

tion and will take the trouble to read it carefully. Why not, then, permit it to pass without criticism and have its full weight with those for whom it was primarily written? Because it is intended or at least adapted to influence the people of Canada as well. Hence if it is weak at any point it is highly desirable that we should see it, and so be saved from false conclusions, which might otherwise lead to disastrous consequences. Now the weak point, as it seems to us, in Mr. Lawder's argument is the fact that it is based upon the contradictory of what Mr. Lawder regards as Mr. Wiman's "unwarranted assumption" that the market of 65,000,000 of people is and must be of greater value to the country of 5,000,000 of people than the market of the latter is to the former. The fallacy by which we are in danger of misleading ourselves is, we take it, wrapped up in that word "value." Taking money as the measure of value, can a given amount of money be taken as of equal value to either party? A sum of money which may be of considerable importance when divided among five people, may be a mere bagatelle when divided amongst sixty. So, too, a sum which may be of considerable importance to a man of moderate means may be deemed scarcely worth a second thought by a millionaire. Our readers will, we think, see the force of these suggestions without further illustration. We are not, of course, speaking from the point of view of abstract justice. It is unfortunately "not a theory but a condition" which confronts us in this matter. Mr. Lawder in one place alludes to the indifference that prevails in the United States in regard to the matter of trade with Canada. In another he endorses Dr. Grant's assertion that "no political party could exist for a day in Canada that was opposed to the extension of trade relations with the United States, as far as they can be extended without our coming under obligations that would endanger our fiscal independence or political life." "In Canada," he says, "the question of reciprocity is considered one of the most, if not the most, important public question of the day. In the United States very little interest is felt on the subject." Why the indifference on the one side and the anxiety on the other? What is the lesson to be learned?

"WHAT has been done in Canada to remove the indifference and, in some cases, the hostility, manifested in the United States on this question?" That is, indeed, the all-important enquiry. Mr. Lawder answers: "No specific statement of the propositions submitted by the Canadian Government to the Administration at Washington has been submitted to Parliament or to the press, nor have any of the documents containing the grounds on which these propositions have been urged been published." This is true, too true, and the Canadian public have surely just ground of complaint. Verily they are either a most patient people, or they must have an almost childlike trust in their political leaders. But when Mr. Lawder proceeds to argue that the American Government and people should be content with a free exchange of natural products, he not only reckons without his host and is wasting his logical resources, but is, it seems to us, scarcely looking fairly at both sides of the question. As a matter of fact, just as what the Canadians specially want is a market for their natural products, or those of them which are too bulky to be sent across the ocean, so what the Americans specially want is an enlarged market for their manufactures. We have a perfect right to consider whether it will pay us to make an agreement for the free admission of their surplus into our markets in return for the free admission of our surplus into their markets, but surely we have no reason to complain if they choose to decline the exchange which would exclude what they are most anxious to include. We may just add that we should not have cared to say so much were it not for the concluding paragraph of Mr. Lawder's pamphlet. In that paragraph he more than hints that in the event of the United States continuing the excessive duties now charged on various Canadian products, Canada should fall back on a policy of retaliation, and impose correspondingly high duties on American manufactures. This, it will be observed, would be not only retaliation but discrimination, and could have no other end than non-intercourse and commercial war, which, as Sir Charles Tupper has said, is but one remove from actual war. Trade is a selfish matter at the best, and there seems to be a quality in protectionism which intensifies the selfishness of the nation which commits itself to that system. We feel as strongly as anyone can that the commercial policy of the United States, especially in its relation to Canada, is of the narrow-

est and most selfish character. But how would it help the matter for Canada to punish her own people by adding enormously to their taxes and to the cost of living, and at the same time provoke a commercial war of which it would be impossible to foresee the end? In view of the powerful reaction that is now setting in in the United States, and the probability, if not moral certainty, that the return towards a revenue tariff is but a question of time, possibly of a short time, there is surely "a more excellent way." When the Canadian people allow themselves to be persuaded to enter upon a policy of tariff discrimination, by way of punishing the United States, the end will not be far distant.

