

A POLICY FOR CANADA.

Rev. Principal Grant Suggests Reforms That are Needed.

THE WASTE OF PUBLIC FUNDS CONDEMNED

Leakages Pointed Out—Too Many Ministers and A Useless Senate—“Luxurious Growth of Suckers.”

The following is the first of a series of letters to be written for the Globe by Rev. Principal Grant, of Queen's college, Kingston:

You have asked me for my views as to the best policy for Canada, and, as I do not like to be silent when challenged to speak on what concerns the public welfare, I submit them without hesitation. However, it is large, and as anyone who gives opinions without at least hinting at his reasons is apt to be misjudged, you will pardon me if, instead of trying to condense unduly, I take the liberty of sending you two or three communications. Should there be repetitions, it is because truth cannot be impressed on the public in any other way. Every citizen understands that, and therefore he plays pretty much on the same tune for more than three hundred years in the year. Of the three hundred grand me three.

First, a government that really desires the interest of Canada must first, last and all the time, stick to the line of husbanding instead of wasting our public money. Money represents God's world, and who wastes this world will have a poor chance of the next. Both parties would willingly put my first plank in their platform if they were absolved from the necessity of being specific, but general professions of retrenchment and economy are worthless. Here is the cold reform as the general manager of the Bank of Montreal puts it, “We have been spending too much money.” National expenditure has increased steadily since Confederation, out of all proportion to the increase in population, or available resources, and there is abundant proof that a great deal of the money has been worse than wasted. It is bad to throw good money away; but when money is spent directly or indirectly to corrupt the people from whom the money is taken, it is a great deal worse. Let me illustrate. I shall take my illustrations, not from the awful disclosures made at Ottawa in 1891, but from others equally suggestive, and open also to the most careful readers of newspapers. The first is a review of the deal books or census returns or year books, though these are mines that would well repay exploration.

I take the Intercolonial as the first case in point. That railway has been an annual loss of from half a million to an enormous sum. At last the people began to kick; they were anxious to get such a white elephant off their hands; and felt that if the company which gives a good service along our national highway for thousands of miles, at no charge to the public chest, would do the same for the remaining hundreds, coming under bonds at the same time to increase the rates, it would be a fair thing. To talk about the necessity of a present of making a present of my debts to a friend, if any one considers that that would be a gift he can have it any day by writing me a check, and should be considered my action a proof of generosity of nature, I shall not object. The suggested method of relief was found to be a political impossibility, but it was also impossible to continue the waste, and instructions were given that it must be stopped. The waste was done as if by magic. A man who knew little or nothing of railways was able to stop it at once, and newspapers now imply that Mr. Haggart must now be a regular “Napoleon” of railways, in fact, another, an Horne. What does this astounding success prove? Either that the previous deficits were unnecessary or that the present showing has been attained by letting the road run down or by forcing a balance. The second and third alternatives would be discreditable to the present administration, the first to his predecessors and all former governments, yet we are forced to adopt one of the three. It is generally assumed that the first is the correct explanation. Being so, it means that not only have millions of our money been wasted, but that the waste has been done as if by magic. Corruption at headquarters is a poison that slowly but surely finds its way throughout the whole organism. It is absurd to think that you can make the people righteous by preaching and praying while this kind of work is tolerated. Not might as well try to train your children righteously by making them say their prayers morning and evening, and allow them to companion with thieves and blasphemers throughout the day. The startling illustration of the intercolonial has scarcely arrested the attention of the people. Very far from it. They are simply congratulating themselves that the big leak has been stopped. Are they sure that it has been completely stopped? And does it not occur to them that this is just a sample of what is going on in the other departments, and that the only radical cure is to limit strictly the sphere of government action, watching closely, too, that sphere, and so put away means of corruption into their hands?

Take another illustration, also from our regular expenditure, for it is the regular expenditure that constitutes the heavy burden, and the tendency of which always to grow. Our post office costs us a million and a half of dollars above the revenue. It has for years been in a chronic state of what might be termed departmental insolvency. Of course, Canada is not so densely populated as Britain, but that only partly explains the deficit. There are other reasons. In Britain no one can send a letter free. Even the Queen has to pay for her postage stamps. In Canada our legislators preserve the privilege of franking privilege that is susceptible of such

