The value of the exports of Newfoundland for the year was \$5,571,284, and the estimated value of the Labrador exports 1,150,000.

**THE BRITISH BREWING TRADE.**

In the *Full Mail Gazette* we find a succinct summary, compiled from a parliamentary return, of the brewing trade in the United Kingdom.—On September 30th, 1880, there were in England 2,507 brewers, and 69,761 licensed victuallers; 37,644 persons had licenses to sell beer to be consumed on the premises, and 11,760 had licenses to sell beer not to be drunk on the premises. There were 12,396 victuallers who

brewed their own beer. The malt consumed by brewers not being victuallers between October 1st, 1879, and September 30th, 1880, amounted to 41,927,900 bushels; the victuallers in the same period consumed 4,996,084 bushels of malt, and the persons licensed to sell beer to be drunk on and off the premises consumed 2713,225 bushels. In Scotland there were on September 30th, 1880, 84 brewers and 12,269 licensed victuallers. The 84 brewers brewed their own beer, and 49 who sold on and off their premises did the same. The brewers in Scotland between October 1st, 1879, and September 30th, 1880, consumed 1,507,881 bushels of malt, and the victuallers 380,943 bushels. In Ireland there were on September 30th, 1880, fifty-three brewers and 10,686 licensed victuallers. There was only one victualler who brewed his own beer, and he consumed 1,864 bushels of malt in twelve months, while the brewers in the same period consumed 2,963,887 bushels of malt. The amount of duty charged on the bushels of malt consumed for nine months ended September 30th, 1880, was £4,458 41s. 2d., and the amount of beer duty charged for the three months ended December 31st, 1880, was £2,229,635 7s. 4d. The total amount of license duty paid by all classes in the United Kingdom for the year ended September 30th, 1880, was £391,967 15s. Of the brewers who paid for licenses, one paid for brewing 950,000 barrels, and one for brewing over 1,000,000 barrels. The beer exported between October 1st, 1879, and October 1st, 1880 was of the declared value of £1,751,918. Of this the largest portion, consisting of 76,022 barrels, was sent to British India, 44,117 barrels to South Africa, 15,762 barrels to Gibraltar, 22,289 barrels to Victoria, in Australia, 28,066 barrels to New South Wales, 21,768 barrels to the United States, and 12,008 barrels to Brazil. Amongst other exportations, two barrels went to French Guiana, 36 barrels of Scotch brew were sent to the Fiji Islands, seven barrels went to Java, and one barrel was sent to the French possessions in India.

**THE IRISH EMIGRATION QUESTION IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.**

On the 21st ultimo, in the British House of Commons, Mr. ARDSON, M.P. for Glasgow, asked the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies "Whether any reply had been sent by Her Majesty's Government to a message forwarded by the Governor General from the Privy Council of Canada, sympathizing with Irish distress and desiring to co-operate for its relief; if it was the fact that the measure offered by Canada was that the Imperial Government should subsidize an emigration scheme that was to cost £80 per family, while Canada was to get the benefit of the new labour, but to bear no part of the pecuniary cost, and do nothing beyond what she now did for all other immigrants; if it was the fact that part of the British Government subsidy would, under the scheme, be applied in paying the Canadian Government a patent fee of £2 for each grant of land, while that land was ceded to Canada by Britain free; and, if the foregoing allegations were well founded, whether Her Majesty's Government would, in any negotiations that might follow, propose a more equal arrangement." In reply, Mr. GRANT DUFF said that "the Governor-General of the Dominion had been informed that the matter had been referred to the Irish Government. In his opinion the offer of the Dominion Government was a far more liberal one than Mr. ARDSON supposed. If further negotiations took place he had no doubt Her Majesty's Government would be desirous, as he was sure the Dominion Government would be, that the arrangements made should be fair to all parties." The *Colonial Register*, commenting on Mr. ARDSON'S question, says:—"Mr. G. ARDSON, M.P., seems to think it his duty to malign or misrepresent Canada on every possible occasion. The question he asked Mr. GRANT DUFF on Monday night was put in such a form as to make his ordinary reader imagine that the emigration proposal made by the Canadian Government was very advantageous to the Dominion and unfair to this country. Mr. DUFF'S reply was sufficiently explicit and satisfactory. The offer made through Mr. FERRIS far more liberal than Mr. ARDSON represented, as indeed our own remarks on it

from time to time abundantly prove. Mr. ARDSON might surely employ his time more profitably than in making rash and baseless predictions as to the future of the Dominion, unwisely attacking its finances, and misrepresenting a very generous offer it has made before the Home Government."

