

strictly logical, or have an acute sense of morality; so Mr. Parnell—who is not starving—not even hungering for anything but political notoriety—finds it easy to rouse the passions of the crowds who flock to hear and see his latest efforts in the role of agitator. A refusal to pay a just debt is the first item in Mr. Parnell's programme, which from sheer necessity the landlords will probably have to accept.

But the second item—viz., the abolition of landlords altogether, will hardly be so easy of accomplishment. For, although the English people and politicians have a genuine sympathy with the Irish in regard to all grievances which have been inflicted by past governments, or present bad weather, they do not see how the state of things complained of now can be altered. The disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church was comparatively easy. The measure by which it was brought about was simple and self-contained; that is, no other important interests were involved with it. But the land question is really a group of questions, each one important, and all inextricably mixed together. When all the preliminaries have been settled as to the process by which landlords shall lose their property rights—the sources and amount of compensation—how is property to be disposed of?—that is, how are the tenant-farmers to be “rooted in the soil”? Is the land to be assimilated to personal or movable property? or is it to be treated in some new way, as something by itself, neither personal nor movable, and yet a marketable property?

Evidently the doctors do not agree about the methods to be adopted in order to bring about a cure; for while some declare for the policy of cutting down the power of settling land to the limits of the power of settling goods, others say that land must be regarded like any other commodity, which letter and hirer may stipulate about as they please. It has been quite easy to raise these questions; but it will prove any thing but easy to settle them; and the end of Ireland's trouble is not yet, nor is Mr. Parnell likely to lead her one step toward it.

AFGHANISTAN.

The triumph of General Roberts in Afghanistan is as complete as the most ardent British could desire. He has met with few obstacles on his way; there was scarcely any fighting to be done, for the few Afghan soldiers who made a show of resistance were quickly disposed of; the revolted tribes saw that the game was up and dispersed to their homes, and the English army entered Cabul. So far, so good. But now another kind of warfare begins—not between the rude Afghan and the trained English soldier, but between the diplomatists of England and Russia. The difficulty English statesmen have to encounter is this: that while they have made it perfectly clear as to what they mean to do and how they mean to do it, by over candid newspaper reports and ill-considered Prime-Ministerial speeches at banquets, the Russians have kept their purposes and plans shrouded in mystery. That pretty, poetic phrase about a “scientific frontier” was not among the things hard to be understood, but the Russian politicians have not been so outspoken. They are moving with great caution, but still they are moving. We feel as if some vast transformation scene is being arranged in the East, and we are eagerly watching for the rise of the curtain. What changes of grouping shall we look upon? What will the scene be—tragedy or comedy? Who will gain and who will lose? No one can tell; we must wait for further developments.

The peculiar method lately adopted for civilising and Christianising the heathens has had such a check in one quarter that it is worth recording. An Equatorial Empire was supposed to have been established by that prince of rascals, the late Khedive. Gordon Pasha was sent to rule over the land in the name of the great Ismail. The Pasha held the theory that Livingstone's gospel was nonsense, and the missionary work done by him and Moffatt quite ineffectual. He held that a policy of physical vigour was the only rational method for subduing the heathen African. And Gordon Pasha carried civilization at the point of the bayonet, and with the help of repeating rifles. But the Africans have risen up in wrath and turned the Pasha out of their country; and the lesson conveyed to all such civilizers is that they had better be as sure of their brute force as they are of their method of working.

EDITOR.

MODERN PROGRESS AND THE TRADE QUESTION.

In the CANADIAN SPECTATOR of the 4th instant, Mr. Roswell Fisher has a criticism of my position, that Protection is in harmony with modern progress. He raises the question: Why, if Free Trade be good as between New York and Pennsylvania, should it not be equally beneficial as between New York and Ontario? or, putting it in another shape, “If Canada were part of the U. S. A., would Free Trade with the rest of the States be beneficial, and if so, why not now?” That question I do not propose to enter upon at present, but I hope to come to it by and bye. One thing at a time. On this occasion I wish to stick to the subject of the relations of Protection and Free Trade respectively towards modern progress.