to be taken for granted that our government should have good bills with which to reward its supporters, not only when they are in public life, but after their usefulness is gone. The present system of adding to the cabinet is wrong. Permanent head clerks or commissioners, who do all the real work of the departments, are the kind of men we ought to have, instead of fleeting and untrained partisans. This is the system in Britain and the United States, but we have it only to a limited extent. As for houses for the Lieutenant-Governors, a man with salary of seven or eight thousand dollars can easily rent a house, if he has not one already in the provincial capital, and then less would be expected of him as regards the preposterous expense called “entertaining” than social funkery now expected. We are over-governed. Perhaps the most notable illustration of this is the senate. How to get a useful second house is a grave question. Different countries are trying different experiments, and we know that we ought to learn anything from our experience. This is certain. We have succeeded in getting the most useless second chamber in the world, and consequently the people are not disposed to abolish it, and see how they can get along with one house. The experiment may very safely be tried, until at any rate we have as many provinces as the Revolutionary War. It is clear that in certain conditions no house will have real power unless constituted on a democratic basis. Now to appoint a second democratic house to keep the first from doing anything would be to invite corruption or worse. Besides, the example of the Ontario province is before us, well, whereas the second chamber in Quebec was as helpless to check Count Mercier as our senate would be to check a worse man when he is sent upon us because of our sins. If there were only one head of responsibility, and more than when there are two; and under our parliamentary rules it is impossible to rush ill-considered legislation, and that gives a really free press plenty of time in which to sound an alarm. The great objection to our second house is simply an addition to the bribery fund at the disposal of the premier. It contains a few of the best men in Canada, and they must feel the degradation of sitting with men appointed for life simply because they have been faithful party hacks, and of knowing that their own rank has been dangled for months and years before the eyes of men whose fealty to the party is uncertain. Let them lead the agitation for abolition. Once the senate is abolished, Quebec and Nova Scotia will for very simple reasons lose their so-called “upper” houses.

I have given a few illustrations to show that the first outstanding feature of a true national policy should be not only the cutting away of mouldering branches and the vigorous pruning of others, but a complete and radical reorganization of all kinds. Suckers are a thousand times more fatal to the health of any tree than a dead or mouldering branch, just because they are not dead, and have no intention of dying. The luxuriant growth of suckers around the trunk of the tree is a sure sign that the trunk is rotting. The suckers are the parasites that have been charged with the care of the Canadian maple. Oh! there is a fine field at Ottawa for a capable and strong statesman, with an “enlightened” and “patient” public opinion at his back, and who would not waste his time begging for patronage, nor eating up his little income or infamy by pillaging him, on the degrading plea that subscriptions for churches and chapels secure a man a million of public money. Eight or nine years ago it was represented to parliament that the channel in question, which was only nine feet deep, had been deepened to fourteen feet. The money was voted. An additional sum was subsequently voted, and the channel was deepened to twenty feet. It is now stated that the reported depth of water in the new channel is not there, and that it has not been, and cannot be, used. A special engineer, Mr. Kennedy of Montreal, was after some pressure appointed to report on the matter, but, strange to say, neither side pressed for his report last session, and as it has not yet been given to the public the exact state of the case is not known. Meantime the work of deepening the channel seems to have been abandoned, and a canal is being built at great cost that, strange to say, will not be convenient for a long time or “block” of barges. Now, all this is startling enough, but it is actually the fact that more has been written in the newspapers about a little addition to the channel than about the actual post office annual deficit or about the Galopis rapids scandal. How is it that our guardians should be so concerned about the spile and so careless about the bung? Some people are so economical that they cannot afford to have a first-class statesman for our Governor-General, though they have hardly a word to say about the seven or eight houses kept up for our Lieutenant-Governors. I see no necessity for honours for Lieutenant-Governors, but a salary for a Governor-General and a good salary for our Governor-General. Our connection with Britain is indispensable to our national existence, at any rate to a free development of our national life and aspirations, and the Governor-General is the living-link that signifies and preserves that connection. The difference between a first and a second class man means a great deal to us. It may mean actual millions. He is the only constitutional check against possible maladministration for years. An appeal to the sovereign people ought always to be in order, and that might be needed especially when we mend or end the senate—even though the administration was sustained by the majority of the house of commons. A first-class statesman would know whether such an appeal should at any time be made. The consequence of misjudgment would fall so severely on himself that a second rate man would never take the risk.

