

vation must be done by farmers or farm labourers after all, and what matter whether these are in the employ of the farmers or of the companies? The employment is given in either case." Very true, but then it is only in virtue of the enormous bounties that the manufacturers are able to do this, which means, in the last analysis that the regular farmers and other tax-payers pay for the whistle. One or two facts will suffice to show who reaps the profits: "Large profits are made by many of the factories. In 1884 some details were published as to the dividends paid by five of the large establishments, which were said to be as follows: 36, 38, 38, 43, and 50 per cent." Other extracts of a similar kind are given, showing that under this as under other tax-fostered industries, the profits go into the pockets of the few, the bills are footed by the many. Lack of space prevents us from going more fully into the statistics with which Prof. Saunders' report abounds. Nor can we give, as we had intended, the main points of his interesting and valuable summary. The practical question for Canada, which is the main point just now, is, or ought to be, sufficiently answered by the closing paragraph of the summary, which is as follows:—

It is probable that the strongest objection to the encouragement of this industry, on the only basis on which it is claimed it could be established, will be found in the fact that it would require, when fully developed, an annual subsidy of about \$4,000,000, for the raising of which, as long as we have free sugar, other industries must be taxed. This subsidy might in the course of time be lessened, but in view of all the facts presented, of the greater richness of the sugar cane when grown in the tropics, and the probabilities of further improvements in the quality of the cane and in the process of manufacture, it is not likely that the bounty could ever be much reduced without crippling the industry.

If there are stronger objections it was scarcely necessary to mention them. This will surely suffice.

SIR CHARLES TUPPER, our High Commissioner in London, has by a single sentence thrown all Canada, save perhaps the few who may be in the secret, into a mild fever of curiosity. His intimation in a recent speech that Canada would shortly strike the United States a vital blow by way of retaliation is, for the present, a sphinx's riddle. What can it mean? Does he speak by authority of the Dominion Government? That must be assumed. Otherwise he is only making both the Government and the country ridiculous, and must incur the censure of his Ottawa masters. But in what way can Canada strike a vital blow at the great Republic? We might, indeed, let our curiosity carry us still further and ask, what is a vital blow; but that would be mere quibbling over a word the meaning of which is obvious from the connection, and which, moreover, may not be the word that was used by Sir Charles. Seriously, we are unable to guess more than two things which the threat could have been meant to foreshadow. The one is, tariff discrimination against the United States and in favour either of Great Britain alone or of the whole world, the wicked Republic only excepted; the other, free trade with the world, the United States included. It can hardly be that the latter is about to be sprung upon us, though, as we have recently pointed out, to throw open our doors for the trade of all nations would be the most effective retaliation possible against the unfriendly commercial policy of our next door neighbours. It would compel them to call out the Grand Army of pensioned veterans to guard their three thousand miles of frontier against the destructive inflow of cheap goods. But then what would the Canadian manufacturers say? And what would the Canadian Government do for money to pay the interest on the public debt and little bills that mature from time to time? No, Sir Charles can hardly mean that. The more probable alternative, so far as we are able to conjecture, is the milder stroke of a differential tariff, discriminating in favour of the Mother Country. This, we are bound to say, would be a better, more unequivocal proof of loyalty than much waving of the old flag from the ramparts of a frowning tariff wall. But what, again, of the protected home manufactures? And what of the retaliation which such discrimination would most surely provoke? Not that we have not a perfect right to favour the Mother Land to which we look for protection, but that we should have to take the consequences, if our self-seeking neighbour should be unable to see it in that light, or should insist on her perfect right to regulate her own commercial affairs to suit her own prejudices. But we may as well frankly confess our inability to make even a half-probable guess as to the hidden meaning of Sir Charles' riddle. May it not be that Sir Charles has been misre-

ported and that he said nothing of the kind attributed to him by cable? We would fain hope so for the sake of his own reputation and the dignity of the country. But in that case, why has not the mischievous report been promptly repudiated?

