

son for her not doing so would be the loss of revenue which she so much needs. Is it not the fact rather that the protectionist nations take care to keep their tariffs for the most part below the prohibitory line, seeing that direct taxation must be the alternative. Again, it is not quite correct, we think, to regard the universal tendency among protectionist nations as being wholly in the direction of still higher tariffs. In the United States, at least, there are evidences of a powerful reaction in the opposite direction. But these are minor points. The admitted fact is that the outlook for British trade is bad. The British people live mainly by manufacturing. Whatever hampers the sale of their products in the world's markets inflicts a serious blow upon their chief industries. The causes which lead to the erection of the hostile barriers are beyond her control. The question for practical statesmanship is how best to surmount these barriers, to reduce to the minimum the injurious effects of the purblind selfishness of other nations. If it be admitted—and a glance at the statistics of her trade must put the fact beyond serious question—that the colonies are utterly unable, and must be for many years to come, to supply a market for more than, say, one-fourth of her products, what other resource is left to her but to continue, by the free admission of raw materials and other necessaries, to keep the cost of production at the lowest possible point, so as still to be able to compete in foreign markets in spite of hostile tariffs. This is, it seems to us, the situation in a nutshell. In all this we have, of course, regarded the question mainly from the British point of view, that being the issue presented. But what about the colonies? What would be the effect, for instance, upon Canadian manufacturers of the free or practically free admission of the products of British factories? Even the Mother Country would no doubt insist that there must be two sides to such a bargain.

ONE of the important questions which should come before Parliament at its approaching session is that of Canada's relations to the United States in the matter of books, as affected by the Copyright Act passed by Congress at its late session. That Act itself, though an important step in the direction of national honesty, is, nevertheless, intensely narrow and selfish in some of its provisions. Amongst these is to be specially noted the requirement that in order to take advantage of its provisions a foreign author must have his book printed and published in the United States. This condition, coupled with another which absolutely forbids the importation of more than two copies of a foreign book thus copyrighted, can scarcely fail to affect seriously the printing and publishing business in the United Kingdom. From this point of view the Act has been not inaptly termed a Bill for transferring the business of publication from Great Britain to the United States. If anything could justify the British Parliament in so far departing from its cherished free trade principles as to adopt a measure of retaliation, or, to put it more mildly, to copy in a single particular the legislation of a protectionist nation, this would certainly do so. That is, however, a matter for the consideration of the Mother Country herself. We are more particularly concerned with the bearing of the Act upon Canadian authors and publishers. In one important respect Canada is at a disadvantage by reason of her Colonial relation. Not only has she no law compelling an American author desiring a Canadian copyright to have his book printed and published in Canada, but she evidently could make no such law effective, seeing that the American author by copyrighting in Britain could secure protection in the Canadian market. On the other hand, Canada cannot give the United States author the protection against the importation of books printed elsewhere which the United States law gives to the British or Canadian author. Though the British Copyright Act prohibits the importation into the United Kingdom of reprints of works copyrighted there, it permits such importation into Canada. It is evident that Canada, unless she is to be ground between the upper and nether millstones, must insist on the British Government's sanctioning the Canadian Copyright Act of 1889 either in its present, or in an amended form. Canada must insist, in other words, on having control of her own Copyright legislation.

FOLLOWING the example of other guilds, the undertakers are seeking from the Ontario Assembly the legislation necessary to enable them to form themselves into a close corporation. Logically their claim is, so far as we can see, just as good as that of the architects, while that of the

architects, as we admitted a year ago, is in its turn just as good as that of the doctors and lawyers. If there is any difference in the force of the arguments for incorporation it is certainly only in degree and not in kind. But whereunto will this thing grow? Is it not about time that a professedly Liberal Government and Legislature should stop and ask seriously whether this whole system of professional close corporations, created and protected by special legislation, is not wrong in principle, and unjust in practice? In one respect, indeed, the powers asked by the architects and the undertakers are less objectionable than those already conferred on the medical and legal practitioners, inasmuch as the former claim monopolies of their respective names or titles only, while the latter insist on forbidding all who do not learn to pronounce their shibboleth, to practice their profession, even without the name. They are content with nothing less than the more complete and absolute monopoly. Such a monopoly the doctors, one would suppose, have already obtained, though it appears that some of them, at least, are not yet satisfied, and are demanding powers still more extensive and arbitrary. A recent communication in one of the Toronto papers complains that the monopoly secured to the members of the legal profession is less complete, they being subject to competition in such lines as conveyancing, drawing of wills, etc. Now, no one can deny that it is perfectly proper and commendable for members of any craft or profession to band themselves together for the purpose of elevating the standard of education and skill in their respective callings. It should not be very difficult, one would suppose, for the doctors or the lawyers, through the agency of such voluntary unions, to secure for their certificates such respect and to confer on their members such prestige as would amply safeguard both their own interests and those of the public. And the same thing is true in regard to architects, undertakers, plumbers, and in fact to workmen in any and every occupation requiring special training and skill. Under such circumstances every intelligent citizen would, for example, be pretty sure to employ, in case of necessity, the physician whose professional knowledge and skill were thus guaranteed, rather than the one who could give no such certificate of professional standing. But the case takes on a very different aspect when these unions are so hedged about by law that they can absolutely forbid every one, no matter how well qualified, who has not entered the ranks through their particular strait gate, to heal the sick or relieve the suffering, on pain of fine or imprisonment. Are not such cases as that in which a reputable physician of the sister province was recently fined \$100 for the crime of having prescribed for some sick or injured person on this side of the imaginary boundary line, a reproach to our legislation and a reflection on our intelligence? Were the members of any union of skilled workmen to ask that a law be passed making it a punishable offence for any one not a member of their union to work at their trade their petition would be scouted. We should be glad if any doctor or even lawyer would show us just where the distinction in principle is to be seen.

