

The CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS is published by THE BURLAND-DESBARATS LITHOGRAPHIC AND PUBLISHING COMPANY on the following conditions:—\$4.00 per annum in advance, \$4.50 if not paid strictly in advance, \$3.00 for clergymen, school-teachers and postmasters in advance.

All remittances and business communications to be addressed to G. B. BURLAND, General Manager.

All literary correspondence, contributions, &c., to be addressed to the Editor.

When an answer is required stamps for return postage must be enclosed.

City subscribers are requested to report at once to this office, either personally or by postal card, any irregularity in the delivery of their papers.

NOTICE.

The Burland-Desbarats Lithographic Company have removed to the magnificent six story building erected for them by G. B. Burland, Esq., at Nos. 3, 5, 7, 9 Bleury, near the corner of Craig, where they will carry on all their different branches of business and publish the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS, L'OPINION PUBLIQUE and the MECHANIC'S MAGAZINE.

CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS.

Montreal Saturday, 25th March, 1876.

THE SESSION.

The question of protection to manufactures, as we have already shown, was settled by the decisive vote on Mr. THOMAS WORKMAN'S amendment. There has since been another vote on Sir JOHN MACDONALD'S motion to affirm the principle of uniting the protection of agricultural products to the protection of manufactures; and this combination, by a skilfully worded resolution, obtained a vote in its favour in the House of Commons of 70; there being against it 116; majority against the motion 46. Both sides of the House cheered when this vote was taken; the Opposition from its being the strongest vote they had had since this Parliament commenced; and the Ministerialists from their having obtained so decisive a victory on a vexed question. The Province of Quebec gave a majority for the amendment; but the Maritime Provinces voted nearly *en masse* against it. Twelve members paired; six on either side. Sir JOHN MACDONALD paired with Mr. HOLTON.

This is the last of the struggles on the protection question this session, and perhaps for this Parliament. It was in fact dead with the division we recorded last week. The effect of this one is only to drive the nails more firmly in its coffin. But the question is: what will be the resurrection when the next elections come? Will the arguments used now have any quickening effect then? It is really for this that the struggle which has occupied Parliament for the last three weeks has taken place.

The other proceedings during the week have been of inferior interest. A considerable number of minor motions have been advanced a stage, the details of which would occupy more space than we can afford. Mr. DAUGER'S introduction by Mr. LANGEVIN, having been elected by acclamation for the county of the Lake of Two Mountains, made a little flurry, in consequence of the proceedings against him in the Court at Montreal. But it is said they are susceptible of explanation in his favour.

The committees have been active. That in favour of the Winter Navigation of the St. Lawrence, below Quebec, has taken a great deal of valuable evidence. This Winter Navigation seems feasible, now that it is only a question of moderate expense. The Public Accounts Committee has not so far elicited any facts of importance beyond those relating to the expenditure in the London Office. The Depreciation Committee has taken a mass of valuable evidence on the Sugar Duties. But as there is contradiction, it is not likely that any change will be made this session.

Many of the members are hoping to get through by Easter. But that will be impossible at the present rate of progress.

FALSE POSITIONS.

The recent debates in the House of Commons on the Tariff were not of a high order. No new information was given on the questions of Free Trade and Protection. No thorough appreciation of the relation which these questions have with the peculiar circumstances of a young country such as ours was manifested. Rather was discussion marked by a great deal of commonplace, relieved by personalities and loud declarations of party allegiance. We have no desire to enter upon an examination of the arguments adduced, but it may not be amiss to take note of one or two curious maxims upon which honourable members thought fit to build their votes.

The first of these was that if the Tariff were raised from 17½ to 20 per cent. "it would be throwing the first sop to the Cerberus of Protection." Why use the offensive expression? Why insult those who hold the theoretic view that Protection would benefit the country? Why confound use with abuse? We are not aware that there are half a dozen extreme Protectionists in the House, and it is unwise, to say the least, to confound in one phrase of reprobation, those who demand an absurdity with those who claim a feeble measure of remedy for our nascent and struggling industries.

