

from the tanners of Bermondsey the confession that they are no longer able to sell the material of a certain quantity against the Transatlantic product. Agricultural implements bearing the trade mark of a New York company are to be found exposed for sale in English hardware shops; and indents from the colonies entrusted to firms in London and Birmingham for execution, actually include American edge tools. The town last named was until recently regarded as the chief source for the supply of small arms to the world; and it was confidently anticipated that the present struggle in the East would have imparted a potent stimulus to gun manufacture in that locality. But for the first time in the history of modern warfare, that branch of industry in the Midland metropolis has failed to reap any advantage. The Winchester rifle in use by the Turk, is produced in Rhode Island."

These are certainly most remarkable statements. They set at rest two popular arguments against the principle of protection, viz: that the tendency of that system is to increase the cost of the article produced, and that it destroys all incentives to excellence in production. It is, in fact, the lesser cost, and the greater excellence in workmanship and finish, in American manufactures, that have produced these wonderful results. England had the markets of the world, and if the principle of free trade deserves the encomiums bestowed upon it by its votaries, should have been able to hold them against all comers. And yet protectionist America, is by English testimony, successfully competing with free trade England, and that in spite of all the prejudice which undeniably existed in former years against that country, as the land of wooden nutmegs, bass wood hams and Yankee notions generally. The most remarkable feature, however, of the state of things portrayed by the *Telegraph*, is the fact that the greatest success achieved by American manufacturers in foreign markets has been precisely in those lines in which, according to all so-called economic laws, success should have been impossible. The coal and iron mines of the United States have been developed by means of a system of protection. And yet from these spring the raw material for precisely those manufactures in which our neighbours have achieved their greatest success in foreign markets. The fact is pregnant with instruction for Canada, possessing as we do almost inexhaustible mineral resources.

There are reasons in favour of a policy of protection which are peculiar to this country, and to which brief reference may be made. Situated as we are in close proximity to a great and successful manufacturing people like those of the United States, with no questions of cost of transportation to enter as an element into the question, the competition must necessarily be most severe. The addition of four millions of consumers to the manufacturers of the United States, right at their doors, nearer to them in fact than many of their customers in their own country, is an object which must almost prompt them to the greatest efforts to destroy possible competition from among ourselves. For a while, enormous prices prevailed as one of the results of the war with its inflated currency, and its system of internal taxation, and the manufacturers of Canada prospered. That is passing away. The balance of trade has been steadily growing against Canada during recent years, until it amounted, as will be found when the Trade Returns are brought down, to about twenty-seven millions of dollars last year, an increase of about ten millions of dollars, as compared with the previous year. That one general fact shows how this country is going behind in its trade relations with the neighbouring Republic. Is it desirable that the labourers of this country should be compelled to seek employment in the United States, and that we should become the consumers of the product of their labour in United States factories? That is what is in fact going on to-day, and it is most seriously injuring not only the present prosperity, but the future prospects of the Dominion.

Our relation to the United States is such, however, that it is not only in the matter of manufactures, but in the foreign trade of the Dominion, that we are now suffering, and are likely to suffer still more in the future. Mr. Cartwright's policy in repealing the Act passed by Sir Francis Hincks, which opposed a ten per cent. differential duty on tea coming from the United States to that which they charged upon imports from Great Britain or Canada, transferred the greater part of the distributing tea trade from the merchants of Canada to those of Great Britain. The result of that was seriously to injure the grocery trade, and as all branches of trade are interdependent, to seriously injure the wholesale trade generally. It illustrates the argument which we think has received too little attention at the hands of the public men of Canada. It should not be a matter of indifference whether the distributing point for goods for the retailers of Canada is New York or Montreal. If the former secures this boon, as under existing circumstances there is too much reason to fear it may, the result is the building up of American foreign trade, and the increase of the advantage which New York already possesses as the great shipping point for the produce of the west. If, by the adoption of a policy which will encourage trade by the St. Lawrence, we make Montreal the distributing point for imported goods, the foreign trade of the Dominion, with all that a prosperous foreign trade implies, will be ours. We are expending large sums of money in the improvement of the facilities for transport on our inland waters. Our object in this expenditure is to encourage the shipment of the produce of the great West, American as well as Canadian, by the St. Lawrence. All these expenditures, however, will be fruitless unless we have ships at Montreal, or Quebec, to compete with those at American ports; and these we cannot have, if the import trade, or more properly, the distributing trade of the Dominion, is to be transferred to American ports. This is not a question of whether the wholesale trade is to be done at Montreal or Toronto or any other Canadian city. It is simply whether the handling of foreign goods required for the use of Canada, shall be by Canadian or American merchants.

We venture to think that the policy of the future will be a policy of differential duties against the United States. The right of Canada to adopt such a policy cannot be successfully denied. Sir Francis Hincks adopted it when he put ten per cent. on tea purchased in the United States, while tea from any other part of the world was free of duty. The adoption of the ad valorem system—which is practically a premium upon the long voyage, is in its practical result, a system of differential duties against our near neighbour. But whether it would be wise to adopt the system against the United States alone or not, there can be little doubt that it would be quite within the power, and quite within the national policy of this country, part and parcel as it is of the British Empire, to have a scale of duties upon goods imported from Great Britain or her colonies, and a higher rate on the same goods when imported from any other country. Such a policy would, of course, require a careful selection of the articles upon which the

increased duty should be charged. Its adoption would unite the bonds which bind us to the mother country. It would be an improvement as a Canadian policy; and its tendency would be at once to inspire in the investment of capital in the manufacturing industries of the country to promote the foreign trade of the Dominion by our own great water highway.