**IRISH EMIGRATION.**

We recently published a statement showing the emigration from the United Kingdom during the year 1880. The following statement from the *Irish Gazette* sets forth the data in regard to Ireland for a number of years, which may be of interest at this time. The number of emigrants who left Irish ports during the year 1880 was 93,857, and increase of 48,904 as compared with 1879. The number of emigrants was 60,180, or 21,677 more than in the previous year, and 117 females 45,668, an increase of 11,700. The total was equal to 17 per cent. of the population of Ireland in 1879. The total number of native emigrants from the 1st of May, 1851 (the date at which the collection of these returns commenced), to the 31st of December, 1880, is 2,637,187—1,406,476 males and 1,230,711 females. During these 30 years the annual numbers of emigrants have fluctuated between 190,322 in 1852 to 72,500 in 1876. Since 1876 the numbers have been steadily increasing. The number of 2,637,187 native emigrants who have left Ireland during the last thirty years represents a proportion of 45.5 per cent. of the population, according to the census of 1851. Of the 93,817 native emigrants of 1880, 81,068 or 85 per cent. went to foreign countries or the colonies; and 12,749, or 14 per cent. to Great Britain. Compared with the four previous years, commencing with 1876—in which year the destinations were first registered—the United States of America absorbed in 1880, 74,236, or 78.1 per cent. of the entire number, as against an average of 16,246, or 39 per cent. Emigration to Canada has also considerably increased, while that to Australia and New Zealand has diminished.

**TREATMENT OF INDIANS—A CONTRAST.**

The systematic manner in which the Indians under American jurisdiction have been subjected to plunder and violation of solemnly entered into agreements is a dark chapter in the history of that country. One of the results is the continuous Indian war which our neighbours have on hand. The following statement, contrasting the treatment of the Canadian Indians with that practised by the authorities of the United States, is from the *New York Herald*. "The annual report of the Canadian Mounted Police forms an interesting and instructive chapter in Indian government. From the very beginning the Canadian authorities have pursued a policy in dealing with the aborigines, the very opposite of our own, and the sad and shameful story of our Indian history only too plainly and painfully testifies to the absurdity and imbecility of the system which has so long obtained at Washington. While the tendency of all our legislation under successive Administrations has been to perpetuate the tribal distinctions—in other words, to preserve savagism—the aim of the Canadian Government has been to break up those relations with the Indians, not only treating them precisely the same as white men are dealt with. Instead of making treaties with the Indians, breaking them as soon as made and then going to war as a preliminary to another treaty to be again broken, the Canadians adopted the plan of placing policemen among them, establishing courts, semi-military in character, and punishing crime as it is punished in civilized communities. This plan has worked admirably. In the report which has just been made the record of Indian crime and punishment is what might naturally be expected in frontier settlements. The principal offences are stealing horses, shooting government cattle, firing the prairies and being in possession of stolen goods, for all of which due imprisonment was imposed. The most significant part of the report, however, is that which shows the extent to which these courts are used by the Indians themselves in obtaining redress against white men. There are numerous suits in which the red man appears as plaintiff against a white neighbour with a complaint of assault, a disputed wager, or an unlawful trespass. A system that produces such satisfactory results is worthy the serious attention and study of our Indian philanthropists."

A London despatch says (London) will not adopt an apologetic tone in the coming debate on the Transvaal question. He says the question became one of saving England from bloodguiltiness. A lively debate is anticipated.

The United States Treasury surplus for the current fiscal year is estimated at \$100,000,000.