THE strike of the English coal miners, in consequence of which nearly half a million of men in that and related industries are thrown out of employment, is one of the most remarkable on record, by reason not only of its magnitude, but of the fact that, whether by concert or not, it is quite as much in the interest of the coal owners as of the operatives. The great rise in the price of coal which must inevitably follow, which has indeed already followed, will evidently more surely and more largely benefit the capital than the labour involved. The possibility, not to say probability that, for the first time perhaps in the history of labour struggles, there may be an understanding between masters and man, suggests what may some day prove to be a new kind of combination more powerful and harder to counteract than any that has hitherto been known. Whatever may be the fact in the present instance, one has but to conceive of a mutual agreement under which, in view of a promised increase in wages, the employees in any great industry which is more or less of the nature of a natural monopoly, may enter upon a "strike," to see the possibility of the price being raised and maintained at almost any figure on which the two parties might fix. Such an event would, however, do more in a week than any amount of abstract argument could accomplish in a decade to bring about the absorption of all such natural resources as partake largely of the nature of monopolies, by the State.

REORGANIZATION OF THE CABINET.

SEVENTH ARTICLE.

THE late Sir John Macdonald, like so many successful leaders military and political, used to plume himself on his luck; his good fortune as well as his great place seems to have been inherited by Mr. Abbott. Horace Walpole, speaking of Chatham's most successful year, tells us it showered snuff boxes and that every mail brought a victory. A bye-election has only to take place to be won by the Government candidate; in Quebec the Rouge party has been annihilated; all is elation in the Conservative ranks; depression reigns supreme among the Liberals. Not since 1874 has any party been so crushed as the Reform party to-day.

Last year in these pages we discussed the subject of the Reorganization of the Cabinet. We pointed out special difficulties which beset Mr. Abbott; the difficulties arising from factions which all Premiers have to encounter; the degrading effect on the country of raising unworthy and incapable men to the Ministry; the widespread craving for reorganization; the necessity of a strong Government, strong not only in the votes behind it, but in talent; of efficient administration; of filling public offices and retaining men in power on business principles. We referred to instances in English history where Cabinets weak in *personnel*, even though supported at first by large and increasing votes, melted away

Like a mockery king of snow,

as, for example, Addington's Cabinet in 1801, upheld on going to the country in 1802 by an overwhelming majority, but which soon disappeared before the widespread perception of the ineptitude and imbecility of certain of its members.

In the third article we discussed the possibility of Mr. Abbott fighting the bye-elections without reorganizing the Ministry, and, deeming such a policy would be disastrous, urged a contrary course.

In common with the public generally we believed a bold reorganization was imminent, and that it would certainly take place before the bye-elections. The bye-elections have come; Parliament has met; there has been no reorganization; and for the Government the contests thus far have been crowned with phenomenal success.

It is easy to divine what held Mr. Abbott's hand. There will always and in every country where Parliamentary Government exists be wire-pulling to influence a leader who contemplates the reconstruction of his Cabinet. That he is responsible and should be able to act with a judgment untrammelled is a proposition, however willingly accepted in the abstract, the average politician will not readily act on. To fill the two vacancies and to fill them acceptably and meet the electors with the old Ministry, thus reinforced, might well have seemed safer than to create jealousies and heart burnings. It would be hard to say which were the bolder course; that which has been taken, or to have gone forward at once with the work of pulling down and rebuilding. What really occurred no doubt was this. Mr. Abbott set honestly about the work; but at every move, serious difficulties presenting themselves, time wore on.

Every day indeed showed that an issue was being forced on the people which threw the question of reconstruction

