

spirit. True, the correspondence between Messrs. Farrer, of Toronto, Wiman, of New York, and Congressman Hitt, read by Sir Charles Tupper at Windsor the other day, if genuine, shows that certain individuals on both sides of the line have been using the desire for reciprocity in trade as a means for the accomplishment of sinister and, on the part of the Canadian resident at least, treasonable ends. But that the falsity and the treason are in the men, not in the policy, is evident from the fact, from the first suspected by many and now brought to light in the same correspondence, that the "Equal Rights," or Anti-Jesuit agitation, in which not a few Canadians whose good faith and loyalty are above suspicion were induced to join, was promoted and probably originated by the same conspirator, for the same disloyal purpose. There are certainly broad and important distinctions between the reciprocity advocated by Sir John Macdonald and that advocated by Sir Richard Cartwright, and the *Spectator* is by this time, no doubt, aware that the idea of discrimination against British products is emphatically repudiated by the former. But it cannot be too distinctly understood, for the sake of Canada's good name, and for the information of Englishmen at home, who cannot be expected to follow and comprehend all the sinuosities of Canadian politics, that not only is there no evidence to show that any influential leader, in connection with either party, would entertain for a moment the idea of making political union the price of free commercial intercourse, but that both Mr. Laurier and Sir Richard Cartwright have distinctly disavowed any such idea.

WHAT, then, it may still be asked, is the real basis of the charge of disloyalty preferred by the one party against the other? We can well understand the perplexity that may prompt such a question by those viewing from a distance the fierce battle now being waged. The answer has already been given in part, but it may not be amiss for us, on the eve of the election, to attempt to re-state it, as it appears from the independent point of view. The answer is, if we understand the situation, that the Conservative or Government leaders declare that the unrestricted reciprocity advocated by the leaders of the Liberal or Opposition party, involving, as it undeniably does, tariff discrimination against British goods; and involving, as the Conservatives maintain that it does, the surrender by Canada of the right to frame her own tariffs in respect to other nations, and the adoption of those virtually fixed for her at Washington, would tend directly towards and must presently end in political union or absorption. We do not know that the responsible Conservative leaders directly charge the responsible Liberal leaders with contemplating or intending this result, though the "veiled treason" of Sir John Macdonald's Manifesto sounds like such an imputation. But the policy they denounce as disloyal, whatever may be the motives of its advocates. They further hold that unrestricted reciprocity would be ruinous to the Canadian manufactures which have been fostered by the National Policy, and would, therefore, be treasonable to Canada as well as to Great Britain. On the other hand the Liberal leaders maintain that reciprocity in trade, restricted or unrestricted, is a mere matter of business relations, and has nothing to do with national politics; that, while they regret the necessity of discriminating against British goods, the country, being shut up to a choice of evils, has no alternative, without sacrificing its prosperity to a degree which would threaten its very existence; that true Canadian loyalty demands that Canadian interests must be consulted even before those of the Mother Country, that the real interests of the latter would be promoted by a good understanding between Canada and the United States, even though purchased at the cost of discrimination against British manufactures; and, finally, that unrestricted reciprocity does not necessarily involve commercial union or uniformity of tariffs. Divested of all side issues and personal considerations—and the personality of Sir John Macdonald will unquestionably count for much in determining the issue—these seem to be the chief points of antagonism. It is unhappily true, no doubt, that a very large proportion of those who vote will vote for their party, without any very profound investigation of principles or policies. But those who desire to free themselves from the fetters of partizanship, and to vote on the merits of the policies, will find themselves called upon to decide these questions: First, would unrestricted reciprocity, as proposed, be necessarily disloyal to the Mother Country, and would it necessarily lead or tend to annexation? Second, would it, by destroying the National Policy, prove disastrous to Canadian manufactures, and

make us, as a people, industrially subservient to the United States? Third, is there any possibility of securing restricted reciprocity, if so, will it meet the necessities of the Canadian situation, and if not, is there any other course open by which those necessities can be met? When they shall have decided these questions to their own satisfaction, they will be ready to deposit their ballots.

THOUGHTFUL citizens of Toronto will be somewhat relieved to know that another effort is to be made to secure the appointment of a competent medical health officer for the city. The Council at a recent meeting declined to appoint any one of the four applicants whose names have been so long before the public and resolved, on motion of the Mayor, to advertise again for applications for the position. As it was further decided that the minimum salary offered should be \$3,000, the prospects of receiving applications from thoroughly qualified men are considerably improved, though it is still doubtful whether the sum named will prove sufficient to secure the services of one of the high scientific attainments required for such a position. It is to be devoutly hoped that the opening of the Spring may not find the city without a Medical Health Officer, not only be fully qualified for so responsible a position, but clothed with all the authority needful to enable him to discharge the duties of his office faithfully and fearlessly. By all means let the Council set aside for the nonce its quibbling propensities and grapple resolutely with the question of having the city cleansed, and its houses, yards, lanes, and streets put into a thoroughly sanitary condition before the coming of another hot season. The matter is one involving not only the health of the citizens, but it may be the very lives of scores, possibly of hundreds of them.