Again, comparatively little has been said against the excessive membership and semi-ministerialism of the cabinet, although the government of the United States is carried on with less than half our number. Not only is the expense considerable, but the freedom of parliament is seriously weakened thereby. With us the cabinet is simply a committee of parliament. Now any one knows that committees have such power that it is almost impossible to defeat any proposal they make, and that the larger the committee the less freedom the body appointing it will have. It would almost seem

to be taken for granted that our government should have good bills with which to reward its supporters, not only when they are in public life, but after their usefulness is gone. The present system of adding to the cabinet is wrong. Permanent head clerks or commissioners, who do all the real work of the departments, are the kind of men we ought to have, instead of fleeting and untrained partisans. This is the system in Britain and the United States, but we have it only to a limited extent. As for houses for the Lieutenant-Governors, a man with salary of seven or eight thousand dollars can easily rent a house, if he has not one already in the provincial capital, and then less would be expected of him as regards the preposterous expense called “entertaining” than social funkery now expected. We are over-governed. Perhaps the most notable illustration of this is the senate. How to get a useful second house is a grave question. Different countries are trying different experiments, and we know that we ought to learn anything from our experience. This is certain. We have succeeded in getting the most useless second chamber in the world, and consequently the people are not disposed to abolish it, and see how they can get along with one house. The experiment may very safely be tried, until at any rate we have as many provinces as the Revolutionary War. It is clear that in certain conditions no house will have real power unless constituted on a democratic basis. Now to appoint a second democratic house to keep the first from doing anything would be to invite corruption or worse. Besides, the example of the Ontario province is before us, well, whereas the second chamber in Quebec was as helpless to check Count Mercier as our senate would be to check a worse man when he is sent upon us because of our sins. If there were only one head of responsibility, and more than when there are two; and under our parliamentary rules it is impossible to rush ill-considered legislation, and that gives a really free press plenty of time in which to sound an alarm. The great objection to our second house is simply an addition to the bribery fund at the disposal of the premier. It contains a few of the best men in Canada, and they must feel the degradation of sitting with men appointed for life simply because they have been faithful party hacks, and of knowing that their own rank has been dangled for months and years before the eyes of men whose fealty to the party is uncertain. Let them lead the agitation for abolition. Once the senate is abolished, Quebec and Nova Scotia will for very simple reasons lose their so-called “upper” houses.

I have given a few illustrations to show that the first outstanding feature of a true national policy should be not only the cutting away of mouldering branches and the vigorous pruning of others, but a complete and radical reorganization of all kinds. Suckers are a thousand times more fatal to the health of any tree than a dead or mouldering branch, just because they are not dead, and have no intention of dying. The luxuriant growth of suckers around the trunk of the tree is a sure sign that the trunk is rotting. The suckers are the parasites that have been charged with the care of the Canadian maple. Oh! there is a fine field at Ottawa for a capable and strong statesman, with an “enlightened” and “patient” public opinion at his back, and who would not waste his time begging for patronage, nor eating up his little income or infamy by pillaging him, on the degrading plea that subscriptions for churches and chapels secure a man a million of public money. Eight or nine years ago it was represented to parliament that the channel in question, which was only nine feet deep, had been deepened to fourteen feet. The money was voted. An additional sum was subsequently voted, and the channel was deepened to twenty feet. It is now stated that the reported depth of water in the new channel is not there, and that it has not been, and cannot be, used. A special engineer, Mr. Kennedy of Montreal, was after some pressure appointed to report on the matter, but, strange to say, neither side pressed for his report last session, and as it has not yet been given to the public the exact state of the case is not known. Meantime the work of deepening the channel seems to have been abandoned, and a canal is being built at great cost that, strange to say, will not be convenient for a long time or “block” of barges. Now, all this is startling enough, but it is actually the fact that more has been written in the newspapers about a little addition to the channel than about the actual post office annual deficit or about the Galopis rapids scandal. How is it that our guardians should be so concerned about the spile and so careless about the bung? Some people are so economical that they cannot afford to have a first-class statesman for our Governor-General, though they have hardly a word to say about the seven or eight houses kept up for our Lieutenant-Governors. I see no necessity for honours for Lieutenant-Governors, but a salary for a Governor-General and a good salary for our Governor-General. Our connection with Britain is indispensable to our national existence, at any rate to a free development of our national life and aspirations, and the Governor-General is the living-link that signifies and preserves that connection. The difference between a first and a second class man means a great deal to us. It may mean actual millions. He is the only constitutional check against possible maladministration for years. An appeal to the sovereign people ought always to be in order, and that might be needed especially when we mend or end the senate—even though the administration was sustained by the majority of the house of commons. A first-class statesman would know whether such an appeal should at any time be made. The consequence of misjudgment would fall so severely on himself that a second rate man would never take the risk.

