

poor men were to be overpaid for their services by the Government salaries, which will hardly be contended, or the Party Committee took advantage of their necessities and extorted from them wrongfully and basely a portion of their honest earnings. And even if they were thought to be overpaid and so able to afford to pay bribes, that fact could confer upon the men of the committee no moral or legal right to levy toll upon them, and thus become sharers in their unjust gains. But that the thing is wholly indefensible goes without saying. The low state of political morality it discloses is a serious reflection not only upon the morals of the community in which it took place, but upon the leaders of the political party or parties, who have failed during their long years in office to educate their followers throughout the country to loftier views of the duties and obligations of citizenship. Nor is it unfairly prejudging the question to say that, with the evidence before us, it is extremely difficult to doubt that the sitting member, on whose nomination the appointments were made, was cognizant to a greater or less extent of the disgraceful transactions. Thus we have another object-lesson on the pernicious influence of the party-patronage system.

SELDOM has there been given, even in Canadian politics, a more striking exhibition of the pernicious influence of the party spirit in introducing exaggeration and distortion into the consideration of the most serious questions of statesmanship than that which was seen during the debate on Sir Richard Cartwright's resolution last week in the House of Commons at Ottawa. The question was one of the most momentous that could engage the attention of Canadian legislators. The disappointing figures given by the census returns of the population of the various Provinces of the Dominion were before the House and the country. The fact is indisputable, if the census returns can be at all relied on, that during the last decade a very large number of Canadians and of immigrants, who during that period came into Canada, have disappeared. Sir Richard Cartwright's reckoning, in which he assumes a natural rate of increase of 2½ per cent. per annum for the population of 1881, and for the immigrants added to that population during the decade, places the total number of missing at over one and a-half millions. One million would, apparently, be a safe and moderate estimate. At any rate the number is very large and the fact is established that not only has Canada failed to profit by the immigration which has been promoted at considerable expense, but that her population has been augmented by much less than one-half the number which should have been added to it by natural increase alone. Of course there is but one explanation, and that a very simple one. The great bulk of the missing, whether old residents or immigrants, have gone to the United States. That can no longer be doubted. The questions, then, for our statesmen to consider are: What are the causes of this movement out of the country, and whether to what extent and by what means are those causes preventable or removable? To these questions Sir Richard Cartwright and his supporters on the Opposition benches give very simple and concise answers—answers, that is to say, which, however elaborated for oratorical purposes, may be expressed in very simple and concise terms. The cause of the loss of population is the so-called National Policy of the Conservative Government, with its inseparable accompaniments, extravagance and corruption. The remedy is, of course, a speedy change of Government. Let the people, through their representatives, drive the present administration from power and put the Opposition leaders on the Treasury benches, charged with full powers to negotiate for unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, and to introduce a *regime* of economical and honest administration. On the Government side it is contended, on the other hand, that the failure to realize what were supposed to be the reasonable hopes and expectations of the people has come, not because of, but in spite of, the protective tariff; that that tariff has, in fact, been very effective in preventing the existence of a much worse state of affairs as the result of various causes, the chief of which is the pessimism of the Liberal leaders and their persistent campaign of obstruction and detraction.

WHAT will most strike the dispassionate reader of this important debate is the extravagance and one-sidedness of the harangues delivered on both sides of the House. Whatever may be the truth as to the relative merits of the policies of a tariff for protection and a

tariff for revenue, respectively, for a country in the position in which our young Dominion at present stands, it is surely beyond reasonable belief that the former policy has been the sole or even the chief agent in driving out of the country a million of people who would have been kept in it had the latter policy been continued. That the tendency of artificially stimulating manufactures by protection may be to enlarge the populations of the cities at the expense of the rural districts is very reasonable to suppose, but that this alone can account for the movement city-wards in Canada, while similar movements are taking place in almost every civilized country, free-trade England included, is incredible. It must be obvious to every close observer that the chief factor in the production of this movement is the economical motive which is leading to the concentration of capital and the minute sub-division of labour in every country, and rendering both manufacturing and agricultural operations on a small scale unremunerative. The unfairness, too, of placing the large expenditures made during the last ten years upon the Canadian Pacific Railroad and other public works of permanent value, over against the results apparent within a very few years, must be manifest to every one who takes the trouble to think about such matters. On the other hand, what can be feebler than the argument so much dwelt upon by the Government orators and newspapers, and even by the Finance Minister, to the effect that the pessimistic speeches of Opposition leaders, and articles in Opposition papers, have been the means of driving a million of settlers out of Canada in ten years? Such speeches, if really depreciative of the country instead of, as is usually, we suppose, the fact, the Government and its policy, might conceivably be the means of preventing some of those who contemplate emigrating from foreign countries from choosing Canada as their future home. But to suppose that any considerable number of persons already in the country and reasonably comfortable or prosperous would be induced to abandon it and try their fortunes elsewhere by the speeches and writings of political partisans anxious to make a point against the Government of the day, is to pay a very poor compliment to the popular intelligence. Such an argument is so suggestive of the want of a better that it is really questionable whether it does not really weaken rather than improve the position of those using it. It is further worth while for the defenders of the Government and its policy to consider whether the contention of some of them that the National Policy has been really effective in providing employment for large numbers of those who would otherwise have failed to find it, and that, therefore, the country is much better off in respect to population than it would have been but for that policy, does not really imply a more damaging admission and a worse disparagement of our climate and resources than any contained in the most fervid speeches of the Opposition.

