

THE STRUGGLE CONTINUED.

The friends of a National Policy for Canada have in those columns had abundant warning that the struggle for it was by no means closed with the victory in the country of 1878, and the victory in Parliament of 1879. Far from it, indeed; the enemy is still in the field, and is still able to delay and to hinder, though not to defeat. New manufacturing enterprises, which could scarcely fall to prove of vast importance to the country, are held in abeyance until it be seen whether the people will confirm in 1883 the verdict of five years before. The latter, say the Free Traders, was merely a catch verdict, snatched from the country by surprise, and at a time of unusual depression. At the very next opportunity, let it come as soon as it may, that catch verdict will be reversed, and the country will go back to the policy which has for its chief exponents Sir Richard Cartwright, Mr. Mills, Mr. CHARLTON and the Toronto Globe. Now, while it is certain that the Free Trade propaganda cannot win the field, it is none the less true that it may be able to do the country serious damage. It is actually now intimidating capital with the threat that Protection will be seriously cut down if a certain event happens. Our Free Trade propagandists would not abolish all Protection. Oh no! They are too cunning to say that. What they seek to do is to impose on people of doubtful mind with the specious pretence that, while not opposed to fair ad valorem duties, they would at once abolish the specific duties, which mainly affect cottons, woollens, farm produce and coal. But these specific duties, as we have so often before urged, are really the most valuable part of the whole tariff. They constitute just that part of the tariff which should be most readily maintained against all attacks, if ever the N.P. is to prove the complete success it is calculated for being. It does appear to be something to the purpose to recall, in this connection, the fact that the new French tariff is wholly specific, and that the steady refusal of the French authorities to surrender the strong vantage ground of specific duties, on cottons and woollens especially, is the main reason why the new treaty negotiations hang fire to-day. We are now pressed to surrender that most invaluable aid to home interests—specific duties—at the time when the foremost commercial nation of Europe, next to England, has adopted that system with the determination to stand to it. It seems as if Free Traders, dreading the effect which expansion of home manufactures may have on public opinion, are determined to choke off progress by threats of a coming change. To the extent that they may be able to stop the country's movement will the "show" in favour of Protection be lessened. Here it is to be observed that all branches of manufacture are not alike in their position and prospects. Some there are which made a grand rush forward from almost the very day when the new policy was announced in the House, in March, 1879. Others there are which need assurance of the policy being not only prolonged, but also put on the broadest and surest foundations are capitalists will embark in them. It is the latter, chiefly, who suffer through the keeping up of the anti-Canadian cry that opens our markets are to be opened to cheap goods from England and the States, and that it is not safe to invest in home manufactures any more. There is an enemy at work that would strangle the commercial independence of Canada in its cradle, for fear that soon it may grow too strong for any such process. On the field of 1878 a battle for National Policy was won, but the struggle is still in continuance. With one more great electoral victory for Canadian interests, we may hope that the anti-patriotic clique will sink out of sight and accept the situation. It will be worth millions to the country just to make their next defeat so overwhelming that they will cease to hinder its progress as they are now trying to do. Coming on the top of present prosperity such a verdict by the country would mark the opening of even another and a new series of prosperous years, which would put the future greatness of the Dominion beyond doubt. A melancholy fact it is, indeed, to see men calling themselves Canadian statesmen actually fighting against the country's progress in effect arguing that our policy would be, not to build up the prosperity

of Halifax, St John, Quebec, Montreal, and Toronto, but of Manchester, Glasgow, Birmingham, New York, Buffalo and Chicago. To crush out the wigglings and twistings of this anti-Canadian policy amongst us a firm stamping out at the next election is required, and friends of the true patriotic policy for Canada should see to it that the stamping out be well and thoroughly done. As the campaign is already fairly opened what is to be done cannot be done too soon. We say let the coming verdict in favour of the N.P. be such a strong one that future appeals or a new trial will be laughed out of court.

FAIR TRADE IS FREE TRADE.