Mr. Fisher says that it is completely mis-stating the views of Free Traders to represent them as holding that England should manufacture cotton and iron for all peoples, that France should devote herself to the production of silks and wines, and that the United States should drop manufacturing altogether and be content to remain the granary and provision store of Europe. Taking this literally it is of course an exaggeration, but quite a pardonable one after all. It is to be taken, however, as a figure of speech, the intention of which is to convey, by means of exaggeration obvious and unconcealed, a perfectly true idea of the drift and tendency of Free Trade, supposing it were allowed to have all its own way in the world. In the paper of Sept. 13th I quoted Mr. Herbert Spencer's dictum that modern progress includes not merely division of labour as between individuals, but also as between different districts of the same country, and, further, between different countries. The English philosopher contends that with more progress there will be more and more of this division of labour, or “subdivision of functions,” as he calls it, *as between different nations*. Having the misfortune to differ even with so high an authority on this point, I have contended (see CANADIAN SPECTATOR of Sept. 13th and 27th) that exactly the reverse is the truth, and that the tendency of material civilization is to do away with obstacles both natural and artificial, to equalize conditions amongst nations, and to make arts and manufactures that may before have belonged to one country only the common property of all nations standing in the front rank. I do not suppose that any Free Trader actually entertains the extreme view that Canadians, for instance, should wholly abandon manufacturing, and become a nation of farmers, stock-raisers, lumbermen and fishermen only; but I do say that the full carrying out of Free Trade in these Provinces would unquestionably bring us a long way towards such a result. Mr. Spencer puts into the shape of philosophical statement what was in Mr. Cobden's mind when he laid it down, in his terse, practical way, that cotton-growing countries should not be cotton-manufacturing countries. No Free Trader can afford to repudiate these two high authorities on his own side of the question. Mr. Fisher does not say expressly whether he accepts or rejects Mr. Spencer's doctrine of *increasing* subdivision of functions among nations as a concomitant or constituent of progress; and I must regret that he did not in his criticism include my article of September 13th and 20th, in which my position was more fully stated and explained, as well as the article of August 30th. By implication, however, he agrees with Mr. Spencer, though he avoids the latter's sweeping generalizations, and makes what is apparently a very modest and moderate statement of the position of Free Traders, in these words:

“We argue that it is for the best interests of the world that society shall be allowed, without let or hindrance, to obtain those commodities which it needs or desires at the least possible sacrifice of its substance; or, in simpler words, shall be allowed to buy its goods in the cheapest markets. As, however, no one society offers within itself the cheapest market for all the commodities which its members desire, international commerce arises, when we add the corollary, that freedom of commercial intercourse should be no more restricted between the individuals of different political societies than between those of the same nation.”

As already intimated, I do not on this occasion take up the question suggested in the last clause of the quotation. But what I have now to deal with is the contention, which seems at first view a very plausible one, that all that Free Traders want is merely that governments should let trade alone, and allow it to develop itself here and there as circumstances may favour, without the interference of the law. The implication is that Protection is an interference with circumstances of natural growth, an attempt to force trade and manufactures with unsuitable localities, and in defiance of natural conditions.

It appears a very innocent and insinuating proposition to say that all that trade requires of governments is simply to be let alone, and that following out this plan will compel each particular industry to stand on its own bottom, thus insuring fair play to all, and allowing the development, in all countries, of the industries best suited to each respectively. The assumption is that, as things now are, all countries have a fair start in the race of competition, and that if some countries are now ahead of others, it is through natural causes, which Protection cannot neutralize, and should not attempt to control. To take concrete instances, it is assumed that, as England is willing to stand or fall by Free Trade, Canada should accept the same position, and, if her manufactures cannot stand without Protection, let them perish. I take these two for instances, for clearness of contrast, because England is the most advanced manufacturing country in the world, while Canada is one of the newest countries, now trying to establish manufactures. Now I make these two assertions, that England's manufacturing greatness was founded and built up upon Protection in