Another platitude thrown out on the floor of the House was that the present cry for relief arose from the prevailing depression in the country and would cease when the stringency was over. In other words, the demand was the result of a panic. The gentleman who uttered this sentiment is evidently from the interior of the country and knows nothing of the working of manufactures in our large cities. Our manufactures languish or perish not so much an account of the prevailing distress, as on account of American competition. After the crisis is over, they would revive if American competition would cease. But American competition will not cease. The Tariff of 17½ per cent. has been no barrier in the past and will be no barrier in the future. All the American papers have had specials from Ottawa informing them that no change will take place, and American manufacturers, besides producing for their own countrymen, will now produce directly also for us. This giant competition our manufactures cannot withstand, and the learned gentleman will find out that next year, even if better times come—which is to be hoped—such of our manufactures as still survive will utter the same cry that they make this year.

A third catch-phrase was repeated in the debate that Protection makes the rich richer and the poor poorer—a sophism which old Horace Greeley exploded over and over again. It proves nothing because it proves too much. It applies, if at all, to out-and-out Protection, to a Chinese policy such as the Americans adopted after the war, but which, we repeat, has no relevancy here.

There is no use discussing the question on its merits, because the vote has been taken and the matter settled for the next twelvemonth. But the standing assumed by the majority of the House, to which we must loyally bow, is one that should be made thoroughly clear to the public, so that there may be no possible future mistake about it. Not only has Parliament decided that the country needs no Protection, but even the responsible admission has been several times repeated that not even incidental Protection should be accorded. The only tariff allowable is for purely revenue purposes. Those who hold opposite opinions need not be distressed at this. It may perhaps be best, from every point of view, that the business of the country during the next year should act as umpire in the premises. Possibly the best lesson of political economy may be derived from facts instead of theories, and our Parliamentary representatives, if they keep their eyes open, may yet learn more from what they will see than from what they have heard.

THE EMPRESS OF INDIA.

About three weeks ago, Mr. DISRAELI introduced a bill in Parliament to enable Her Majesty to make an addition to the Royal style and titles appertaining to the Imperial Crown of the United Kingdom and its dependencies, and its principal clause was that it shall be lawful for Her Most Gracious Majesty, with a view to the recognition of the transfer of the Government of India, by her Royal Proclamation, under the great seal of the United Kingdom, to make such addition to her present titles as she may deem meet. The introduction of this measure gave rise to a most spirited debate in which the principal members of Parliament took a share. The discussion rolled mainly on two points—first, whether the additional title including India was more necessary at present than it has been in the past five and twenty years. The answer was that at least four-fifths of the Queen's subjects reside in India, and that if she is a sovereign at all, she must be the sovereign of the country where four-fifths of her subjects reside. It was further declared that at the time when the Crown assumed the direct government of India, out of the hands of the East India Company, the discussion arose whether an addition should not be made to the Royal title. But as the transfer took place immediately after the Mutiny, the Government of the day judged it inexpedient to connect the Royal title with that bloody event. The late visit of the Prince of Wales has, however, given another and more cheerful aspect to the relations of India with the Crown, and it is only fair to calculate that the result of that voyage will be a firmer hold of Britain over her Eastern possessions. Certainly a separate Royal title applied to India would naturally include the idea of a more vigorous government in that country, and that it should do so is desirable were it only as a warning to Russia which has pushed its way through Khokand, and halted its battalions within only 225 miles of the British frontier. Another objection to the assumption of the new title was made by Mr. LOWE. He urged that England might some day lose India and that, in such an event, the sovereign would have either to submit to the humiliation of "docking his title or retain an illusory title like the old misnomer of King of France." To this unfortunate and un-English argument—so characteristic of Mr. Lowe—the proud reply was made that the best way to keep India is to proclaim to the world, by a separate Royal title, that Britain means to associate all her resources with its retention.