—WHILE writes to the St James's Gazette on the trade question, which continues to attract much attention in England. A great deal of misconception still prevails respecting the meaning and application of the terms 'fair trade,' 'free trade,' and 'reciprocity,' but they appear to me simple and comprehensive enough. Although it suits Mr Gladstone's purposes to distinguish them, they are yet synonymous. Free trade, he would now have it, means that which we have had since 1846; 'fair trade' and 'reciprocity,' he declares, mean protection in disguise. No one can know better than he the fallacy of this assertion. Fair trade and reciprocity are but synonyms for free trade in its correct and proper sense, they are simply used in contradistinction to the Customs laws that have existed here for nearly forty years, falsely called now by most Liberals 'free trade.' Now, what is fact is free trade? The answer is simply that which its name imports—i.e. the interchange of commodities between one country and another duty free. Trade between nations means the mutual interchange of merchandise subject to the respective Customs duties, or practically so. Free trade was unquestionably so understood up to 1846 not only by Messrs Cobden and Bright, but by Mr Gladstone, and, indeed, the entire community. To the objection that other nations had shown no disposition to accept the principle and might never do so, the answer of Messrs. Bright and Cobden was that some country must make a beginning, and that if we first opened our ports other nations would as a matter of course follow suit. They never contended that it would be right or beneficial for us to keep our ports always open while other countries continue to lay protective duties on our goods. No satisfied were Messrs. Cobden and Bright with their free trade theory, and so convinced were they of its universal acceptance, that they scouted the possibility, pressed upon them by Mr Disraeli, that other nations, while profiting by the benefits we conferred upon them, would not only give us nothing in return but would flood our markets with their goods to the detriment of our own industries. Their whole argument, their *raison d'être* for the opening of our ports, was based upon reciprocity, or, in other words, 'fair trade,' which Mr Gladstone now says means protection in disguise. It is perfectly plain that Messrs Cobden and Bright would never have raised the banner of free trade were they not at the time convinced that their doctrine would be speedily accepted by other countries. In fact, the opening of our ports in 1846 was an experiment only, which Messrs. Gladstone, Bright, and Cobden no doubt thought would prove successful. How events have falsified the prophecies of these gentlemen, and completely vindicated the course taken by Mr. Disraeli, the "Inexorable logic of facts" has fully proved. Upwards of thirty-five years have passed, yet no other nation has reciprocated, and Germany, France, the United States—the countries which have most profited by the opening of our ports—are now the most determined in excluding our goods from their markets, while they flood ours with goods we really do not want. We have never, in fact, had free trade hence the present cry for it, or, in other words, for fair trade reciprocity, which, as I have said, means the same thing, and that which in 1846 was contended for by Messrs Cobden and Bright. The government undisturbed all this very well, the best proof of which is that they are now trying to extort a fair trade treaty from reluctant France, who, knowing that she already possesses all the commercial benefits we can bestow upon her, fails to see why she should be Quixotic enough to make any sacrifice for our benefit. Yet, in the face of all

this, Mr Gladstone and his disciples are now with unblushing effrontery attempting the country, declaring that this very fair trade they are doing their utmost to obtain is a delusion, and simply that best protection in disguise. This is not only absurd but mischievous and dishonest. The real free traders are those who are now advocating fair trade or reciprocity and not the Government, who, while denouncing it, are going round the world with a bated breath and whispering humbleness begging for reciprocity or the smallest concession in that direction, to meet with continually only. The Government, in the course they are taking, are betraying the best interest of the country and playing the game of the foreigner, whose object is to exclude our goods and destroy our commercial ascendancy. These facts will soon become thoroughly known to the country.

PRINCIPAL GRANT ON THE NORTH-WEST AND THE ALL RAIL ROUTE.

Another valuable contribution to North-West literature has just been published—in the form of a lecture delivered a few evenings ago by the Rev. Principal GRANT, who recently returned from a holiday trip to that country. It will be remembered that about ten years ago Dr. GRANT accompanied Mr. SANDRO FLEMING on his Pacific Railway exploration tour across the Rocky Mountains, and upon his return he wrote "From Ocean to Ocean," one of the most readable books of travel that had been given to the people of Canada for many a day. When Dr. GRANT arrived at Winnipeg a few months ago he found matters completely metamorphosed. Instead of a few scattered huts, here and there a half-breed or an Indian, he was in the midst of the activity and bustle of a city of nearly fifteen thousand inhabitants, representing not only all the older Provinces of Canada, but the leading countries of the old world. Dr. GRANT is intensely enthusiastic over the immense and valuable country which Canada has secured in the North-West. He speaks of its great resources, the majesty of its rivers, the productivity of its soil, the grandeur of its scenery and its adaptability to become the home of millions of people in a tone which indicates that he has great confidence in its future. His eloquent peroration will speak for itself:—

