

the old feudal restrictions should be relaxed or utterly swept away. If the land is to remain tied up as it is, in farms of this or that size, the representative of the farmer, as temporary owner, having no power to sell, and nobody being able to buy, the effect of foreign competition must be that landlord, tenant and labourer will go down together—unless the two latter forsake the sinking ship.

Land will have to go down far lower than the present market value, and many an enterprising farmer will have to transfer his capital and enterprise to the colonies before the iron barrier of entail will be broken down. Meanwhile, reforms are possible without disturbing the feudal foundation of things. The farmer wants both more liberty and more security. He wants to farm as he likes and to sell his produce as he pleases. At the same time, he needs to be guaranteed against eviction under a reasonable time—and against the landlord's right to confiscate the value of his improvements. All the restrictions with which the farmer is bound hand and foot are nonsense. They have grown up out of wanton abuse of power on the part of the landlords. The latter have set up the plea that they must dictate to the farmer how he shall work his farm for fear the farm should become deteriorated.

Nor does the farmer's trouble end here, the operation of the Game Laws is also dead against him, as his land may be ravaged by the game, and ridden over to the detriment of his crops by those in pursuit of it.

Many other grievances weigh down the man who strives to make a living, and at the same time to develop the resources of the soil in the interests of the community. And not the least of all is the irritation of that loss of independence which, beginning with dictation as to how he shall farm, ends but too often in compulsion as to the vote he shall give at the elections, and the church in which he shall worship his God. What wonder, then, that with bad weather, falling prices, and a black outlook generally alike as to freedom and to profit, many a stout yeoman has come to the resolve to quit the country of his fathers, now wholly given over to the "trade of war," and rejoicing chiefly in the perfection of its monster arms of precision—the crowning specimen of which is well-nigh capable of blowing him to the far distant land in which he is now compelled to seek his fortune.

In conclusion, I repeat that England can send to our shores no more welcome comrades than "tenant farmers with capital," we have in our North-West a land so bountifully blessed by Heaven, that as Douglas Jerrold said "nature is so good-tempered, she needs only to be tickled with a plough, to laugh herself into a harvest;" for the rest, our greatest want is

"Men, high-minded men,
Men who their duties know,
But know their rights, and knowing, dare maintain,
Prevent the long-aimed blow,
And crush the tyrant, while they rend the chain,—
These constitute a State."

A SCOTTISH STUDENT ON "ARGUS."

In your issue of August 30th "Argus" still continues his parable against Free Trade. One thing his worst enemies must grant him is, a studious endeavour after fairness; indeed, he states his opponents' arguments with such clearness that the marvel is that he is not himself a Free Trader. This fact, taken in connection with the name he has assumed, at once recalls the old Greek myth of the hundred-eyed guardian of Io. He had some of his hundred eyes always awake, until Hermes, the god of merchandise and chicane, lulled all the eyes to sleep. Surely the Argus he represents is not the wide-awake Argus "whom jealous Juno set to guard her spouse's lowing love," but that same Argus overcome by the seductive strains of false traders like Hermes, god of cheats.

"Argus" states with admirable fairness the contention of the Free Traders, that history is for them, and that the great forces of the time are all working on their side. He states correctly, too, their assertion, that the present conquests of Protection are due to merely temporary causes. He, indeed, somewhat overstates these conquests; for it is scarcely fair to include France among those who have been won over to Protection again. It has really taken rather to the bounty system, which, while objectionable enough, is not quite so stupid as the system of Protection. When a nation pays away a sum in bounty, it clearly knows how much it loses; but when it puts on protective duties, it loses in innumerable directions that are never dreamed of. That, however, is a mere matter of detail, and does not affect the argument. If the Free Traders are right, this falling away from Free Trade is due to temporary causes, such as the prolonged bad trade, which, again, has resulted from over-trading on the part of manufacturers on the one hand, and the depreciation in the value of silver on the other. Free Traders allege that this outcry for Protection in so many countries—an outcry which has led in so many cases to the various governments yielding to it—is similar to the outcry that rose against the bakers during the famine prices of the French Revolution. Then, men desperate with hunger suggested that hanging the bakers would cheapen bread; now, men desperate with prolonged loss demand Protection, in the hope that this will benefit them. "Argus" has never shown that this hypothesis is an