THE paper on "An Enlarged Waterway between the Great Lakes and the Atlantic Seaboard," which was read by Mr. E. L. Corthell, C.E., of Chicago, at a meeting of business men in Montreal a few weeks since, and which formed the basis of an interesting discussion before a meeting of some of Toronto's engineers and business men in Association Hall, a week or two ago, raises a question so large in dimensions, and so far-reaching in results, that we hesitate to express any opinion in regard to it, without fuller information. One of the speakers at the Toronto meeting said that the great question which should be answered is, if it is practicable and possible to build the proposed ship railway from Collingwood to Toronto and obtain a depth of twenty feet from Toronto to the seaboard, would the revenue which would be derived from the project be sufficient to pay the interest upon the investment? Mr. David Blain, who has taken an active part in promoting the scheme, and has studied it with some care, maintained unhesitatingly that the scheme was not only feasible, but that in less than two years the railway would pay a handsome dividend. Without venturing to question the correctness of this very sanguine view, we should be inclined to suggest that the first and great question to be determined is that of the feasibility of the railway itself. Mr. Corthell, we are told, maintains that under certain conditions a ship railway may be advantageously substituted for a canal; that it can be built of any capacity at less cost,

be more easily, more speedily and more cheaply operated, and be made to answer all purposes better than a canal, and with equal safety to shipping. With all respect to Mr. Corthell and to the ability of scientific engineering skill to reach reliable conclusions by the application of demonstrable general principles and known laws of mechanics, we yet submit that there is small probability of securing the investment of the immense amount of capital necessary for the construction of the Hurontario ship railway, or of any similar project, until the feasibility of such railways has been proved by actual experiment, on a smaller scale. If there is anywhere in the world a ship-railway in successful operation it would tell immensely in favour of this scheme to make the public acquainted with the fact. If, as we believe is the real state of the case, the experiment has never yet been successfully made, it is evident that the promoters of so large an undertaking will have to wait. Fortunately they will not now need to wait very long for a fair trial of the experiment in Canada. Should the ship railway, which is now being built in New Brunswick to connect Northumberland Strait with the head waters of the Bay of Fundy, prove successful in operation, a tremendous impetus will be given to the carrying out of similar projects on a larger scale, not only in Canada but the world over.

LORD SALISBURY'S speech at the dinner of the Associated Chambers of Commerce, a few weeks since, was not adapted to give much encouragement to those who may be hoping that the report of the Government's Labour Commission is intended to pave the way to radical legislation of any kind. Judging from the *Spectator's* summary of the Premier's speech his idea is rather that the Commission may collect and formulate a mass of information for the guidance of both parties in future labour disputes. "If the Commission," says Lord Salisbury, "can do anything to help all classes to see where a strike or a lockout has been mischievous, and why it has been mischievous, where a strike or a lock-out has been successful, and why it has been successful, it will greatly add to the evidence at the disposal of both parties for guiding their conduct in the future, and probably even lead the way to the growth of voluntary organizations intended to mediate between the parties." To those who still cling to the old-fashioned economic notion that free contract and free competition must continue to be ruling factors in the determination of the relations between labour and capital, Lord Salisbury's views will appear to be eminently sound as well as eminently safe. They will agree with him that any attempt at legislative interference with those relations, such as, for instance, by fixing the maximum length of a day's labour, or the minimum rate of wages in a given occupation, would be not only wrong but ruinous. To that other class of thinkers and agitators, who reject the old political economy and contend that it is this very freedom which, by pitting the weak against the strong, the uneducated or unintelligent against the clever, and so forth, is at the bottom of most of the misery and destitution that afflict and degrade the masses, the Premier's conclusion will seem but lame and impotent. These bold innovators will maintain that it is or should be one of the chief functions of the people's Government and Parliament to protect the serfs of necessity against the selfishness of the powerful, the tyranny of capital, and so forth. The issue of the future is evidently between radically antipodal views of the real functions of Government. The question of the true nature and sphere of the social organism, when wrought out to its ultimate results, is really the new problem which is forcing itself to the surface, a problem whose conditions statesmen of the class of Lord Salisbury have scarcely begun as yet to recognize. Into the merits of the argument as between the two economic theories we do not now propose to enter. That the weight of logic will not be wholly on the side of the old, orthodox party, when the real issue is joined, is however tolerably clear. Lord Salisbury, for example, lays stress on the word "adult" when repudiating the idea that the labourer needs to be or can be aided by legislation, thereby suggesting the fact that legislation has already been invoked, with almost universal approval, for the protection of children against the cupidity of employers and the cruelty of overseers. This in its turn suggests the enquiry whether in many cases the necessities of the adult labourer do not render him equally powerless and so give him an equal claim to the protection of the State, that is of his fellow-citizens of all classes in their organized capacity, in the unequal struggle. But the question of practical politics is whether Lord Salisbury has not by his out-