

in the profits of the wheat trade. It has been calculated that it costs him fourteen shillings to produce a quarter of wheat. The average cost of carting it to the railway station is three shillings, and the price at the railway station nineteen or twenty shillings. The farmer we have described has not a large number of quarters to dispose of, and supposing him to gain half-a-crown on each, his profits will not be vast. But if his half-crown, or most of it, goes to the money-lender, he gains nothing, and if the injudicious revenue officer raises his rent, his gain is a loss.

The conclusion at which we arrive is, that there is little probability of India being able greatly to increase its production of wheat. If we could improve the condition of the cultivator, get him out of debt, lower his rent, provide him with better cattle, get him to buy fuel and use his cow dung for manure—if, in short, we could begin by creating a social and economic revolution, then the production of wheat might indeed be doubled or trebled. But though we do not think this is likely to happen, it is possible, and even probable, that the exportation of wheat may be increased; and it may also become possible to sell it in England at prices with which this country will find it hard to compete. We have seen that the cultivator parts with his grain for very little profit. The difference between the cost of production and the ultimate selling price is chiefly made up of the cost of cartage, and railway and ocean transit. The conditions vary so much in the different parts of India that it is not very satisfactory to deal with averages. But as we have not space to consider separate districts, we must take the most reliable general averages we can obtain. And we find it calculated that the cost of production of a quarter of wheat is fourteen shillings; cartage to the railway station, three shillings; railway charges, seven to eight shillings, and ocean freight about twelve shillings. The cost of production cannot be reduced, nor is it probable that ocean freight will be lowered. But a great effort is now being made to improve the facilities for transportation by land as well as to cheapen the railway rates. A Parliamentary Committee was occupied during nearly the whole of the last English session in considering the advisability of largely extending the Indian railway system. We have not yet seen the report of this Committee; but it has recommended that the Indian Government should borrow twenty-eight millions sterling in the course of the next five years for railway construction. With this sum about 3,000 miles of new railway may, we believe, be constructed, and as the main object is the development of the export trade, the wheat growing districts ought soon to be pierced in every direction with feeder lines. The cost of cartage will thus be reduced where it is now heaviest, and in some parts where it is now almost impracticable to carry the wheat to market, large purchases may in future be made. Then, most of the lines will be under State control, and as the development of trade is even a more important object than direct traffic returns, it is probable that more moderate rates of railway freight than have hitherto prevailed will be adopted in future. Thus it is not unlikely that, without any increase of production, India may in a few years become able to send more wheat to the English market, and to sell it at a reduced price. But a great uncertainty surrounds all speculations as to the future of things in India, and if this country had the wisdom to open its doors more freely to English imports, and thus to stimulate the languishing English demand on the Canadian market, English zeal for the development of the Indian trade—which is largely the result of American and Canadian Protection—would probably cool, and this country would yet be able to hold its own in the English market.

WILLIAM RIACH.

SOME FEATURES OF CANADIAN JOURNALISM.

"PITCH into George Brown." Such was the order given one day by a Conservative newspaper proprietor to his staff, and it is but an act of posthumous justice to the members of the staff to say that their instructions were carried out to the letter, and that, whatever else may have been neglected upon the paper, the "pitching-into" process was never permitted to fall into abeyance. As the world moves now it is a comparatively long time since the opening words were spoken, but from that day to this the principle underlying the advice has been actively at work in Canadian journalism. The principle has more or less governed the entire newspaper press of the Dominion, to the great injury of the country's best interests. It has vitiated literary taste and kept down at the lowest possible point the standard of literary excellency; its flagrant partisanship has deprived criticism of all value; but its crowning offence against the Republic of Letters is, that it has called into existence a sort of literary "rough" whose congenial employment it is to knock down everybody who has the temerity to think differently from the party to which the "bludgeon man" belongs. The dead sleep well, and we have no wish whatever to disturb

