

INDUSTRIAL WORLD

AND NATIONAL ECONOMIST.

DEVOTED TO HOME INDUSTRIES, COMMERCE, FINANCE, INSURANCE, RAILROADS AND MINING

Vol. II—No. 28.

THURSDAY, JANUARY 20, 1881.

23 PER ANNUM.

Industrial World

AND NATIONAL ECONOMIST.
Issued every Thursday, by the Industrial World Publishing Company.

SUBSCRIPTION. \$3.00 PER ANNUM.

OFFICES:
MONTREAL, OTTAWA, TORONTO.

Communications, and all letters, must be addressed
INDUSTRIAL WORLD PUBLISHING CO.,
P. O. Drawer, 1010,
OTTAWA, ONT.

PRINCIPAL CONTENTS

Editorial Matter—Governments, Railways and Telegraphs.—The National Railway and the National Policy.—The New Syndicate.—A Gigantic Monopoly, etc.	17, 18 & 19
Editorial of the Commercial and Industrial Press.	20
Onto Prices Current and Weekly Review.	21
Scientific and Practical—Insurance.	22
Shipping—Railway Matters.	23
Montreal Prices Current and Weekly Review.	24
Lumber Trade.	25
General Trade—General Intelligence.	26
Money Market.	28
Miscellaneous.	29
Goods Trade.	30

GOVERNMENTS, RAILWAYS AND TELEGRAPHS.

It is remarkable how new political questions arise of the world's material progress. A great engineering work may become an important factor in the domestic or international; and a scientific invention may create the battle ground upon which two parties in a great nation are to struggle for the victory. Mr. De Lesseps built the Suez Canal with an eye principally to the benefit of France, but England makes more use of it than all other nations put together; and its use or ownership may some day set the Powers by the ears. In the United States the question of Government control over railways is daily coming to the front, that of Government ownership will not lag far behind it, and long ere the Secretary of Oregon Stephens's invention comes to the two parties in the American State will have their fight out on one or both of these lines, with the decision of a Presidential election as the result of the face of the matter, then, it appears as if material progress forms the breeding ground of new questions, political, legal and municipal. But for the question of gas, for instance, the extortions of gas companies and the demand of the public to be protected against them, would have been unknown, and the same may be said of street railways. Are we to sit, then, in supposing that, with the onward march of civilization and progress, the duties that Government has to perform must increase and multiply, and that the sphere of its action must inevitably keep extending and extending? Or are they in the right to hold that, as the world progresses, the sphere and duties of Government must contract, and private enterprise be more and more substituted for the action of a State? We declare for the former view, but we do not see the political economists against us—the whole of the school of doctrinaires and Free Traders. Among the first apostles of the "let alone" school was James Mill, who proclaimed the doctrine that "the best government is that which governs least." And the chief living apostle of the same doctrine is Herbert Spencer, whose name casts so large a shadow that no man would like to say that they differ with him, for fear of being thought stupid. Mr. Spencer has written volumes leading up to this conclusion—that as civilization advances, the individual or private enterprise, in some form or other, will take up and do all that Government used to do, that the sphere of Government action must keep contracting; and that the minimization of the functions of Government is the task of progress. Of course Free Traders are not a man, they must be so in order to be consistent. They hold it utterly preposterous to suppose that manufactures and commerce can do any better benefit from legislation; and argue that, after the removal of all acts, the best that Government can do for trade is to let it alone. The wide and sweeping theory of non-interference of the State, carried to its most possible limit, includes of course the doctrine that no attempt should be made to build up a nation's manufactures by means of Protection. Coming

down from the theory and doctrine to practical instances, we find Mr. Bismarck opposing the Free Trade acts on the ground that Government has no right to limit itself between employers and employed, except to enforce performance of contracts; and at a later period we find the same illustrious apostle of Free Trade declaring that, in taking measures against adulteration Government was exceeding its duty, inasmuch as adulteration was merely a form of competition, the regulation of which, he contended, was something that the State should not attempt at all. Here we have the statesman giving practical expression to the theory of the philosopher. But against even such great names as these some that should command respectful attention may be cited. We make but one reference at present—to the late Sir ARTHUR HAYES, a man who had the double gift of a philosophic mind and keen practical insight. We quote from the third chapter of his work entitled "Thoughts upon Government":