into the shade, namely, whether men could tolerate anything that tolerated Mercier and show the least approval of the most flagrant pillage by public men which ever disgraced a country. Unable to separate himself from the unhappy Count, Mr. Laurier experienced the fate of the victims of Mezentius. Would voters cast their ballots in favour of giving the Dominion up to the plunderers of Quebec? Sir Richard Cartwright's extraordinary genius for inspiring repellant must be accorded due weight. But this is a trifle compared with his Unrestricted Reciprocity. That, read in the light of Mr. Blake's letter, and the letters of Mr. Mowat, of Wiman's actions and utterances, Boston banquets, antagonism to immigration and to North-West development, and a pessimism which, looking at the prosperity on all hands, is as ludicrous as it is lugubrious, had a powerful influence on the new voters—on young Canada—which has no faith in annexation, but, full of hope and energy, enthusiasm and power, believes in Canada, and Canada's future. Something must be allowed for the power of organization of Mr. Birmingham, which seems to have been of a high order, and full importance must be attached to the just confidence inspired by Mr. Abbott and Sir John Thompson, a confidence which has grown deeper and stronger every month; but yet the great note which rises from the bye-elections, clear, strong, jubilant, not to be mistaken, is a protest against the policy of the leaders of the Reform party which did not merely squint but looked full-faced across the line.

Mr. Abbott has now an overwhelming majority. His party is compact; has clear views and aims; is by tradition and training and conviction of his fairness and strength, thoroughly loyal. The Opposition hardly exists. The Opposition as organized up to a few months ago, around a principle with which the people will have nothing to do, and under leaders greatly discredited, the one by an untoward association, the other by extraordinary defects which time has developed and emphasized—the bottom is out of that. Mr. Abbott is in a position of the greatest freedom ever enjoyed by a First Minister. A First Minister advanced in years has an advantage which cannot belong to a young leader. When he is, like Mr. Abbott, entirely capable, he may dismiss from his mind all fear of rivalry—that fear which has so often led to acts which make the historian qualify his estimate of a great man. Mr. Abbott has this further unspeakable advantage. Having come recently to power he is unhampered by factitious personal claims. There has been no time for the growth and reproduction of barnacles on the Admiral's own ship.

He is indeed comparatively free from all the greatest difficulties in the way of governing men—difficulties most of which never meet the public eye. These, like so many of the unhappy conditions of private life, proceed from human selfishness. The telegraph brings us news of Cabinet Reconstruction in France, and this reminds us that nearly thirty years ago, when the then ruler of France was at the zenith of his power, Cabinet reconstruction was on the *tapis*—a reconstruction which was much needed, because more than ten years had elapsed since a band of singularly able adventurers had placed Louis Napoleon on the throne. A passing reference to this may not be out of place. In 1863 an undergraduate was in Paris, and being a connection by marriage of a man who occupied a position in one of the Departments, who was the Paris correspondent of a London newspaper, who had a wide knowledge of politics, whose house was the rendezvous of men, some of whom were then prominent, and all of whom have since become known in letters, or politics, or art, he had an opportunity of hearing much of what was going on. Gambetta was unknown, was poor, and was not yet accustomed to fulminate in that café, where, in 1868-9, the roar of the young lion attracted the attention of all Paris, and startled the Tuilleries, even though Napoleon was talking of "Crowning the Edifice," and Prevost Paradol began to believe in him, and Emile Olivier thought that the hour of his greatness had surely come. But to return to 1863. At that time Paris outshone every capital in Europe, and threw her most brilliant past into the shade. The Empress Eugénie had not yet lost her youthful loveliness. The habits of the Emperor had not, at least visibly, begun to tell on his constitution. Princes from every country in Europe crowded to Paris, and the most beautiful women of the time might be seen every day in the Boulevards and the Champs Elysées. The Emperor and Empress drove out, apparently unguarded; and they, at times, no doubt with a view to popularity, affected a modest equipage, a small, light phaeton, drawn by a pair of ponies with an Arab strain. He was at the height of his power. Men looked on him as an oracle. All Europe waited on his utterances. This was three years before Austria was crushed at Sadowa. He was undoubtedly at the time the most powerful potentate in Christendom. To the superficial onlooker all was well. But at the house of the civil servant referred to, politics were discussed in a Cassandra mood, and the youth not yet left college, who had brought from England the accepted estimate of Napoleon III. and the prevailing admiration for the man of mystery, was amazed to hear a catastrophe spoken of as possible.

Well, how did the drama of reconstruction go? A Prime Minister is a sort of king, and a despotic ruler has to be his own Prime Minister. There is a remarkable similarity between all courts as regards rivalries, social and political, and a leader in power will, even in a free country, have to be on his guard against what is equivalent to a