Again, comparatively little has been said against the excessive membership and semi-ministerialism of the cabinet, although the government of the United States is carried on with less than half our number. Not only is the expense considerable, but the freedom of parliament is seriously weakened thereby. With us the cabinet is simply a committee of parliament. Now any one knows that committees have such power that it is almost impossible to defeat any proposal they make, and that the larger the committee the less freedom the body appointing it will have. It would almost seem

protectionist country. Now, while it is easy to increase business with a free trade country, because the matter is wholly in our own hands, and because monopolies cannot exist where competitors can come in from other countries and under it, it is impossible to make a general treaty with a protectionist country, say by France and Germany, free trade countries. For protected free traders to do anything like that ought to be impossible. Again, rational policy must aim at arranging the cheapest and most perfect system of exchange between our producers and their customers. Are the mass of those customers to be found in the United States or in the United Kingdom? Clearly in the latter, for, as long as the great fertile plains to the south of Canada raise more than enough for their population, and everyone that has ever seen them knows that will be for a long time to come, their inhabitants must be exporters, and can be but indifferent customers. The surplus to be sold makes the price for the lot, and the market for this surplus is Europe, and, chiefly, in the United Kingdom. Again, we are politically united with Britain, but we are no more politically united with the States, say by France and Germany. To discriminate between these rival countries would be offensive; whereas, if we were recognized as quite proper if we announced as our ultimate goal, “Free trade under the flag, with a common tariff on specified articles against the world.”

When, then, Britain and the States are bracketed together on the same plank, it looks as if there were still men in the country who had not escaped the C. U. or U. R. delusion. The suspicion that they are still in bondage will be fatal to them as politicians. Both on commercial and political grounds our policy is to encourage trade with the only country whose markets are always open to us, and always hungry, whose trade policy is steady, and in the prosperity of whose people we are most interested, because they are our fellow subjects, and ready to stand shoulder to shoulder with us in those supreme crises which at times all nations are called upon to face. This policy is in our immediate and our ultimate interest. It might be put on commercial grounds solely. But it is surely the least attractive because it is a proper sentiment for Britain is gratified at the same time. When it is seen to be bound up with our national aims and development it becomes imperative.

There are, however, some people in Canada who are more American than the Americans, and, whenever a British or a Canadian policy is propounded, they assume that the proposer is hostile to the States. I consider it expedient, therefore, to turn aside at this point from the special question of the tariff to the general question of the right attitude of Canada to the United Kingdom and the United States.

Canada has been part of the British Empire since 1763. We have evolved naturally from lower to higher stages of political life, until our self-government is well nigh complete. We have worked out a constitution better than that of the mother country or the States, and I see no reason why the evolution should stop on to our still greater advantage without any branch of imperial unity. Separation would be all loss and no gain to both the mother country and to Canada. The British Empire is the greatest instrument on earth for the promotion of peace, justice and commercial freedom, and I have no use, politically, for the man who would lessen the weight or dull the edge of that instrument, while, so far as Canada is concerned, only through the British Empire can we have our national life be freely developed. The treatment of countries like Mexico, San Domingo and Chile by the States shows that; not to refer to the little unpleasantness that we ourselves have had or such human atrocities with different times, and which, in the interest of good neighborhood, we desire to forget. This being my position, you can see that I can have no sympathy with statesmen who talk of separation as likely to take place soon, or to say that a public man or a public official has a right to advocate the breaking up of the Empire to which he belongs, or even to advocate that Canada should throw its constitution into the fire, and let it be itself from the world because it has the right to advocate a closer union of the different parts of that empire, is to manifest a lack of political instinct and almost a lack of common sense.

So much for our attitude towards Great Britain. Towards the States our attitude cannot possibly be the same, simply because the relationship is different. It is a great country, endowed by God with every conceivable kind of resource, and, as regards the people, it is enough to say that they are of substantially the same stock as ourselves. Respect them, admire them, imitate them, like them, look forward to a union in the future of the English-speaking race—that is all right. But just as they are not going to break up their own union in order to bring about any theoretic reunion, so neither are we. To break up our own empire in order to demonstrate our affection for another, or in order to gain some fancied commercial advantage, may be wisdom to parish politicians, but it is not the kind of wisdom that a self-respecting people will ever endorse. All right-thinking Canadians desire the closest possible relationship of commerce and friendship with the great republic, and it is enough to say if these now are not what they should be, that it is not our duty to trade with them, but they will neither trade freely with us in natural products nor with our mother country in manufactured products. Every overture for closer relationship has since from us and every overture has been repulsed, as decidedly when Sir John Macdonald was premier of Canada. We have made too many overtures. We have shown a great anxiety. We have thereby defeated our own object, for we have led them to wrong conclusions with

NEGLECTED

Colds & Deep Seated Coughs



SAFELY AND SURELY CURED BY
Allen's Lung Balsam.