"This whole land of Canada with its ocean lakes and boundless forests, rivers like seas and exhaustless pastures on sea and shore, let every one of its children love and serve with loyal service. It is a good land; from the copper-mines of Newfoundland to the gold of Cariboo; from the coal of Cape Breton to the coal of Nanaimo; from the wool, berries and balbut of the Atlantic to the salmon of the Fraser and the huckleberries of Queen Charlotte's Island; from the harbours of Nova Scotia to the bays of the Pacific. But where is the centre and pivot of this vast country, whose three sides are washed by three oceans, and the fourth the water-land of America? Not even the great Province of Ontario, more than a thousand miles from the sea. Its centre is that North-West of which I have spoken. No one can breathe its stimulating air, no Canadian can think of it without the vision of the future coming before him. Then his heart swells with joy, with gratitude, with exultant hope; for the man that has no pride in his country is a maimed creature, use to be pitted as we pity the blind, the deaf, the dumb, the idiot. A vision comes before us of our loss and herds, of vast expanses of golden grain waving in the breeze, of warehouses filled with food for the millions across the sea, of expanding commerce, enlarging cities and busy streets by the hundred thousand, the abodes of fellow-citizens, industrious, prosperous, loyal, God-fearing. All this is ours, and with all the gathered wealth of the past to boot, our fathers' memories and our fathers' flag. The past with its wisdom is ours, the present with its ample power, the future with its ample promise; ours without a single break in national development or historical continuity. Ought we not thank God for our inheritance?"

We regret that pressure upon our space prevents our publishing the lecture in full, for it is one deserving the widest circulation, not only on account of its intrinsic merit, but because of the immense quantity of valuable information we hope that it will be published in a convenient shape and that steps will be taken to have it widely distributed in the United Kingdom, where information about Canada is more eagerly sought now—days than at any previous period of the country's history. There is one point in the lecture to which we are desirous of calling attention, and that is Dr. GRANT'S strong views on the subject of an all-rail route on Canadian soil for great transcontinental railway. Having described the three routes for getting to Manitoba, he continued:—

"But no Canadian can be satisfied until there is an all-rail route through our own territory. To complete it only some hundreds of miles of railway are now needed, the section, namely, between Lake Superior and a junction with the Thunder Bay branch already referred to. Until this 600 miles is built we cannot feel comfortable. It is indispensable from a national point of view. The country is not one united, can get from Province to Province without going through foreign territory. No farmer would feel comfortable if he had not a right of way from one part of his farm to another, or if he were dependent for it on his neighbour's good will. If he cannot secure that, he had better sell his farm in whole or in part. So if we can build that 600 miles of railway we had better give up the dream of being an independent people (Chiefs). Before the Intercolonial was built the Maritime Provinces had a taste of what is meant by passing through a foreign country in order to get to Ontario or Quebec, and the experience was by no means satisfactory. The Intercolonial is worth all that it cost and a great deal more. We had similar experiences in the West at the time of Kule's little rebellion, when so many obstacles were interposed to our volunteers getting through the Strait Canal. That which has been is that which shall be. No people that respect themselves should be dependent on their neighbours for a right of way. Others will respect us only when we respect ourselves (Applause). Nobody is this road necessary, but its value as a direct link of connection with the North-West should induce us to build it. Everyone now believes in the future greatness of the North-West. Shall we then at the outset make the North-West tributary to another country, or shall we secure direct connection with it as speedily as possible? We are told that it will pass through a wilderness. On the contrary, there are indications of vast forest and mineral wealth, and a railway is indispensable to open them up."

Having expressed his preference for such great works being constructed by Governments rather than by companies, Dr. GRANT concluded this portion of his lecture by saying:—

"The thing has been done, and done with the approval of one and all, for both at different times committed themselves to the principle of a company, and I believe to the exercise of patronage by a Government generally took the same view. Our duty now is to see that the Syndicate fulfils its contract, and at the same time we must keep faith with the Syndicate in letter and spirit, and loyally support them in the great work they have undertaken. Their success will be our success, their failure a national failure."

THE QUEBEC GOVERNMENT AND THE Q. M. O. & O. RAILWAY.

In his elaborate speech delivered at St. Theresa a few days ago Mr. CHARLEVOIX referred at length to the Quebec, Montreal, Ottawa and Occidental Railway question. It having been alleged that the Government of which he is the head were intent upon selling the road without consulting the Legislature, Mr. CHARLEVOIX gave the statement a flat contradiction. In order to set at rest rumours which are current on the subject, it may be as well to publish Mr CHARLEVOIX'S remarks, as we find them reported:—

