

situations, but leave the country, were that policy changed, though nothing can be much more certain than that a large percentage of them have simply left some other employment to enter the workshops? What about the effect of all the immense sums of money which have been expended on public works within this period? Or, to turn the shield, can any intelligent Canadian, knowing the resources of his country, believe that it has made such progress in wealth and population during these fifteen years as it should have made? How are we to account for the fact that, notwithstanding all its rich resources and the expenditure of large sums of money in public works for the development of those resources and the promotion of immigration, the increase in population during the last ten years has fallen below the normal rate of natural increase in a healthy country? Can any one doubt that if during those fifteen years, in addition to all the other means of development, we had had free commercial intercourse with the United States, our country might have kept pace, to some extent at least, with that country in its wonderful progress in population and wealth? Those who remain in the country are reasonably prosperous, no doubt, but that fact affords but poor consolation to the tens of thousands of parents who are compelled to see their sons forsake not only the parental roof but the country itself, and cross the international border in pursuit of the means of livelihood, as soon as they reach the age of self-support. Should not such facts as these be taken into the account and fairly faced in any argument based upon the historical record of those memorable fifteen years?

So far as their courage, or the lack of it, with reference to the Manitoba school question is concerned, the two political leaders stand exactly upon a level. Neither gives any indication of his real views as to the right or wrong of the affair. It is very likely that both are alike hoping that the necessity for any such expression may never arise. Should the decision of the Supreme Court throw the question into Parliament, the occasion will test the breadth and manliness of each, as it will be about equally embarrassing if not politically fatal to both. We do not know that either is to be severely blamed for seeking to avoid as long as possible such a contingency, so long as he can do so by a mere policy of silence. There is a place for tact in politics as elsewhere. Perhaps there is no law, either of politics or of ethics, which demands that a political leader shall hasten to impale himself upon either horn of a dilemma before the actual necessity arises.

Sir John had a surprise in store for his Belleville hearers. The secret had been well kept and there was a touch of the dramatic in his announcement that his Government has intimated to that of the United States that, if they are prepared to submit any fair tariff concessions, they will

be responded to by Canada in a liberal spirit. The statement raises a good many questions. In the first place, would such reciprocal tariff legislation be a desirable way of increasing our trade with our neighbours? Would it not make our tariff dependent upon Washington in a way to which the Government have always been strongly opposed? To reduce the Canadian tariff upon certain classes of goods in consideration of certain reductions deemed equivalent in the American tariff, would logically mean that any future change at Washington should be followed by a corresponding change at Ottawa. Then, again, is there, judging from past experience, the least probability that what our Government would deem a fair arrangement would be so regarded by the Washington Administration? Our neighbors have declared almost *ad nauseam*, that no such arrangement would be deemed fair by them which did not include a considerable list of manufactures. To include such a list would probably be quite incompatible with the oft-repeated determination of Sir John and his colleagues to protect Canadian manufactures. But whether there be much or little probability of such an offer bearing fruit, the announcement that it has been made is significant, as another of many proofs that the Ottawa ministers are alive to the fact that there is a real and serious demand throughout the Dominion for tariff-reform and better trade relations with our next-door neighbours. Meanwhile there is good reason to hope that those neighbours have come to the conviction that it will be the part of wisdom and common sense to lighten the burdens of their own people, irrespective of the policy of others.

#### ANGLO-CANADIAN FEDERATION.

In a March issue of this journal I ventured to state my opinions regarding the future of Canada, and endeavoured to show that the accomplishment of either one or the other of the proposals for Annexation or Independence is as impossible as is the continuance of our National Policy. While dealing with Annexation I advised the advocates of that policy not to be led away by Yankee glitter or the exaggerated utterances of un-British pessimists and unmasked boodlers.

In that essay, in the face of Carnegie's loud proclamation to the world that America was the most prosperous country upon the globe's surface, I stated as my opinion that the United States was undergoing a period of artificial prosperity and suggested a "sickening relapse." It does not require the exercise of any ability to say "I told you so," and, inevitable though we must consider the catastrophe which has befallen them it would ill-become us to gloat over it, as they are our neighbours and kinsmen, and what affects them most assuredly affects us in common with the other nations of the world. At the same time I should like to point out to my few surviving annexation friends the astounding inconsistency of the cry which still goes up—"we are a prosperous people." As this cry goes its accustomed round

the Mayor of Chicago announces that the coming winter will usher riot and anarchy into his city, as within it are 200,000 destitute and unemployed. From the extremes of east and west, New York and San Francisco, comes the cry of the unemployed. As the territory comprised within the United States is the richest in the world, it cannot be the fault of the country that the people thus suffer. It must therefore, be the fault of the people themselves and their statesmen. A business man, by one dishonest act, ruin his credit, and it is the same with a nation. It is this dishonest fall of European confidence in America which is the chief—I do not say the only—cause of her present stagnation. Largely using the borrowed European wealth in the development of their country, they sought to avoid those obligations which are imposed upon all borrowers, whether individual or national. The instrument with which they attempted this dishonest trick was the McKinley tariff. This is not a mere sensational and empty assertion. It is a fact that requires no great knowledge of political economy to prove it. The interest upon European capital invested in the United States amounts to many millions yearly. It would be folly to imagine that this was paid for in gold, for, even during her most prosperous years, it would be absolutely impossible for her to do so. It was paid for in the exchange of commodities between America and Europe. McKinleyism, however, so distorted and restricted this exchange as to render the interrupted payment of interest impossible. In brief, business thus hampered the able and Europeans are withdrawing their capital and seeking more profitable investments elsewhere. That they withdraw in gold is not to be wondered at, for gold is the world's standard of price. Had the same upheaval taken place in any other country investors would have withdrawn gold. In the United States, however, silver legislation, by driving gold out of employment in that country, has directly assisted the European military power to accumulate vast gold reserves in the event of a not unexpected war, and thus the evil is accentuated. The United States is not able to meet the demand for gold, the primary cause of which demand was the McKinley tariff. Their silver is artificially priced at nearly double its value; and now want of confidence has given place to a panic both at home and abroad. The ignorance of the people, the cynicism, I know not which—and the dishonesty of statesmen whom they have grown cause to be thankful are not now in power, while disgracing the United States in the eyes of the world, are solely responsible for the temporary though serious difficulties in which they are placed.

In giving this brief review of the deplorable results caused by the forces at work among the people with whom Annexationists have at one time asked us to throw in our lot, and who gracefully slink out of an Empire the magnificent solidity of which the world has never before seen, it would hardly be fair for us to leave this question, without reference to the commercial line drawn across this continent. Annexationists have used the promise of this line as a clinching argument in favour of their policy. In so doing it would be well to remind them that they become the tools of those American statesmen who have brought this trouble upon their own country, and who, were they in power, would bring the same