In regard to the title itself there was much curious philological and curious disputation—special objection being made to the term Empress. This strikes us as singular seeing that the whole possessions of England are popularly known as the British Empire, and that we are constantly using the words Imperial Parliament, Imperial proclamation, and so on. However, the final choice was left to the Queen who chose the title of Empress of India. We should have expected that the selection would pass unchallenged. But such was not the case. A few days ago, the Marquis of HARRINGTON moved an amendment "that while willing to consider a measure enabling the Queen to make an addition to her titles, the House considers it inexpedient to impair the dignity of the Crown by the assumption of the title of Empress." The Marquis of HARRINGTON supported his motion in a speech conciliatory in tone. He said he offered the amendment with reluctance; he admitted that it was impossible for the Government to have foreseen the opposition which the measure had provided; he challenged the Government to show any good reason why the title of "Empress" was preferable to that of "Queen" and he repeated the argument that the Bill was a slight to the other Colonies. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Stafford NORTHCOLE, defended the title of "Empress" as accurately representing the relations of the Queen to India. The de-

bate lasted seven hours, and was excited and acrimonious. Finally the amendment was rejected, and the motion for going into Committee was adopted by a vote of 305 yeas to 200 nays.

NEWSPAPERS OF THE DOMINION.

A return has just been brought down showing the total number of newspapers and other periodicals in each county and city of the Dominion which have paid postage on papers sent from the office of publication, with the revenue received therefrom during the three months ending 31st December last. The numbers were as follows:—

	No.	Revenue.
Ontario and Quebec.....	346	\$7,073 32
Nova Scotia.....	30	437 45
New Brunswick.....	28	388 20
Prince Edward Island....	8	116 03
British Columbia.....	3	23 01
Manitoba.....	2	16 81

Total..... 441 Total..... \$8,059 92

The return for the two chief cities of the Dominion is as follows:—Montreal 31, revenue \$1,967.00; Toronto 35, revenue \$2,280.91.

We submit that this is a very fair exhibit. It is altogether too much the fashion, even among ourselves, to depreciate the value of our newspapers and periodicals. If quantity is a test—and it is a decided test—we are not at all behind the Americans. For a population of about 40,000,000, they have somewhat over 4,000 journals. For a population of about 4,000,000, we have over 400 journals. The proportion according to population is singularly close, and affords about as good a test of comparison, as we know of, between the standing of the two peoples. With regard to quality, there is not the same parity, owing to a difference of training between the Americans and ourselves. It is remarkable that, where in many social and commercial respects, we are somewhat unconscious imitators of our cousins beyond the border, in our educational processes and general intellectual tastes, we still adhere to the English model. And may the day be far off when we shall deviate from that standard. In the matter of enterprise our newspapers are not behind their American colleagues, but our idea of enterprise is fortunately very different from theirs. The personalities of the latter are an outrageous abuse from which we are free, and which the bad example of a few of our newspapers has not succeeded in making general. But there is a quality of American journalism which it were perhaps well to introduce more generally into our own. We refer to the condensation of news and paragraphs of general interest. This requires intelligence and labor, and is the sole work of one man who is known as the exchange editor or reader. It is extraordinary how this process, if well conducted, adds to the interest and value of a paper, crowding it with minute and almost encyclopaedic information. As a corollary of this system of condensation, the American papers dispense in great measure with lengthy stenographic reports. The Chicago *Tribune*, for instance, keeps only one short-hand writer on its large staff. The English system is very different in this respect, but the English journals are generally double sheets and addressed to people who take time to read, whereas in this country we read as we run, and hurry through our papers as we do through our meals.

There is another feature about journalistic and periodical literature which the public should be reminded of and for which they ought to be thankful. It is very cheap, much cheaper than the American. As a rule, our neighbors pay about one third more than we do for their papers, while certainly they do not get one third more value. Some wise legislation has also been enacted towards decreasing the expense of papers passing through the mails. More might be done in this regard, but that will come with time. As things now stand, notwithstanding the diminution of postage, it will be found from the return printed above that the Government