

learn to regard schools of all kinds "as missionary agencies, not business corporations." Morality is not the result of intellectual and scientific teaching. "Personal example and personal affection are its true soil, and education must be organized upon that basis in order to be effective." When parents and boards and educators of every grade shall have come to see that moral training, character-building, should be the first and chief end of all educational processes, not a mere side issue or accompaniment, and when all who have to do with the training of the young shall be chosen on this principle and given ample scope for carrying it out in practice, then and not till then will the problem of religious instruction in the schools have been solved.

### THE NEW N. P.

You cannot create power, is a maxim absolutely irrefutable. Power can be made, but not created, and it is the difference between making and creating which has led to so much confusion of thought among protectionists. Things which are equal to the same thing are equal to one another, is also a maxim which it is impossible to deny. This likewise has been bandied about with diverting inconsistency by worshippers of that great and glorious institution, the National (?) Policy. Let us look into this a little closer. By the first maxim we infer that, though we cannot create, we can make power. But what does the second maxim tell us? That to make one power requires an equal power with which to do it. This being the case, we see at once that to build up a nation by taxing its people is nothing more nor less than an attempt to create power by either imbeciles or interested and dishonest individuals, both in and out of the political world. The protectionist tells us that power is taken from the people in the shape of money, but that the power so taken goes to build up the nation. What pitiable idiocy! Whoever heard of taking power from a people to make them powerful. If power is taken from a people, in whatsoever shape, the people are just so much the weaker. To deny this is exactly the same as asserting that a part being taken from a whole, the whole remains.

Two questions are continually being asked: Where has all this money which has been taxed out of us gone? Why have we retrogressed during the last fifteen years, when we have had such a magnificent country to develop? In answer to the first question, I would point to Canadian millionaires, some of whom live in luxury in England and the continent of Europe upon the Canadian's hard earned money, and to our appallingly costly government. To the second I would answer, if we amuse ourselves by maintaining, and investing our savings in, an extravagant government and aesthetic millionaires, we can hardly expect to do more than hold our own; most certainly we cannot hope to progress as a nation. It is now time we looked thoroughly into our present situation. There is such a thing as taxing ourselves into annexation to the United States and out of an Empire which will be, ere many years pass by, much more powerful and respected by the world than even at present. The pro-

tectionist tells us that we are taxed as a preventive to annexation. He affirms that the N.P. is not a gigantic system of taxation, but a system of protection to our industries against, chiefly, United States competition. No wonder, indeed, that the advocate for tariff for revenue only and honest administration is tempted to despair of success when such as these arguments are put forward, so devoid of the most elementary conception of political economy. What is our democratic form of government but an administration for the people, by the people, and with the people? Are we not flagrantly ignoring the first principle of government when we countenance any administration which is bound to a policy of handing the people's money to one class?

The protectionist cannot answer this successfully, but informs us that what is right in principle is not always expedient—it would be more manly to use the politician's real excuse, *convenient*—in practice. Any thoughtful man can see that the unbridled use of this argument would lead to anarchy. I might ask, if we have no rule of right, what rule under heaven have we which we can follow with confidence and hope?

The protectionist tells us that protection is a necessary expedient to prevent our market being captured by the United States manufacturer. In other words, it is an expedient to prevent Canadians buying in the cheapest market. Before leaving this argument, I will tell a tale of not so very long ago, when the sugar manufacturing cities of Bristol and Greenock, Great Britain, were placed in trying circumstances by the bonusing by the French Government of the sugar industry in France. This assistance from their government enabled French manufacturers to place their sugar upon the English markets about twopence per lb. cheaper than the manufacturers of Greenock and Bristol could afford to sell at. These cities closed down their sugar mills and applied for government assistance. The case was pressing, as hundreds in both cities were thrown out of employment. The government, however, after careful thought and enquiry, came to the conclusion that it had no right to tax the whole people to sustain one class. It said that for every pound of French sugar the Englishman bought, the Frenchman made him a present of twopence! and that to interfere with such a satisfactory state of affairs for the sake of one class was not within the province of any government for the whole people. When asked indignantly what the unemployed in Greenock and Bristol were to do, the government answered, that, if for every pound of commodity bought by England, she were to receive a present of twopence, the whole people of Great Britain would soon be rich enough to do without work! That, as England was growing richer for every pound of sugar she bought, the unemployed of Bristol and Greenock would soon find employment more remunerative than the one they had been deprived of. Such was the government's ultimatum and time proved it absolutely correct in every particular.

This is precisely the position of Canada to-day. The United States bonus their industries enormously. Why should we not take all our neighbors are stupid enough to give us, throw the old N.P. overboard and boldly adopt a new one. The new national policy would contain the following clauses:

First, that religion and the state be

kept apart, and all public appropriations for sectarian institutions of any kind shall cease.

Second, taxation only for honest and economic government.

Third, unity of the Empire and early representation in the Imperial House.

The first clause is one which, at the present time, will meet the approval of all truly religious people of whatever religious belief. The present religious political excitement bids fair to swamp the real issue before the country—tariff reform—and, if unchecked by feelings of loyalty to our country, it is not impossible that civil war will result. That such a war might be productive of certain benefits ultimately cannot be successfully denied, but all true minded men will pray that both Protestants and Catholics will be guided by reason, and the elementary principles of common sense, and so avert the necessity. In British Columbia in the place of religious politics and schools, we have religious peace, and are well content. As a result, our educational system is of the highest possible order, and Protestants and Catholics live side by side as brothers and Christians. The principles upon which this western Province was founded, are worthy of imitation by all other Provinces even at great sacrifice.

Of the second clause I need not speak, as it explains itself to every rational man.

Of the third clause I have already written in THE WEEK, of 29th September, 1893, and not in vain, for it is now a live issue among the Toronto Young Conservatives.

This is a wide question, and one which has been subject to great misapprehension among colonials generally. The cause of this misapprehension was the preferential trade question which should never have been admitted into the Imperial Federation movement, for two reasons. First, it is an attempt to coerce weak commercial nations. Coercion is a policy which rarely fails to defeat its own end. We see this in McKinleyism, and are familiar with the result. Openly expressed hatred of the United States by more than one nation. The second reason, however, is the most important. It is in direct antagonism to laws of political economy, for, any preferential trade question will rarely depend upon the form of taxation the countries concerned in it adopt. If we consider this subject for a little, we find that no more flimsy manner of building up an empire could possibly be conceived. If, in a few years, Canada ceases to tax her imports altogether, where will her preferential trade with the Empire be? At present we have the protectionist and soon we may have the tariff-for-revenue advocate in power. Can we ignore the single-tax advocate? Though single tax and the millennium have been amusingly coupled together, there are now a great number of people who affirm that this is a only just form of taxation. As this is a municipal, and in some cases, provincial form of taxation, it will be understood, and come into force much more rapidly than any form of Federal taxation which can be proposed.

Some have asked the question, Of what advantage would Imperial Federation be to the colonies if there is no preferential trade policy? Imperial Federation is not so much a question of advantage as of necessity. Out west here we do not require to be told that if the English-speaking world does not