THE terrible calamity which has befallen the Springhill collieries in Nova Scotia has sent a thrill of horror throughout the Dominion. The thought of more than one hundred and twenty stalwart men sent down to death in an instant, and without a moment's warning, is appalling, while the fact that not less than fifty-five widows and one hundred and sixty-five fatherless children survive to mourn the loss of husbands, fathers and bread-winners, appeals powerfully to the sympathies of every generous heart. In very few cases, it may be safely assumed, will the dead labourer have been able to make any adequate provision for those who were dependent upon his daily labour for the necessities of life. The need of prompt and liberal assistance is obvious, and we may be sure that it will be forthcoming from all parts of the Dominion without stint. It is to be hoped that the measures of relief taken may be systematic and thorough, having regard to the future as well as the present. In the immediate presence of such a sorrow the public will gladly respond to any appeal that may be made, but too often the relief afforded is but temporary, while the want and suffering entailed are abiding. It would be a reproach to Canadian charity to leave any of these bereaved ones to drag out wretched lives in poverty and suffering for years to come, and it is to be hoped that effective means may be found to prevent this. The first duty is evidently to care for the wants, present and prospective, of the destitute wives and children. After that a rigid and impartial investigation into the causes of the catastrophe will be in order. Such events do not happen without cause, and, though it may be that the one whose carelessness or ignorance may have wrought the catastrophe has not survived to tell the tale, it is imperative, with a view to the prevention of similar disasters, that the exact cause shall be discovered, if possible.

THE recent debate in the British House of Commons on Mr. Howard Vincent's motion for the calling of a colonial conference to consider the best means of forming an Imperial Zollverein, and the speech of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, President of the Board of Trade, at the annual dinner of the London Chamber of Commerce, a day or two after, are the latest important contributions to the discussion of the question of Imperial Federation. Whether the balance of opinion and influence elicited on the two occasions is deemed encouraging or the reverse to the prospects of Imperial Federation depends, it is evident, on the mental attitude of the reader. Those who regard the proposed federation as an utterly impracticable and visionary scheme find in the speech of Mr. Goschen, and the admissions of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, strong confirmation of their own foregone conclusions. The advocates of the great project will, on the other hand, take courage from the friendly and sympathetic tone in which both Ministers

recognized the increasing desire for a closer union between Britain and her colonies. The fact that the question has attained sufficient importance to call forth a motion and a debate in the House of Commons, and to be made the subject of a sympathetic reference on an important occasion by the President of the Board of Trade, is certainly noteworthy, and, from one point of view, encouraging. It is always an important stage in the progress of any great movement, when it has gained such a place in the public estimation as to become a matter of debate in influential circles. It does not, however, follow that every movement which gains that stage is sure of ultimate success. It is really the testing stage. As we have frequently had occasion to point out, the commercial question is likely to prove the rock upon which every attempt at federation of the Empire is foredoomed to split. If the colonies were prepared to federate on a free-trade basis, or if the Mother Country was prepared to consider a basis of differential tariffs, all else would be comparatively easy. This is confessedly not the highest ground on which to debate such a proposition, but commercial facts are inexorable. We should be, we hope, among the last to depreciate lofty sentiment in a matter of this kind, but it is, we think, undeniably obvious that whatever impetus the movement has gained in Canada, it has its chief source in commercial embarrassments arising out of the high tariff wall with which our wealthy neighbour to the south is surrounding his premises, and the necessity of finding new markets for our products. Hence Imperial Federation without preferential trade arrangements would fail to meet one of the chief conditions of the problem, so far as Canada is concerned. When, then, Mr. Goschen, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, tells the House of Commons that the Colonists must understand that it is impossible for England to tax corn, and his statement is received with cheers, he throws a barrier across the path of the movement which neither his subsequent expression of sympathy with its purpose nor even his vague admission that the English people must be prepared for some fiscal changes in the interests of that movement can suffice to clear away. In the absence of a fuller report of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's words, it is difficult to understand his meaning, if he actually said that it did not follow because differential tariffs were impossible that a commercial Zollverein between Great Britain and the colonies was impossible. Perhaps a more accurate report by mail will enable us to see with him how a commercial union can be conceived of as possible without differential tariffs, a feat to which we confess ourselves at present unequal.

WITH the death of General Sherman the last of the three really great generals discovered and developed by the fratricidal war of the United States has passed from the stage. Grant, Sheridan and Sherman were a trio of strangely diverse and even contrasted characters, but each was in his way a military genius. It may, perhaps, be straining a little the proper meaning of the word "genius" to apply it to General Grant, whose strongest qualities, and those which brought him the glory of the final victory, were rather dogged determination, and reliance upon sheer weight and persistent pressure of overwhelming numbers, than any brilliant abilities as a strategist. Sheridan's genius as a dashing cavalry commander there is less room to doubt, though his career afforded no evidence that he possessed the abilities needed for the successful direction of a large army in a difficult campaign. Of the three names there is little doubt that General Sherman's will survive in history as that of the one best entitled to rank amongst great military chiefs. His March to the Sea was undoubtedly the greatest achievement of the war, if the relative strength of forces, and the formidable character of the difficulties and dangers to be met, are taken into the account. Hence the plan and execution of this march have probably been studied and will continue to be studied by the military commanders and in the military schools of other nations more than any other expedition of the War of the Rebellion. One of the strangest facts in General Sherman's life history is the slow development of his talents. In the earlier period of his life he had failed in business and had not succeeded in law. Not only so, but the history of his earlier years as a military officer was far from being a record of success. He was for a time exasperatingly slow in the movement of his troops, and seemingly over-cautious and irresolute, if not absolutely timid, in the presence of even inferior forces of the enemy as e. g. when he retreated from Cumberland Gap or when he wanted 60,000 men to cope with 12,000 Confederates in Kentucky. It would seem that it was only in the later