THE one fact incontestably proved by the census returns is that the National Policy has signally failed to secure that growth of population throughout the Dominion which the unquestionably rich resources and capabilities of the country seem to give its people a warrant to expect. It by no means follows that any other policy within the reach of the Government under existing circumstances would have shown very much better results. It is quite clear that the possession of ample room, vast undeveloped resources and an energetic population, are not the sole requirements for rapid growth to national greatness. Other considerations must be taken into the account. The flow of population is determined mainly by industrial conditions, especially by the demand for labour and the comparative rates of remuneration. The real reason for the exodus of so many of our people is, as every reader knows by observation, either lack of employment, or lower rates of remuneration than can be obtained on the other side of the boundary. Multitudes of our young men love Canada and leave it with great reluctance, only after seeking in vain for occupation in their respective lines of industry. Others are drawn away by the higher wages or salaries which they can secure "on the other side." In these respects Canada is placed in unequal competition with her neighbour, so vastly her superior in population and wealth. In two of the indispensable conditions of national development, viz., capital and population, this neighbour has an immense advantage. Canada suffers in the competition for want of capital to develop her resources, and population to supply a market for the products. Of course, the ability to procure the capital depends upon the presence of the consuming population, or the accessibility of an

adequate market. Had Canada the advantage of reasonably free access to the vast market created by the sixty millions of people on her borders, in addition to those now within her reach by sea, the capital she so much needs would flow in in abundance. A moment's consideration of the difference in the conditions in respect to a market, between a nation of five millions and one of sixty-five millions, will suffice to show the fallacy of Mr. Foster's retort that Sir Richard proposes to escape from the injurious effects of a high tariff by entering into a partnership which would involve the imposition of a higher tariff. What may be narrow and damaging restriction in the case of the smaller nation is almost equivalent to continental free trade in the case of the larger. Hence, too, it is easy to see that the fatal fallacy which underlies Sir Richard's contention is the assumption that the change of Government he desires would be followed by the reciprocity which would supply the one thing now lacking to ensure that rapid growth which the National Policy, whatever its good or evil effects in other respects, has conspicuously failed to bring. If the Opposition could but convince the country that by placing them in power the boon of free admission to the United States markets could be secured on terms consistent with Canada's self-respect, and her duty to the Mother Country, they would not long want opportunity to carry out their policy. As a matter of fact, to secure such reciprocity is now the avowed policy of the party in power. The Opposition may be right in their contention that it is unattainable on the conditions proposed by the Government. Then when the Government has tried and failed will come their opportunity. For our part, we wonder that the Finance Minister, if he and his colleagues are really in earnest in the negotiations which they are pledged to attempt in Washington next month, and if they clearly realize that very much depends upon the result of those negotiations, had not made a different reply to Sir Richard Cartwright. "If the Opposition," he might have said, "are sincere in attaching so much importance to reciprocity with our neighbours, and if they prefer the interests of their country to those of their party, why do they not, instead of striving to thwart the Government at every step, support it with all the weight of their sympathy and influence in the coming negotiations, seeing that the success of those negotiations must, in their view, be of immense advantage to the country, and need not stand in the way of further advances in the same direction, while their failure will give their political opponents a much better leverage for the overthrow of the unsuccessful Government."

THERE can no longer be any doubt that the scarcity of bread, owing to the wide-spread failure of crops, which has already brought some parts of the interior of Russia face to face with the grim spectre of famine, threatens to be serious in other parts of Europe, and even in Great Britain. In such countries as Germany and England, with ample resources at command, the results can scarcely be worse than a certain increase of hardship and privation among the people of the poorer districts, and a large increase in the cost of bread for all classes. The possible, not to say probable, results in Russia in the shape of starvation and perhaps riot are fearful to contemplate. There is, too, reason to believe that the horrors of the crisis will be greatly increased by the racial fanaticism and madness which are driving out the Jewish money-lenders and middlemen, whose capital, by whatever unworthy means it may have been accumulated and however selfishly it may have been employed, has hitherto been of great service, in the absence of a better arrangement, in the work of gathering and distributing the crops, whether good or bad. It is painful, in view of the threatening evil, to read of large quantities of grain unharvested and perishing in those districts in which the harvest has not totally failed. What effect the coming destitution may have upon the general European situation—whether the Czar will be compelled through sheer poverty to keep the peace for a year or two longer, or whether he may be tempted to try desperate measures to distract the attention of the people from internal miseries, it seems impossible to predict. By whatever spirit moved, it cannot be denied that the recent action of the Sultan of Turkey in permitting the passage of Russian transports through the Dardanelles, in violation of treaty, is fraught with menace to the peace of Europe, especially of Great Britain. There can be little doubt that Lord Salisbury is vigorously protesting, but whether, in the absence of the sympathy and coöperation of other Powers, which, it must