

on woollens, silks, dressed leather, wrought iron and other articles are subject to increase. The effect would be, if these proposals were carried out, that fifty per cent. of the Russian imports would be taxed.

### TRADE AND LABOR.

At the annual dinner of the Association of Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom, a very important speech was made by the British Premier, Lord Salisbury, upon the trade and labor questions. In proposing the toast of "The Associated Chambers of Commerce," his lordship, while congratulating his hearers on the improved aspect of commerce compared with 1886 or 1887, and while regarding the present aspect as, on the whole, bright and prosperous, said: "There rise up two dark shadows which no one can contemplate without a certain feeling of anxiety and disquietude.

"One of these is the revival of Protectionist feeling, especially in the more democratic and more advanced nations of the world, which threatens to surround each nation with a brass wall of hostile tariffs, and in the excess of the feeling of nationality, to destroy that feeling of progressive industry and commerce, which, to the last generation, was the hope of the progress of the world. On this, indeed, there are now no differences of opinion. We all feel how injurious to our commercial interests this recrudescence of Protectionist feeling must be. It has principally shown itself in France and in America. But the two countries differ in this remarkable particular—that, whereas in France the Government seems to be less Protectionist than the people, if you are to measure the feelings of the people by the tendency of their representatives, in America the extravagantly Protectionist tendencies of the Government have received a severe check at the hands of the people. This country has decidedly renounced, as far as the opinion of leading commercial men may enable us to judge, every idea of influencing the action—the fiscal action—of foreign countries by any modification of our own fiscal policy; and, taking the fact as a starting point, you may say that we have no means of influencing the legislation which they may think right to adopt."

Turning now to the question of labor, Lord Salisbury described it as the other dark shadow, arising from the same cause, from the same return to Protectionist ideas, which is so curious a phenomenon of the present time. His definition of Protection is worth noting with care. He said: "I would define Protection, in its widest sense, to mean trying to win a race, not by out-running your rival, but by using the public forces to prevent him running at all. And that is not only the practice with respect to foreigners, but I am afraid that it has found some hold among us—among men who are merely competing with their own fellow subjects and countrymen. It is, undoubtedly, so long as it lasts, a dark cloud, because it is a very serious and dangerous delusion. These fights between labor and capital have their inconveniences, but they must take place, and we cabinet

ministers must look on them with absolute neutrality. And I do not think it is just to say that the existence of unions—trades unions, federations, or bodies of that kind—can be looked upon as a danger or an unexpected evil by the commercial interests of this country. Union is not the discovery of agitators; it is not invented by any particular man, or the result of any particular set of political circumstances. The people who made trades unions and employers' federations were Watt, who invented the steam-engine, and Wheatstone, who invented the electric telegraph; they are the result of easier communication, the much easier communication, which exists between all mankind, compared with what existed in the days of our grandfathers. All we have to hope is not that this spirit of union shall abate, but that it shall go on and have its perfect work, and that all who are united by a common interest shall be guided by common counsels to do that which is wise and best for themselves and the community in their judgment.

"But the correlative of unions is perfect freedom *not to have* unions. The corollary of liberty uniting is an absolute liberty of refusing to unite, and the State—all who bear office, or who exercise influence in this country, are bound to do their utmost that each man in his own discretion may use his own liberty to dispose as he thinks best of whatever commodity, including that greatest of commodities, his labor, according as he may judge to his interest. That is not a mere controversial proposition. It lies at the base of our national character and our national instincts. Either Englishmen must absolutely change their characters, so that they shall be unlike anything which they have ever been before, or they will continue to require that each man shall be free in his own actions, to carry on his own industry. Take this question of mines. Supposing that the price of coal is high and labor is rare, and a number of men desire to sell their spare labor, or to labor over eight hours a day, for the purpose of meeting a great public want—do you imagine you could send those men to prison? Do you imagine that if you did send them to prison they would not have a thousand ways of concealing from the law what they were doing; and so the only means of carrying out the sinister object of the law would be to multiply regulations and appoint inspectors, until the generally lengthening evil of red tape would stifle and throttle the industries of any country it touched."

"The desire that, as a rule, human labor shall be limited to eight hours a day, is a desire for which I have a great respect, for I believe that, speaking of real work, and all employment is not work—but, speaking of real work, eight hours is quite as much as the labor of the muscles or the tension of the brain of the average man can give. But that is quite a different thing to requiring that it shall be imposed by Act of Parliament.

"Our rule is, that with respect to the labor of those who are unprotected, of women and children, Parliament has a right to interfere; that with respect to all things that affect the health of the community,

Parliament has a right to interfere with industry; but that with the ordinary labor of the adult men, Parliament has not a right to interfere, and, I believe, if you once leave that sound ground of principle, if you once pass the rubicon which separates you from the domain of Socialism, you will part with your commercial and industrial supremacy, and, some decades or generations hence, will slink to your old ground, with all lost for which once you struggled. I see there are persons who say that it ought to be confined to miners; that it is absurd to extend it to any other vocation, but that as a majority of miners—it is not the whole body—but as a majority of miners wish it, it ought to be enacted for them. But are they so simple as to think such a principle, if it can be introduced, if it can be made to work, will not be extended to other industries? How are you to separate the miner from the quarryman? How are you to separate the quarryman from the navy who works on the railway? How are you to separate the navy from the other industries upon the railway? You will find that each industry is chained to another industry by a link of argument that you cannot break, and that, having conceded the principle in the case of mines, if it can be sustained—which I greatly doubt—the pressure, at first at all events, will be very strong to extend it to other industries as well. But my belief is that it will not work at all."

### ENDOWMENT LANDS.

Several experiments have proved the practical impossibility of holding, as a source of revenue from rent, lands set apart as endowments of public institutions. The University of King's College had an endowment of lands which would have given it all it could possibly require, if they could have been retained and made productive as rent-bearing. But the leasing system was extremely unpopular, and could not be maintained in face of the competition of freehold lands. The Clergy Reserves, one seventh of all the granted land in Ontario, down to a certain period, yielded only a modicum of rent. At present, the report of the Commissioner of Crown Lands reminds us we are alienating grammar school lands; they are going the same way, following the same law, as the clergy and the university lands. It is impossible to preserve them; the tenant system is not taken to by choice, though it is being developed, in the case of farm lands, to a considerable extent.

But if our endowment lands cannot, as a rule, be saved, it does not follow that nothing can be done in that direction. In Australia, the Crown has saved from alienation lands which yield a yearly rental of \$10,000,000, £2,000,000 sterling. The fact that most of these lands are used for grazing purposes, and are held under lease in large areas, favors the system. If the time should ever come when they will be broken up into moderate sized farms, the leasing system will probably break down. No government in any part of Canada outside the Western ranches, could reserve the public lands for leasing; they would not