their repose; therefore what we say is not intended as a personal reflection upon the late George Brown. But there is no disputing the fact that George Brown in his day was mainly responsible for the introduction of the pitching-into style of journalism which has prevailed among us since. Mr. Brown made his journal a power and stamped upon it his own strongly marked individualism; so much so, in fact, that it became, not the mirror of public opinion, but the mirror of what one man thought public opinion ought to be. To a large section of the public the late Mr. Brown was a literary dictator, and those who refused to accept him as such were treated with a ferocity that was unique in its intense bitterness. Looking back upon his journalistic career one fails to discover any traits of generosity or ordinary fairness to opponents, or even friends when they happened to run counter to his wishes. Possibly there are those who will seek to excuse this particular form of journalism on the ground that it was the rougher child of a rough parent, and that the period was not favourable to the production of high-class journalism. We need not discuss that at present; but what strikes us as singular is, that anybody in these days should seek to perpetuate the system, and that "pitching-into" opponents should be looked upon by some and frequently encouraged by others as the very perfection of progressive journalism. The lesson of the late George Brown's life is eminently suggestive as to the practical benefits to be derived by a political party from this mode of warfare. That he inflicted a great deal of unnecessary and wholly undeserved pain upon individuals and families will hardly be disputed; but, practically, did he secure anything like adequate results to his party? We certainly think not. "The Pacific Scandal" found them without a policy, and his ever-to-be-lamented death left them without a head. If hounding down political opponents had been the true method by which to create or solidify a party, then the Canadian Liberals were great indeed. If the history of Canadian parties teaches any one lesson more emphatically than another, it is the utter fatuity of substituting personal abuse for the absence of those great social and political questions about the solution of which thinking men will, or perhaps we should say must, differ. A quarter of a century's abuse has driven all the prominent opponents of the late George Brown into the front ranks and left nearly every one in whose interest the abuse was employed either out of the running or far behind in the race. We have therefore to rise no higher than the low level of political tactics to feel satisfied that it is a mistake as well as a prostitution of journalism to use it for purposes of personal detraction and abuse. There are clear indications that the people are getting thoroughly sick of the whole thing, and that they will soon begin to do on a large scale what a few educated people are doing on a small one, namely, turning with a sense of relief to the few leaders of opinion who are beginning to discuss our social and political problems in a spirit of calm impartiality. There never was a time, perhaps, in the history of Canadian journalism when it could boast of such a large array of first-class men as it can at the present time, and these gentlemen owe it to themselves as the literary pioneers of this northern continent to raise the profession out of the political ruts into which, from whatever cause, it has fallen.

Newspapers that have bound themselves hand and foot to one political party or the other claim that they have no political standard higher than their party, and that whatever party morality requires, that is necessarily right, and the opposite is as necessarily wrong. It is justly charged against the modern exponents of the "pitching-into" theory that in reality they have no honest convictions: that their zeal for honest government and their high moral indignation against electoral bribery are both simulated, and that crimes are only crimes when committed by political opponents; and it is alleged that the very outcry they make about these things is of itself a proof that the zeal for purity is not real. Then again, taking the Press as our guide, it is painful to contemplate the venality and general wickedness of our public men. The Dominion Cabinet is a body of "suspects," any one of whom would descend to the lowest depths of dishonesty for political purposes; and how Sir John and his following have managed to escape the penitentiary so long is a problem beyond the comprehension of your honest Grit editor. Sir John and his merry men are every one of them potential candidates for the Rogues' Gallery, and if they escape it will not be for any lack of honest indignation against their evil deeds. Fortunately the balance of evil is preserved among our representatives, and although the Provincial Cabinet of Ontario has not numerically as many scoundrels in its ranks as the Dominion Cabinet, yet the Ontario ministers make up for deficiency in numbers by enlarging the scope of their wickedness. Mr. Mowat, for example, is in point of moral depravity equal to any three or four Ottawa ministers. We read their characters every day in several costly columns of editorial, and giving an independent judgment we look upon Mr. Mowat as a man of the most