

which would prove this in detail, it may serve a purpose to seek for some large general considerations governing the operation of Protection in Canada, the apprehension of which will enable us to understand what it is and what it is bringing us to. To know merely bare facts, without understanding their causes—whence they come and what further results they tend to—is not the most satisfactory kind of knowledge. Supposing it to be proved by figures that certain things are so, we still want to know the reasons why, under the circumstances, they must be so, and why they cannot possibly be otherwise. If with regard to the operation of this tariff of ours we can once get on the right line of sight, then much groping about in the dark will be saved, and the true meaning of what might otherwise appear a huge jumble of facts will be revealed.

It is an old saying that "two of a trade can never agree"; and the struggle between two or more of the same trade is what we call competition. Competition is always between those of the same trade, not between those of different trades. The nearer alike the products of any two countries are, the more direct is the competition between them. Now, we come to a vital point in this whole matter when we realise that Canadian manufactures are in a general way *like* those of the United States, and *unlike* those of England; for which reason our competition must be with the former far more than with the latter country. Whatever the political differences between ourselves and our republican neighbours may be, natural circumstances, and the industrial conditions arising out of them, are very much the same here as in the Northern States. In agricultural productions these Provinces and the States lying nearest to them are very much alike, and in manufacturing, both peoples tend to follow the same lines, and to run in the same grooves. In politics, and in many details of manners and morals, Canadians perpetuate old country resemblances, but we make cotton cloth as they do in the States, and not as they do in England, even though we use English machinery to do it. In style, quality, and general get up, the goods turned out by our cotton mills are exact copies of fabrics made at Lowell and Fall River, while differing greatly from the products of Lancashire. Enter a Canadian foundry or reaper and mower manufactory, and you see just the same methods used, and the same kinds of articles produced, as in similar establishments over the border; both methods and products being very different from those of England. Almost the only conspicuous exception is the woollen trade; there, indeed our competition is with England. With something like superstitious reverence we follow English precedents in the administration of laws which ourselves have made, but when it comes to driving shoe-pegs by machinery we copy Massachusetts. Our railways are all built and run on the American, and not on the English, plan. Our farm implements are all of American pattern, and are all made and used in the American way. Almost every new industry started in Canada is a close copy of something already in operation in the States. In the domain of politics and of morals we are largely under old country influences, but by pressure of material circumstances it is decreed that in our industrial progress we must move upon American, rather than upon European, lines. Canadian industries are and must long continue to be mostly *like* those of the United States, and *unlike* those of England. Further, this likeness in manufacturing production between the two sides of the border must keep increasing with every year of our industrial progress; which means that the competition between them must keep increasing too. We are more competitors with our neighbours now than we were twenty-five years ago; twenty-five years hence the similarity of production, and with it the competition, will be greater still. We must get a grasp of this important truth concerning the two countries, that the natural relation is that of competitors with each other in the same branches of production, some obvious exceptions allowed for. Raw cotton and tobacco we must bring from the Southern States, but the cotton manufacture is no more a natural industry of Massachusetts than it is of Ontario or Quebec. We may have to bring more or less Indian corn from Chicago, but carrying Minnesota wheat to Manitoba would be like carrying coals to Newcastle, the product of each being the same kind of wheat—hard spring. Montreal is not and never will be a natural market for boots and shoes made at Lynn and Haverhill, for the obvious reason that she is herself producing the same kind of goods, and in the very same way. It is the case of two of a trade; the one is no natural market at all for the products of the other. Observe, too, that this similarity of production, which is the basis of competition, has increased, is now increasing, and must continue to increase in future time. The only way to stop the growth of competition would be for Canada to call a dead halt, and stop improving her manufactures. Every new development of Canadian industry marks a new point of similarity, and therefore of contact and competition, between ourselves and our neighbours. Details might be cited at length to illustrate; but they are not needed by any one who

knows what manufactures are on both sides of the border respectively, and how rapidly we are following in the industrial tracks of our neighbours. The theme is a fertile one, a very practicable one for Canada besides, and will bear dilating upon to an indefinite extent. It will not soon be exhausted, either, because it is a *growing* theme, which must keep increasing every year in interest and importance.

JOHN MACLEAN.

MATTHEW ARNOLD ON EMERSON.

THE greatest good fortune that has recently befallen the United States is the visit of Matthew Arnold.

Justice Coleridge was received with great favour, and seems to have formed many happy associations connected with this country. Dr. Freeman, Mr. Herbert Spencer, and others of distinction have been very beneficial to us. But only Mr. Arnold, of eminent literary men, has come among us to tell us frankly what he thinks about certain phases of our character and certain ones of our authors. He is too honest a man, and has too high an opinion of his calling as a critic to flatter us. And such a critic as Mr. Arnold is, accomplished and subtle, is sure to find things to criticise that will be of infinite benefit to us, whether public sentiment agrees with him now in the main or not.

A few of our authors, especially in or about Boston—Longfellow, Emerson, Lowell, Holmes, Whittier, Bryant and Hawthorne—have gained a national reputation and acquired a degree of popularity, which furnishes the newspapers and publishers the pretext for bringing forward their names on all occasions. Not only do they publish a blue and gold edition, pocket edition, riverside edition, globe edition, and various other editions, but they make up a great variety of books, with extracts from these authors, and many more about these authors. In fine, I for my part, while sincerely glad that they have produced some excellent things, have long been weary of hearing the changes rung on these names. There is a great want of critical perspective among the American readers of these men. And nothing can be more wearisome than the constant allusions to them in the American, and especially in the New England, journals.

I knew Mr. Emerson personally, and know that he had no such exalted opinion of his own books, nor of those of his friends.

It will be productive then of the greatest good to American readers to have some of these men compared by an able critic with men of other countries and other times.

Americans speak of these men as if they were the only authors of eminence of recent times; as if there were no contemporary literature in England, France and Germany. This dilettanteism is entirely ignorant of all estimates that imply a comparison with other countries. For instance, the Boston literary correspondent of the *Springfield Republican*, the ablest newspaper in New England, severely criticizing Mr. Arnold's estimate of Mr. Emerson, claims that Emerson was a greater poet than Gray, and a greater philosopher than Spinoza. He confounds the technical and the popular use of the word philosopher. It is only in the latter meaning that Mr. Emerson can be called a philosopher at all, just as we speak of Dr. Johnson or Carlyle as a philosopher. In Germany, to call such men as Emerson by the name philosopher is regarded as extremely absurd, and as indicative of very crude notions of criticism.

Again, in a criticism in the *New York Times* a column and a half long, on the new edition of Emerson's works, the critic says: "Verily, in half a dozen somewhat harsh verselets of Emerson there is more flavour, more song, more meatiness than in all the verses of the living British poets put together."

* * * * *

So far from doing harm to Emerson's greatness, the criticisms of Mr. Arnold are likely to set men thinking that they may have been neglecting a writer the like of whom no nation can at the present day show."

When our leading journals form such exaggerated estimates, the hopeless condition of criticism among general readers can be imagined.

Now when a critic of Mr. Arnold's ability comes among us and frankly and honestly states his far lower estimate and gives his reason for it, it is well calculated to set us thinking and comparing. There is nothing we need more at present than frank criticism, combined with learning and insight, applied not only to our literature but to politics and many other departments.

Mr. Arnold appeared before a large audience in Assembly Hall, New York, on the evening of January 4th. He is a tall man, rather slender, sixty-one years old, but looking younger. He is not handsome, and is awkward in gesture and movement. His voice is not good or, to speak more accurately, he has poor control of it. When he speaks, his lips protrude as