"It is an opinion of some people, but, as I contend, a wrong and delusive opinion, that, as civilization advances, there will be less and less need for government. I maintain, that, on the contrary, there will be more and more need. It is a melancholy fact, but it is a fact, that civilization is mostly attended by complication. And, moreover, it is attended by diminution of power, as regards individual effort. I always like to strengthen an abstract statement by some concrete illustration. Now, take lighting, for instance. There was but little occasion for government regulations when the lighting of each particular house in great cities entirely depended upon the owner of that house. But now, when the lighting, not only of public streets, but of private dwellings, is chiefly effected by four or five great centres of lighting in a town, the whole of this function has entered into the domain of government, for no one private person has power enough to regulate the matter for himself, or can in any way insure that the quality of his light shall be what he desires. A similar course of argument applies to several of the primary necessities for the well being and comfort of human life. Water supply, drainage, sewerage, means of locomotion, all enter the same category. . . . One of the principal consequences of civilization is the division of labor, and that division, though no doubt a great benefit to the commonwealth, deprives each laborer of power over those departments of labor in which he is not concerned as a laborer. His interest, therefore, in those other departments, properly and legitimately goes to the State. And practically he will find that his only influence over them will be through the influence he can exercise upon the government. It is not only in these material things that the same law applies. The individual will find that, in the greater matters of government, advancing civilization has uniformly deprived him of some personal power and influence; and that he has, it may be unconsciously, surrendered some of those functions, which would have been his under a simpler form of life and manners, to this absorbing creature called government. If he wishes Art or Science to advance, not being an artist or a scientific man, he will find that the only mode, or, at least, the chief mode of action that he can adopt, is through government. Again, advancing civilization has not rendered it easier for the individual to deal with the foreign or colonial markets which concern him. Throughout the world, its progress has only tended to complicate these matters, and rendered it more necessary that those bodies, called governments, should give ever-increasing attention to those interests which they alone can deal with. Moreover, the holding of property has not become more simple in its nature as civilization has advanced, and has not given government less to do, but more to do, in order to protect the various interests to which it should give fair play. Property, as great jurists declare, is but a creature of the State; it must not be allowed to become a noxious creature to the general community. I am persuaded that any man who will give a large circumspection to this branch of the subject will be ready to admit that advancing civilization has provided, and will continue to provide, more work to be done by the government of each nation. I am well aware that the foregoing remarks may be held to indicate the advantage of a form of government which is not approved of by many persons, who, moreover, think we have outgrown it, but which, on the contrary, I hold to be one that we must advance into, rather than recede from. This form of government is called paternal government. . . . Amongst a free people, the danger is not of too little governmental interference, rather than of too much. . . . There are people who theoretically declare that they desire the least possible governmental interference in all their affairs; but when any calamity occurs, or when any great evil, socially speaking, comes to the surface, and is much talked about, these same persons will be found joining in the cry that government ought to have foreseen this—ought to look to that, and, in short, all of sudden when it is too late, they are willing greatly to extend their views with regard to the proper functions of government. I mean the conclusion, from all that I have said in this chapter to be, that paternal government, as it is called, should be welcomed rather than abjured; and that we may be certain, in a free country, that limits will be put to its action, falling short of, rather than exceeding, those which are required for the welfare of the people governed." Sir ARTHUR HAYES evidently had a glimpse of what was coming when he put the means of locomotion among the matters with regard to which the individual is powerless to protect himself and must depend upon the government to do it for him. In England, the Government Railway Commission has considered many old abuses, and has proposed in the last many more that were just beginning to be developed; so that there the people have had a light experience, comparatively, of the tyranny of great railway companies. But what would he have said had he lived a few years longer, and had the subject of the American people to FAY and LE and GORP come into his observation?

We fancy that he would have seized upon the illustration and made it tell and would have reaffirmed in much stronger language his main proposition. What he says about the division of labor as a concomitant of civilization makes a good point, in these days of a specialty for every man, and every man for his specialty, no power short of that of the Government can protect the interest of the individual in the thing and one thing with regard to which he can do nothing for himself. Our author lays it down that if the individual, not being artist or man of science, wishes Art or Science to advance, he must depend mainly upon getting the Government to act for him in the matter. Here it seems easy to take the next step, and to say that if the individual, or any number of individuals, wish the country's manufactures and its active producing capacity generally to advance, the same *deus ex machina* must be invoked. How progress gives birth to new complications in matters colonial is easily seen. As long as Canada was merely a backwoods country, with little or no manufactures to speak of, the question of Protection or Free Trade, as affecting the interests of the colony and the parent State, respectively, was unknown. But mark what the progress of the colony brings about. Manufactures arise in Canada, the people begin to feel an interest in them; there is a demand for Protection in order that they may be still further developed, and, presto!—there is a new colonial question upon the boards. So true it is that the march of civilization and progress creates a new questions and new complications, causing, as Sir ARTHUR HAYES argues, more need of Government interference, instead of less need, as theorists of the other school erroneously maintain. When he speaks of property as declared by great jurists to be a creature of the State, which must not be allowed to become a noxious creature to the community, he anticipates the powerful and piercing argument of Judge BLACK, of Pennsylvania, respecting the indefensible right and title of the State in railway property, which recently we published in these columns. "Paternal government," of which there is, undoubtedly, in some respects, too much on the continent of Europe, is a favorite subject of ridicule with British writers, especially the political economists. But if the continent has in some things too much of this kind of government, the developments of the time are teaching the British people, by hard knocks, that to have too little of it is not a blessing. What may truly be called giant evils are rising up in the land, and John Bull will have to sweat and suffer under them until he comes to himself sufficiently to recognize how very necessary that "paternal government," which he has so much laughed at, is becoming, amid the appalling complication of interests which is being developed along with civilization and progress. From the numerous new afflictions which he has to suffer, no power less than that of the strong arm of the State can bring relief; and, after having vainly tried many other resorts, to this power he will have to appeal at last. Take this instance: The abuses connected with the water supply of London become so intolerable that pressure of public opinion drives the Government to form a scheme for buying out all the water companies at once, and so bringing relief to several millions of people. But when details come to be settled, it is found that the companies cannot be bought out short of paying them twice what their plant and property is actually worth. Parliament gives signs that it will not sanction such gigantic, gratuitous waste, and the scheme has to be dropped. But is it reasonable that, standing against the London water companies, the Government of a great nation should be paralyzed, and powerless to give the relief which the people cry for? Shall we not some day see the Government armed with power to expropriate, for the good of the people, the property of corporations, at the just and full rate of twenty shillings in the pound, and not at thirty or forty shillings, as demanded? It is not reasonable that the Commonsense which should be powerful to help itself; but still, as we say, John Bull will just have to sweat and suffer for it, until he quits himself of his British prejudice against paternal government." This kind of government, says Sir ARTHUR, "I hold to be one that we must advance into, rather than recede from." The prophecy will prove a true one: every year that passes sees something done towards its fulfillment. With regard to the danger of paternal government being carried too far, Sir ARTHUR HAYES makes a most important distinction. He says truly that amongst a free people the danger always is of too little governmental interference, rather than of too much. In Germany, under a monarchical military Government slightly tempered by the influence of a debating society called the Reichstag, the danger from too much of