MR. EDGAR'S letter in reply to the summons of the Caron Commissioners to lay before them the names of the witnesses he proposed to call to give evidence in support of the charges formulated against Sir Adolphe Caron, was just what everyone, we suppose, expected it to be. It was, in fact, just what he gave Parliament pretty clearly to understand it would be, at the time of the appointment of the Commission. The way in which the letter has been received by the party press on either side is also just what might have been foretold with unerring certainty. The Government journals denounce his refusal to appear before the Commission as prosecutor as a cowardly retreat. The Opposition applaud it as the only manly and self-respecting course. We must confess that, after giving the matter the most impartial consideration of which we are capable, we are forced to agree with the latter view. Had the Government contented itself with simply referring the charges to a commission instead of to a Parliamentary committee, without changing their form in any way, the accuser, however he might deprecate their action as an infringement upon Parliamentary right and dignity, could scarcely have refused to produce his evidence before the tribunal chosen by the Parliamentary majority. But when the Government took the remarkable if not unique course of eliminating one of the principal charges and changing and adding to others, we cannot see how any wise man could be expected to step into the snare thus spread before his eyes. To us the issue seems to be in a nut shell. The changes made in the form of the charges either do materially modify their meaning or they do not. If they do, the evasion is apparent. If they do not, there could have been no valid reason for making them. In other words, the natural inference seems to be that, had the accused Minister been impelled by the indignation of outraged innocence, or had his colleagues felt confident that no such charges could be sustained, both he and they would have refused to allow the change of a word. They would have insisted on retaining the *ipsissima verba* of the original accusations and compelling the prosecutor to prove them to the very letter, or stand convicted and branded before Parliament and the country as a slanderer. This may seem a harsh mode of reasoning. It is to be hoped that it is unjust to the Postmaster-General and his colleagues. But it is, we venture to say, the mode of reasoning which would be used by the public, were the case one involving no question of party. The further action of the Commission will be awaited with curiosity, if not with anxiety. It will, we assume, be bound to go on with the enquiry, especially since Mr. Edgar has supplied it with the names of a formidable batch of witnesses. Its appointment was not, we think, made in any way conditional on Mr. Edgar's appearance as prosecutor. If entered upon, the reputation and dignity of the judges will be so far involved that they cannot afford to permit it to degenerate into a broad farce. There seems to be no sufficient reason why the investigation should not be thorough and searching without the further aid of Mr. Edgar. The country should insist upon nothing less. The Government should permit nothing less. Sir Adolphe Caron, above all others, should see to it that nothing less is done, and that no room is left for his opponents to claim that the charges were not sifted to the very bottom. We shall see.

COMPOSING and press room limitations make it necessary that this note should be written before the counter demonstration which has been organized by way of offset to that held on Monday evening by the friends of Home-Rule in honour of Mr. Blake has taken place, much as we should prefer to have heard both sides before commenting. A good deal has been said, and something was hinted by Mr. Blake himself, with reference to the supposed bad taste of the *anti*-Home-Rule meeting. Had

the reception of Mr. Blake been of a purely personal character, organized and conducted by his political and personal friends and admirers, there would have been undoubted force in the objection. But as Mr. Blake took particular pains to have it distinctly understood that his reception was emphatically a demonstration in favour of Home-Rule, designed to have influence, as an expression of Canadian opinion, upon the Home-Rule cause in Great Britain, we are quite unable to see why those Canadians, be they few or many, who do not believe in Home-Rule for Ireland, have not a perfect right to do what they can by fair means to show the British public that Canadians are not all of one mind in regard to the question. Of course it is conceivable that the counter meeting might take a personal turn, which would be in decidedly bad taste, but we see no reason to fear that its promoters will suffer themselves to be outdone in dignity or courtesy. At the same time we are bound to say that we are unable to understand how any Canadian, approving, as every Canadian must, of the principle of self-government in local affairs as applied in the Dominion, can object to the granting of the very moderate measure of the same thing asked for unhappy Ireland. If, as Mr. Blake assures us, all that the Irish claim is "the local government of their local affairs," if, "they have agreed and the Bill provides that they shall have no power to deal locally with trade, commerce, or navigation; with customs or excise; with army, navy, or militia; with peace, war, or foreign relations"; if, moreover, they are to have no power to make any law touching religion, or infringing in any way upon liberty of conscience, and so forth, it is not easy to see that they are asking anything which every Canadian does not regard as a natural and political birthright, for which he would fight to the death.

THE appointment of Professor Loudon as successor to the late Sir Daniel Wilson in the Presidency of the University of Toronto will, we have no doubt, meet the approval of a larger number of those most deeply interested in the welfare and progress of the University, and especially of its *alumni*, than any other which could have been made. We see no reason to doubt, moreover, that the new President combines in his own character and attainments a larger measure of the special qualifications needed to enable him to promote the best interests of the University, under existing circumstances, than could have been found in any other available person. Many would have been glad, of course, had it been found possible to secure, in addition to all the other rare qualities demanded, such eminence in literary and philosophical circles as might have served to shed additional lustre upon the institution abroad as well as in the Province. But as it is pretty clear that this could have been done, if at all, only at the loss of more practical and essential qualifications, such as a thorough acquaintance with the genius and historical circumstances and needs of the Province, with the habits and modes of thought of its people and with its educational system; at the loss, too, it is not unlikely, of that administrative and executive ability of which Professor Loudon has shown himself possessed in large measure, during his long connection with the affairs of the University, the Government has no doubt done wisely in making choice of the man to whom opinion in educational circles seemed unmistakably to point. The fact that the new President has to a very large extent the confidence and sympathy of his colleagues is a strong argument in his favour and will contribute powerfully to his success. In so speaking we are not losing sight of the scholarly ability of which Professor Loudon has proved himself possessed during a long and successful career as student and teacher, or of the special distinction which he has won in his own chosen department, that of applied mathematics. If, owing to his modest and retiring disposition, he has not come so prominently before the public as many men of perhaps less ability, the fault is of a kind which a discerning public will very readily pardon. It is also one which does not lessen the probability that he may be found fully equal to any demands in the way of literary effort which may arise in connection with the duties of the more prominent and responsible position in which he is now placed. We should omit that which is in our estimation the most essential of all qualifications, if we failed to add an expression of our confident hope that the new President's experience in genuine teaching and his advanced views in regard to the true functions of a teaching university are such as will cause his appointment to mark a new era in the his-