"It had been said in some papers that he wanted to make a bargain and sell the road without previously submitting the terms to the House. Those people who circulated that supposition knew him but little. The Government would endeavour to obtain the highest price, but would never conclude any sale or bargain before submitting the terms to the Legislature. The negotiations would be submitted to the members to enable them to form an opinion. The Government had now offered the terms of which he could not disclose, but in order that the people might be put in concert with the progress of affairs, he would assure them that the Government would never sell the road for less than \$6,000,000, which was all the money that it really cost the Province, allowing for the \$5,000,000 subsidy it was previously prepared to give a private company. The municipal contributions not yet paid up would be another item to add to the amount to be received on account of the road. Montreal had already paid her \$700,000, and the city of Quebec, as well as the other municipalities, would also follow this noble example. The Canadian Pacific Railway, it was said, should purchase the road, but it must be remembered that this was a private company which could not be bound to do any more than it had pledged itself to do. The Federal Government which was interested in selling its great policy of the Pacific Railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific carried out would no doubt endeavour to conciliate conflicting interests. He believed that the people of Quebec were entitled to ask better terms at Ottawa. He did not mean that they should beg for help from any Government. They had always succeeded in holding a creditable position by means of their own resources. But the Government at Ottawa might consider it just to give a subsidy to the Q. M. O. & O. Railway, as it had given to other railroads. If the Canadian Pacific Railway would not buy our railroad, the railroad was not to be sold to us on that account; the Province would keep it and find other purchasers for the price he had mentioned. That price would not be lowered. The Government could sell the road for that amount at the lowest sum at which the Government would sell it, because that was the figure which would bring the Province out without loss. If we sold the road for \$6,000,000, the interest, calculated the money at 5 per cent, would amount to \$300,000 per annum."

EDITORIAL COMMENTS.

The London Standard says that owing to unforeseen difficulties which have arisen, it is understood to be very doubtful whether Sir Garnet Wolseley will succeed to the appointment of Adjutant-General of the army when Sir Charles Elicke retires; and in view of General Wolseley's probable retention of the Quarter-Master-Generalship, Sir Frederick Roberts has determined to proceed to India to take up the command of the Madras army, to which he was lately appointed.

The editor of the Canadian Spectator, evidently knows whereof he speaks when he says:—"In all British schools, where maps are displayed, it is certain that on the walls will be found a large map of America—that is to say, of the United States, with Canada showing a long black strip on the northern boundary. I knew the geography of America when I was a boy, but Canada I never heard of. English school teachers are just as ignorant of Canada after a lapse of 100 years as I am. Why could not our authorities work in this matter, and try, at least, to get a map of Canada on the school-room walls? Surely we have a claim to that extent upon the nation's schoolmaster at home."

From a recent comparative statement says the New York Daily Indicator, it appears that omitting vessels of less than 50 tons measurement, Europe possesses 42 tons to every 1,000 inhabitants. America, 40, and Australia, 70, while Asia and Africa have only 2 tons per 1,000. Liverpool ranks as the most important port in the world, with a tonnage of 2,647,373; this is succeeded by London with 2,330,698, and Glasgow with 1,432,364; New York comes next with 1,153,676 tons. The nine leading ports of Great Britain have a tonnage of 8,721,123, while the first four ports of the United States have only 1,976,940. St. John N.B. is in this respect as important as Boston or Charleston, and more so than Philadelphia. Great Britain and Ireland possess a gross tonnage of nearly 12,000,000 sailing vessel tons, and with the tonnage of her colonies the British flag covers 14,000,000 tonnage, out of the total existing world's tonnage of 27,000,000. The United States, twenty years ago, carried 68 per cent. of their foreign trade in their own bottoms, whereas now they carry about 16 per cent.

The Governor-General's recent North West tour is rapidly bearing fruit in the way of drawing increased attention to the country. Still more practical results may be looked for in the future. In an article on the subject the London Morning Post refers to the cordial reception of His Excellency by the Indians. "No one," it says, "can say that they have ever given trouble to the settlers in Canada, or failed to observe the engagements which have been entered into with them. Lord Lorne's tour has been in every sense a triumphal progress, and has brought more vividly than ever before the people of England the attachment and regard which is entertained for the Old Country and its institutions in the Dominion. The chief anxiety at present in Canada is to see a large and sustained emigration movement from Great Britain. Our surplus population, as it has been well observed, is all that Canadians asked of us, and it is as much for our benefit as for theirs that they should have it. No finer soil or healthier than that of Manitoba can anywhere be found. Whether farming does or does not pay in this country, there is no manner of doubt that it does in the Dominion; and those Englishmen who are desirous of trying their fortunes in another hemisphere can do so there under the most favourable circumstances."

The Wreck Register contains a large amount of information regarding wrecks on the British coast last year. The number was 2,519. During the last twenty six years it was 31,841. As the result 18,550 lives were lost. The value of the National Life Boat Service can be estimated when it is stated that during the twenty-six years referred to its agencies were instrumental in saving 18,736 lives. The following particulars are furnished:—

"The number of English ships which appear to have foundered, or to have been otherwise totally lost on our shores, from