

Once impressed upon the general sense of the mercantile world, these rules will make the law, and legislators will endorse them.

LORD DUFFERIN'S FAREWELL SPEECH.

It would be strange indeed if even Lord Dufferin could deliver a speech of such a character as that to which we adverted in our last number without exposing himself to criticism. We can hardly be surprised that Mr. Goldwin Smith should have felt that a portion of that speech may have been intended as a warning to those who do not conceal their opinion that the political destiny of Canada is absorption in the adjoining republic. Mr. Goldwin Smith has criticized Lord Dufferin's speech in the *Spectator*, and we are pleased that he has done so, because we feel assured that discussion will establish the correctness of Lord Dufferin's views. Lord Dufferin had illustrated the folly of a people in the enjoyment of a constitutional system of government, affording them the utmost liberty at the smallest possible expense, speculating on what may happen some hundred years hence, by comparing it to the folly of a man in the enjoyment of perfect health doctoring himself until he superinduced imaginary pains, and perhaps a real illness. Lord Dufferin clearly and unmistakably applied his remarks to the healthy state of our political institutions, but Mr. Goldwin Smith remarks on the passage: "It happened that 'the people whom Lord Dufferin was addressing, and whom he describes politically as a type of jovial health, had just overturned their Government in the 'hope of escaping by fiscal change from a 'state of commercial depression which 'they found intolerable, and which was 'manifestly the consequence in some 'measure, of their exclusion from continental markets by the existing political 'system.' Now, unless the foregoing passage means that the remedy for our commercial depression is annexation to the United States, we own that we fail to discover what it is. We are not unaware that attempts have been made during the late political campaign to create discontent among our people, on the ground that they are excluded from neighboring markets by protective duties. The victorious party has encouraged a belief that the adoption of what is termed a national policy will afford substantial relief. That they have been too sanguine, we have no doubt, adverting to the fact that the depression which is found so intolerable prevails to fully as great an extent in Free Trade England and in Protectionist

United States as in Canada, which, strictly speaking, is neither the one nor the other. The important point, as bearing on Lord Dufferin's speech, is that the party of which Sir John Macdonald is the recognized leader would repudiate as strongly as its opponents the imputation that "the existing political system" is chargeable with the depression, or that relief is to be obtained by a change of that system. The contending parties at the late election differ no doubt very widely as to the best mode of dealing with our tariff under existing circumstances, but they do not differ as to the power of our Legislature to apply whatever remedy may appear to it best. Mr. Smith's contention is that "a nation must have a future," and that "by its conception of that future its present policy must be guided." We willingly accept the proposition. We do not concur with Mr. Goldwin Smith in conceiving that our future is to be absorption in the United States, and we must therefore object to a policy based on the realization of such a conception.

It is easy to sneer, as Mr. Goldwin Smith does, at what he terms Lord Dufferin's "chimera," that but for an untimely quarrel the United States might have remained a happy dependency of Great Britain, "under the gracious rule of Governor 'Generals, and sending up clouds of incense in their honor." The idea, doubtless, appears chimerical to us after a century of independence, but Mr. Goldwin Smith and those who concur with him in prognosticating revolution fail altogether to give due weight to the aversion of the people of every country to civil war, which invariably precedes revolution. This error is one into which English statesmen and the English press almost invariably fall when they discuss the subject. They declare that in the present day England will never coerce the colonies into remaining dependencies when it suits them to change their political condition. Now, such declarations are based on the assumption that the people of the colony would, with at least an approach to unanimity, demand peaceable separation. In the United States, prior to the revolution, there was always a party of loyalists, and there can be no doubt that even among the revolutionists there was a powerful party most unwilling to resort to extremities. Now, Lord Dufferin feels assured, and we think with good reason, that all questions which may in the future arise between Great Britain and the Dominion of Canada can be amicably adjusted, and if so, he is justified by history, to which Mr. Goldwin Smith appeals, in believing that it will be impossible to incite the

people to revolt. We have our own experience to aid us in arriving at a conclusion. It is now admitted that the grossest misgovernment prevailed in Canada before the Union in 1840, and that the mass of the people in Lower Canada not only felt that misgovernment, but utterly detested the remedy, viz., the Union, and yet, how insignificant were the numbers who would incur the risk of revolt. It may be a chimera to speculate on what the political institutions of the United States would have been to-day if England had acted justly in the last century, just as it would be to speculate on what the institutions and the dynasty of Great Britain might be if a wholly different line of policy had been adopted two centuries ago. Mr. Goldwin Smith closes his criticism as follows:—"Truth has at best a poor chance 'against rank; if she were gagged she 'would have no chance at all." We should be sorry indeed that it were possible to gag Mr. Goldwin Smith, but in his reference to "rank" he should bear in mind that the "truth" enunciated by Lord Dufferin is in accordance with the sentiments of the Canadian people, as evidenced by the fact that the opinions occasionally ventilated by Mr. Goldwin Smith have never been formulated into a motion in either the Senate or Commons of Canada. Irish Home Rule is not a conception so likely to be realized that Parliament would dream of taking into account in their present legislation the possibility of its being adopted fifty or one hundred years hence; but Irish Home Rule has its advocates in the House of Commons, and, in addition, a large national support, whereas in Canada Mr. Goldwin Smith cannot get a member of Parliament or a public meeting to endorse his chimera. We are ready to admit that there are men of a speculative turn of mind, and possibly some in Parliament, who share Mr. Smith's opinion; but the very fact that they keep those opinions to themselves affords proof that they feel that public opinion is against them.

Lord Dufferin has rendered good service by becoming the exponent of Canadian sentiment on this important question, and we feel assured that both political parties will appreciate that service.

—An attachment has issued against G. A. Perry, store keeper, of Coteau Landing. Mr. Perry was formerly at Coteau Station, where he was burnt out and had \$2,000 insurance in the notorious Niagara District Mutual. The company contested the claim, and though Mr. Perry got judgment in his favor, we believe he never recovered the amount of his claim. This loss crippled his resources materially, and he has ever since been at a disadvantage. His liabilities are estimated at about \$7,000 to \$8,000.