untenable one, nor made any effort to prove that the present re-conquest of territory by Protection is due to permanent, and not temporary causes. Moreover, the temporariness of these causes will appear only the more when we take up the cases. It is notorious that, in Germany, Prince Bismarck has given Protection in the hope that, pacified by it, the manufacturing classes may support him in his increased armaments. In France, what opposition to Free Trade as there is which is not explicable by bad trade is, or was rather, due to some extent to opposition to Napoleonic policy. One and all, their political economists are for Free Trade. As for the United States, a nation that was guilty of repudiation in so many of its States not more than a generation ago, and has been so unconvinced of its sheer fiscal stupidity as to repeat it in varying forms more or less disguised, is simply in economic babyhood; that it should continue protective duties is not extraordinary. That it has not wrought ruin to itself is due solely to its gigantic resources. As for Canada, its perversion is due somewhat to bad example as well as bad trade.

The only way of testing which view of the tendency of history is right,—viz., that of the Free Trader or of the Protectionist—is to see what would be the result of the triumph of each successively. Let us take Protection first, because of the precedence due to age. Let us imagine Protection carried to its utmost rigour in every country in the world. It would mean the absolute cessation of all commerce, for there is no production of nature the most chaotic that might not be made to grow in any country by means of proper treatment, then the growth of this would be protected by tariffs, so that nothing would be imported, and in consequence nothing exported. There would be no immigration, as labourers coming in would tend to lower the price of labour, hence they would be prohibited entering, and capitalists would lower the price of capital, so they would be hindered from intruding. "Argus" admits that the electric telegraph and the steam-engine help diffusion, but if Protection conquered, diffusion would be dead.

Now, let us look at the result of universal Free Trade. Every nation producing only what it was best fitted to produce, and buying with these productions the manufactures or produce of other nations, each would help the other. National acerbities would be sweetened, men would learn to know each other better, and like each other more. If we make Free Trade as absolute as we please, we can never imagine, as resulting from Free Trade, such a fiasco of self-contradictory absurdity as would result from the absolute universality of Protection. If Protection is such a good thing, why does "Argus" only contemplate the case of nations protecting against each other? Why does he not recommend that provinces and states, townships and parishes, should each protect its own manufacturers from competition? nay, why does he not carry it yet further, make each individual protect his own industry against everybody else and do everything for himself? Then only is Protection absolutely universal, and then civilization has ceased.

All that "Argus" says about the diffusion, not only of manufactures, but also of the power and skill to manufacture, is true, and very true; but does not seem at all to the point. If "Argus" were a thorough-going Protectionist, he would protect the brains of Canada from competition with the brains imported from Britain or the States, and compel it to be content with such appliances as the inventors of Canada supplied their fellow countrymen with; so, too, with literature and art. If, then, no one in his dreams would think of carrying Protection to its utmost limits, and if the natural result of Free Trade would be universal instead of partial prosperity, then so surely as history tends to the possible, and not to the impossible, does it tend to the universal establishment of Free Trade.

J. E. H. T.

Stirling, Scotland.

"CRIMINAL LABOUR."

That Canadian Liberal (?) organ, the *Globe*, has already spoken dictatorially of what ought to be the views of our working men on the question of criminal labour. Some slight encouragement is thereby afforded to pursue the subject. It is a nice question, and one that will bear discussion, whether the Toronto Liberal organ ventures upon liberal views from inherent life or from external pressure. Does it reflect light from above, or is it only a reflection of the lesser light of half-educated public opinion? Less pretentious, yet more independent journalism has been accustomed hitherto to credit itself with necessitating the *Globe's* advance towards true liberality. This is fair criticism, and a necessary subject for inquiry as regards the matter in hand. For any measure of practical reform to take effect it must be a ray from the Light of Truth—must be not merely a reflection of the people's views, but a little in advance of these, so that it may draw men out of self a little upward. If the *Globe* be in advance of public opinion, the time is not yet. If it merely reflects it, prison reform will ere long be an accomplished fact in Canada.

In furtherance of this end, it may be permitted to extract the following useful statistics of prison labour in Prussia from the *Warehousemen's and Drapers' Journal*, of London (England). The official figures show that there were 16,188 prisoners under punishment. This is about equal to one in every 10,000 of population. The trades engaged in by them while in prison com-