regard to our necessities and to our spirit. No one respects a man who does not respect himself, and a man who has dealings with a richer neighbor has to be the more careful of the two in this regard. Canadians must preserve their self-respect jealously, just because their neighbors—on account of their own business—are wonderfully ignorant of Canada and just a little apt to regard it as the rich are apt to regard the poor. Further overtures from us are a waste of time, energy, dignity and money, and they simply delay the coming of an era of improved commercial relations. That will come only with the sure growth of free trade sentiment in the United States. I look forward to a happy reunion of our race with as much longing as Dr. Goldwin Smith, but to begin it with a second disruption is out of the question, and premature attempts from our side will defeat or delay the object we have at heart. In the meantime we have our own problems to solve and they have theirs. Let each country attend to its own work and it will be all the better for both of us. So far as tariffs are concerned, let both countries have their own way, and let us do business except on other terms. Protests of special affection when we are doing business excite only laughter or contempt.

Our commercial policy then is to encourage trade with Britain, the only country whose markets are open to us, and to buy as cheaply as possible from other countries whatever we must get from them. What this means in detail and what would be the advantages and probable results of the policy, are the subject of my next communication. Kingston, Nov. 2. G. M. GRANT.

No Hawaiian Freight.

San Francisco, Nov. 14.—The steamer Monowai sails for Honolulu next Thursday. The report that no freight was being offered for transmission to Honolulu by the Monowai was made the subject of investigation, and C. T. Wilder, Hawaiian consul, writes up to this morning no bills of lading had been presented to him for countersigning. As no freight can be sent to Honolulu without this formality, it is apparent that the cargo for Hawaiian ports will not be shipped. “There is considerable time,” said Mr. Wilder, “for offering consignments. It may be that merchants here do not care to risk their goods by sending them to a country where there is any chance of a revolt, and the cargo will be lost for business and the merchandise might be lost, with nobody to be responsible for it.” Besides hear the Monowai was loading with Australia's homebound world's Fair exhibits, and would be sure to carry a heavy load of goods. “We can't tell what will happen until the Monowai is ready to sail.”

The Penitentiary Wardenship.
Regarding the statements made in the eastern press as to the opposition to Mr. Fitzsimmons for the wardenship of the British Columbia penitentiary was pure ly on religious grounds and that the majority of the Roman Catholics in the province were favorable to Mr. Fitzsimmons' appointment, a prominent Irish Roman Catholic citizen yesterday announced the following statement: “As a matter of fact, the majority of the Irish Roman Catholics in Westminster are not favorable to Mr. Fitzsimmons' candidature, but, on the other hand, only a very few are in favor of Mr. Fitzsimmons. We do not look upon this as a question where the matter of religion should come in at all, and the great majority of us endorse Mr. Moresby, believing him to be the better man. It just amounts to this, that if the religious cry is kept up, the Irish Catholics of Westminster will not be long in sending a memorial to Ottawa which will convince the department of justice of the ground on which the majority of us stand. You may publish this if you like,” added the speaker.—Columbian.

No Cure, No Pay.

Men who are weak, nervous, broken down; men who suffer from the effects of disease, overwork, worry, from the follies of youth or the excesses of manhood; men who have failed to find a cure, do not despair, do not give up! Forty years experience has proved that Dr. Clarke's celebrated method of treatment can be depended on with absolute certainty to effect a permanent cure. So confident am I, that I will cure even the worst cases, that I am willing to let you deposit the money in your local bank to be paid me after you are cured and not until then; this makes you absolutely safe. If unable to call, send for free Question List and be cured at home.

Everything sent sealed, secure from exposure.

Call or address, naming this paper
Dr. F. D. CLARKE, Merrill Block, Detroit, Michigan

Dickens Out Done in Fact.

The young couple, the “Boots at the Holly Tree Inn” have, in the way of precocity, been thrown entirely in the shade by a little Indian boy and girl who have just been tried at the criminal sessions at Berhampton on a charge of bigamy. The girl and boy, aged respectively 6 and 9, were indicted for marrying, the former being at the time, to the knowledge of the bridegroom, already under the barbarous Indian custom of child betrothal, the wife of another. As the act only allows presumption of death after seven years' continuous absence of one of the parties, it was justly observed that a bride of 6 could not possibly plead that excuse. For three days little Lillith stood beside her fellow bigamist in the dock, while their respective parents were charged with abetting their offence. Ultimately the jury returned a verdict of “Not guilty,” and, as the local commentator says, “the youngsters went cheerily home again with the smallest possible conception of what all the bother was about.”

Rheumatism.
Yes, and neuralgia, too, are greatly relieved and often entirely cured by the use of Pain-Killer. Try it. 25c. for new 2-oz. bottle.