the "paternal" is obvious enough. But the case is very different in England, where at every turn the Government of the day has to reckon with a real, live Parliament and a live public opinion. This living public opinion, both in and out of doors, is abundant guarantee against any "undue zeal" and too much meddling on the part of the Government. With the march of civilization and the multiplication of "modern improvements" generally, new evils arise in our midst much faster than any Government, subject to real Parliamentary control, will be disposed to attempt remedying. We, therefore, living under the British constitution, may safely give the Government very large new powers to deal with those new evils, which were wholly unknown to our grandfathers—without any fear of these powers being abused. With us the danger lies all the other way, and we shall be wise to recognize the important truth. And it must be said that, much as the truth is derided in print by British theorists, British statesmen appear to have had within themselves some sort of a practical consciousness which in certain cases has been strong enough to overrule the theory for practical purposes. The ownership of the telegraphs by the State, and the existence of the Railway Commission, form part of the very practical kind of tribute which British public opinion, under the relentless compulsion of circumstances, has to pay to a truth which in theory it repudiates. How long may it be, pray, ere the same relentless power shall have extorted even a larger measure of a similar tribute from the people of the United States? Not very long, we should imagine. JAY GOULD and VANDERBILT have been going their gait very rapidly since the war, they have now advanced a long way, and people are beginning to ask whether they are not drawing near to the end of their tether? The mercantile will soon be up in arms against the projected telegraph monopoly, as the Grangers already are against the railway companies. Is Canada meanwhile, an uninterested spectator of what is going on, with regard to railway and telegraph companies, in Great Britain and the United States? By no means: we have our great railway problem still to work out, and the telegraph problem is imminent upon us, too, if current report be near the truth. But, having said so much on the general question, we think it best to take a separate article, in which to deal with the present particular question affecting the Dominion.

THE NATIONAL RAILWAY AND NATIONAL POLICY.

What do the signs of the times indicate, with regard to the ownership and control of railways, telegraphs, and works of that kind, now mostly in the hands of incorporated companies? They indicate, as we believe, and as we have elsewhere endeavored to show, that the time is drawing near when the Government of each and every civilized country will be compelled, in justice to the people and for the safety of the State, to assume the ownership of all railways and telegraphs. At the very time when this necessity of the near future begins to loom up largely before nearly all observing men, we are about to hand over to a company our great national railway, already well commenced by the Government. According to the true spirit and essence of National Policy, this is like putting the sun ten degrees backwards on the dial; it is a concession to the evil genius of Free Trade and laissez faire, where we should have looked instead for the carrying out of the idea of the nation as a Commonwealth, with the Government as manager. But it is idle to blame the Government of the day for what is now as good as done. Both parties—Government and Opposition alike—stand committed to the policy of having the Canadian Pacific Railway built, and owned, and run by a company; and, as far as this is concerned, neither of the two can throw stones at the other. The Industrial World is not a political journal, and it takes sides with neither party. Its mission is, irrespective of political parties, to advocate the great principle of National Policy and Protection to home interests in competition with foreign interests. It claims to be the exponent of an idea—the advocate of a principle—but it does not betwixt either the advocate of one political party or the opponent of another. If either party carries out that idea, or makes as far an attempt to do so in circumstances will permit, then the policy of that party we must support, in order to be consistent with our profession. It, on the other hand, either party declares for Free Trade, or against that measure of Protection which we deem necessary for this young country, situated as it is between two fires of competition—from England and the United States—then the policy of that party we must oppose tooth and nail. We