THOMAS WHITE,  
Editor of Montreal Gazette

## THE ROMISH AND THE PROTESTANT MIND.

There are two classes of mind in the world of very different mental tendencies of which we may take as typical examples, John Locke and John Henry Newman. The tendency of the one class is towards freedom of thought, personal liberty of investigation, and looking at things at first hand. That of the other, towards clinging to authority, leaning on persons, and looking at things through the eyes of others. To these latter "*the traditions of the Elders*" present an almost insurmountable obstacle to the reception of the new, however true. To them it is always the "hoary old," never the grey and decrepit; and the words of Christ, "Why, even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?" has little meaning.

I do not say that these two classes are very clearly marked off by any hard and fast lines of separation, but that, in a kind of general way, there is a class of thinkers and a class of leaners; of child-minds and of men-minds; of minds with natural Protestant tendencies, and of minds with natural Catholic tendencies. Nor is this Protestant mental characteristic *always* a result of great energy of character or of high intellectual endowment, but rather of a simple directness of vision and sensitive moral nature, alive to, and able to discriminate between, the substances and the shows of things; between the living kernel and the dead outer husk. The Pharisees connected somehow the idea of sanctity and defilement with fasting from or eating certain things at certain times (owing to some church traditions probably), but Christ shewed them that no external rite—that nothing that affected the mere body or entered by the mouth, could, as such, touch the moral character, or injure or benefit the soul of the man. And the most learned Pundit often makes a mistake here, at which the simple, honest mind is lost in astonishment.

Again, these minds with natural Protestant tendencies are marked by all degrees and shades of difference, from great robustness and independence of thinking, down to such a modified character of it, as is scarce distinguishable from that tethered thinking, which essentially is Catholic, and which concerns itself chiefly with *confirming* the so called thinker and others in a *foregone* conclusion. This, in the proper sense, is not thinking at all, only looking for arguments to support an assumed position. Such a person seeks not to determine the measure of truth in any theory, but only sets himself the task to prove it true. The difference is substantive and real. It is the difference between the old Romish Ecclesiastic trying to bend the system of the universe to the demands of his religious theory—to make the sun and the planets and the stars themselves, in their immeasurable depths, spin round the *central earth*—each revolution in a day-span—with a velocity exceeding a thousandfold the velocity of light, and, so, *accommodate themselves* to his (now exploded) hypothesis—exploded into a thousand fragments, in spite of Index and Inquisition and schoolman and the Pope himself—the difference between such, I say, and the student of nature who is simply content to shape his theory by the truth of things—the "*homo minister et interpres nature*."

For the purpose of theory, America had no business to have been at all. For was it not the Romish Council of Salamanca which endeavoured to divert Columbus from his great undertaking by opposing Patristic interpretation and theory to his belief in the true figure of the earth, and pronounced it heretical to persist in his enterprise?

But what, indeed, has been the whole history of the Papacy but a series of blunder after blunder, and an endeavour, by dogma and *the stake*, to control the free action of the mind, to narrow the horizon of thought to the little area of Monk-life, and to fasten despotically the yoke of her opinion upon the neck of the human race. And what is Catholicism but the slavish acceptance of this yoke—the blind acquiescence in her dogmatic teaching, though that teaching has been so often upset by the clear evidence of fact; and in her infallibility, though that infallibility is unsupported by a tittle of real evidence, and has broken down again and again before the logic of the human mind.

And yet they tell us that there is no salvation out of the pale of Rome; that character and upright life, and obedience to the behests of conscience, the love of truth and the honest struggle to live it out, go for nothing, if unaccompanied by a belief in the dogmas of Trent, and unless, renouncing the plainest evidence of all our human senses, we believe that the bread and wine in "the Lord's Supper" are not bread and wine at all, but bones and blood and brains and muscles, and that, at such times, we are eating, in very deed, a living man.

When a man can be reduced to such a state of mentality; when his manhood can descend to this; when the thinking, active soul can become the passive slave of such a dogma, truly may we exclaim, in the words of the poet,

"O judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts,  
AND MEN HAVE LOST THEIR REASON."

With such men can there be any common stand-ground on which to reason at all? Do conscience, intellect, common sense, history count for nothing; or is this solid-ribbed world anything better than the football of a schoolboy's dream, to be kicked hither and thither as the game demands, or the victory alternates either side.

J. A. ALLEN.

Perhaps of all the actions into which the evil passions of humanity are led, there more base than that of writing an anonymous letter. It is a moral assassination, or by a masked murderer—a lie without an author—the mean-spirited act of the coward, in whose heart gall has replaced the wholesome blood, and whose malice and revenge vent themselves in slander. I would as soon trust my stake with friendship with the hangman, my name with a coquette, take a serpent in my hand to my heart, as hold communion of love, friendship, or interest, with the despotic of an anonymous letter.—*J. E. Smith.*