

all made exemptions in favor of the poor; the railway passenger tax does not touch the third class. But Lord Derby was "not blind to the possible risk of making one class pay most of the taxes, while another class has to decide how they shall be spent," and he recognized the prevalence of democracy in England by adding that "this is a risk which all democracies must incur." He did not find that, in the democratic republic of the United States any outcry is raised or scandal caused by the most colossal fortunes which have anywhere been created. If this is not quite correct, it may at any rate be said that there is not more outcry there than there is in monarchical countries on the same subject.

At a Parnellite demonstration in Glasgow, Mr. F. E. Redmond defended boycotting. He described as a safeguard against crime that which is, in most cases, itself a crime. But the treatment of Lord Kenmare's bailiff shows how naturally boycotting leads to crime. Mr. Redmond distinctly showed a leaning for the present government; but he confessed to a sinking in his heart because he feared that the prospect was too bright to last. Parnell has distinctly declared his intention to render all government impossible if self-government be denied to Ireland. He expects to hold the balance of power in the next parliament, and the divisions among the Liberals may not unlikely give it to him.

Some effervescence among the warm blooded young men of the French race in Quebec took place after the execution. Mixed with this was a party element in which older hands were seen. The students of Laval carried the tri-color flag through the streets and sang the Marseillaise; the effigies of some obnoxious ministers of the crown were burnt in different places; calls on the whole parliamentary delegation to resign are made but nobody responds; at Montreal the union jack was pulled down from the city hall by the enterprise of Ald. Robert and replaced by the tri-color, but Mayor Beaugrand promptly undid the freak of the excited alderman. There has been no breach of the peace anywhere; and the excitement may be expected soon to die out.

From the completion of the survey of the upper part of the Saskatchewan river some important information is got. The spruce groves along the banks have been greatly reduced by fire and some of them destroyed. But much good timber still remains. Coal was found in abundance, one seam being 25 and another 30 feet in thickness, partly under the river. The quality is said to be better than that of the coal at the Galt mine. Several miners were each getting from the river bars gold to the value of from \$2 to \$4 a day. The gold is confined to thin layers, often not over an inch thick; and as a result the steam mining scows have generally proved unprofitable.

For the purpose of carrying the Canada Atlantic mail, a combination between the

Allan line and the Dominion line of steamers is reported. The Vancouver, the Sarnia, and the Oregon, of the Dominion line, according to the *Liverpool Journal of Commerce*, will be employed for this purpose. So far the combination will be welcomed, the vessels mentioned being swift sailers. But the combination is said to go farther, and to have for its object an increase in freights. The experiment may prove perilous in face of the competition with American routes.

"I do not," said Lord Iddesleigh at Calder, "call it Free Trade if you merely take off the duties of imports, and do not at the same time give your own people the power of competing fairly with their neighbours." But how that power was to be given by legislation, is a secret which the noble Lord kept to himself.

#### DIFFERENTIAL DUTIES FOR THE EMPIRE.

It now appears that Sir Charles Tupper was not alone in declaring in favor of differential duties for the Empire. Lord Salisbury has taken the same ground. "Why," asked he, according to the *Economist*, "should we not impose differential duties in favor of our colonies, so as to draw them more to us, and secure to ourselves the growing trade with them." And he added that though such a modification of duties presents some difficulty, their imposition would not be a contravention of Free Trade. Differential duties such as are here suggested would be sure to beget retaliation. In vain England would plead that the discrimination did not contravene the most favored nation clause by which she is bound in her commercial treaties with other nations; that the discrimination was confined to the British Empire and left all foreign nations without cause of complaint. Practically an old controversy which once took place between England and the United States would be revived. In her navigation laws England once made a discrimination between nations which possessed and nations which did not possess colonies. The distinction had an equitable look, but the United States, which could not discern its equity, retaliated. That she would do so again, if Lord Salisbury's suggestion was carried out is almost certain. The weapon of differential duties might perhaps be legitimately used in the way proposed, but that it would be wise so to employ it or that its employment would bring the results desired is very doubtful.

At first sight, the colonies might be expected to throw up their caps in favor of differential duties by which they would expect to profit. But these duties, if imposed at all, could not be one-sided; they would have to be the result of a compact in which Canada, on its part, would have to undertake to grant a similar favor to English goods. Would Canada be willing to do this? Would it be her interest to do so, to raise up a commercial barrier between herself and her nearest neighbor? She could not expect to have the benefit of the arrangement without its drawbacks.

From the English point of view, the *Economist* shows that nothing would be gained. If England bought more wheat from the colonies she would buy less from foreign countries, since her capacity of consumption would not be increased but would in fact be decreased by an arrangement which would have the effect of enhancing the price of wheat. And the result of buying less from foreign countries would be that she would sell less merchandise to these countries. The number of her customers would not be increased, though it might not, as the *Economist* contends, be lessened.

The suggestion to return to differential duties is like an attempt to put back the clock of time. It points to a system which belongs to the infancy of colonization, and which is invariably relaxed when the colonies attain the vigor of years. British colonization has witnessed every degree of mutual succour. At first, the mother country claimed an absolute monopoly of the colonial trade; while colonial produce was admitted free into the markets of the mother country or charged with a less duty than the rival products of foreign nations. The necessities of cheap food to a great manufacturing nation broke down the corn laws; the necessity of cheap timber, first decreased the difference in the discriminating timber duties and then swept them away altogether. The system was changed by the force of circumstances; and it is impossible to restore it, in its entirety. Foreign wheat cannot be taxed for the benefit of colonial; no one pretends that this is possible. That discriminating timber duties can be revived is extremely doubtful. And if they were, would Canada, in return, be required to discriminate in favor of the whole list of British goods and against similar foreign goods of every nation? If not, how far would the discrimination go? By what rule would its limitation be regulated? What would be the effect on our own manufacturers and on our revenue? These are considerations which would demand attention, and would have to be fully discussed.

#### THE BOARD OF TRADE ASSESSMENT SCHEME.

The Council of the Toronto Board of Trade, has had under consideration for some months, a scheme of assessment life assurance for its members. The scheme was put before a meeting of the Board on Monday evening last, and has, we understand, been approved. It appears to have arisen partly out of the praiseworthy desire of some members of the body to see provision made for the dependents of its older or less fortunate members, and perhaps more largely from the need, present to the minds of a good many, of some motive by which its membership could be held together. The latter consideration is, indeed, plainly stated in the circular calling the recent meeting. We append a part of the circular:

"The Council has had under consideration the subject of Gratuities upon a mutual assessment plan, adopted, especially by the New York Produce Exchange and other