

the city parks, or to breath the fresh air in some outlying district. One of the strongest presentations of the argument from this point of view which we have seen was made over the signature of "Only a Working Girl," in a recent number of the Toronto News. True, there was a good deal of irrelevant matter in the rather lengthy letter, such as the very touching and, we fear, o'er true picture drawn of the hardships endured by household servants in hot kitchens, in preparing elaborate Sunday dinners for their wealthy and luxurious employers and their friends. We may have the sincerest sympathy for those who thus suffer through the thoughtlessness or selfishness of those who by a little healthful self-denial on one day in seven might greatly ameliorate the condition of thousands, but we are unable to see how that condition would be bettered by the running of cars on Sunday. Much more to the point is the touching view presented of the pitiable condition of tired mothers and feeble children, sweltering in the heat and being slowly stifed in the closeness of their small rooms and narrow alleys. To many such, a few hours in a large park or the open country on Sunday would no doubt be a great boon. The question of Sunday cars is, to our thinking, rather one of social and moral expediency than of religious obligation, if there is in the last analysis any real difference between the two things. Christian people can be under no religious obligation to injure the health and happiness of the majority in order to promote the moral or spiritual welfare of the minority. The case is emphatically one in which the greatest good of the greater number should be the controlling principle.

Looked at from that this point of view, the desirability or otherwise of running the street cars on Sunday is a question of fact. Is it true that a limited car service would enable large numbers of citizens, old and young, to reach the parks or outlying fields, who are otherwise doomed to spend the day, like all other days, in the foul air of their unsanitary homes and surroundings? How many thousands, how many hundreds even are there in the city who cannot, without undue exertion, reach some of the city breathing places? And how many of these could afford to make use of the street cars for themselves and their families were they available? The families of the poor are often large, and while eight or ten cents per week may be but a trifle even to a labouring man, this sum multiplied by four or six would become a serious, often a prohibitory matter. For our own part, we greatly appreciate the comparative quiet and safety of the streets as we now have them on Sunday. We do not think that Puritanic glasses are needed to enable one to see that a healthful and uplifting moral tone is imparted to the very atmosphere by such conditions. At the same time, if it can be

shown that the running of a limited number of cars on this day would be such a blessing to many as would more than counteract the hardships and loss inflicted upon those to whom Sunday cars mean Sunday labour, we should feel bound to favour the car service as the lesser evil. But those who toil with their hands will be very short-sighted if they do not perceive that they have more to lose than any other class by any loosening of the restraints upon Sunday labour. There is undoubted logical force in the argument drawn from the open livery stables and the unrestricted use of private carriages on Sunday, but the permission of a greater evil cannot be justified by the existence of a lesser. Sunday steamboats, Sunday railway trains, Sunday refreshment booths, and many similar innovations are but corollaries of Sunday street cars. The latter once in motion, there is no logical halting-place until the European Sunday is reached. All this means more and more Sunday work, and Sunday work means in the great majority of cases seven days of work in the week. We feel sure that not more than a small percentage of the labouring citizens of Toronto are prepared to purchase a few Sunday car rides at such a cost.

According to the published statement of trade returns issued by the Customs Department, as given in Saturday's Empire by its Ottawa correspondent, the imports of Canada for the eleven months ending with May are valued at \$109,462,587, and the exports for the same period at \$101,815,370; the former being an increase of more than ten millions, and the latter an increase of more than five millions over the amounts during the corresponding periods of the preceding year. A still more marked increase in both imports and exports is shown for the month of May, the increase in the former being \$2,725,088; that of the latter \$1,107,150. To all who believe that the amount of a country's foreign trade is one of the best evidences of its prosperity, these figures must be gratifying especially as affording ground for hope that the period of depression may be passing away. To those who hold to the old ideas with reference to the balance of trade, the fact that the increase in the value of exports for the eleven months is almost double the increase in the value of imports during the same period, will afford unmistakable evidence that there is something seriously wrong in our commercial relations, in consequence of which we are doing a losing business and our resources are being drawn upon to meet our trading losses. Still more startling confirmation of this will be found by those who thus reason, in the fact that for the month of May alone the increase in the value of imports is almost two-and-a-half times as great as the increase in the value of exports.

Several other questions are suggested by the foregoing figures, one or two of which we may state without feeling called upon to explain. These and similar figures are quoted by advocates of protection as evidences of the successful working of the N. P., and the difficulties which present themselves are those which arise in relation to that point of view. So far as the increase in exports is concerned there is of course little room for difference of opinion. Free-trader and protectionist alike will rejoice to see a steady increase—the larger the better—in the volume of exports. The latter is bound, however, if we understand the theory, to inquire carefully into the nature of the increase, with special reference to the kind of the exported commodities. Do they consist mainly of natural products of the country, or of articles manufactured by Canadian skill and industry from those or imported products? If the latter, to what extent has the manufacturing process been carried, for, as is well known, one manufactured article is very often but the raw material for another manufacturing process of a higher order. It will, we suppose, be granted that one main object of the protective policy is to check the export of raw material and to foster the export of the products of skilled Canadian labour, therefore a valuable test of the success of that policy will be not only the falling off in the volume of exports of natural products in their original shape, or as near that shape as circumstances will admit, i. e., with the smallest practicable amount of Canadian labour bestowed upon them, but the extent to which they have given employment to skilled labour before they were brought into the shape in which they were exported. We have not the facts before us necessary for the application of this test, and consequently can merely remind our readers of the necessity of making it before giving to the N. P. credit to which it may possibly not be entitled. It is evident that the bare fact of increase in the value of exports may not of itself prove that the fiscal system under which it is produced is beneficial to the country, since it is open to the thorough-going free-trader to aver that the effect of the protective policy has been to place the people under conditions which compelled them to work harder and export more largely of the products of their labour in order to meet and counteract to some extent the injurious effects of that policy. So long, it may be contended, as the country is inhabited its inhabitants must procure in some way the necessaries of life. If, under the operation of a certain policy, a man finds himself obliged to work harder than before to the extent, let us suppose, that will enable him to sell twelve dollars worth of labour-products for every ten he sold previously, because twelve dollars under the new conditions will go no farther than ten under the old in procuring the things which it is necessary for him to