

there will not be land enough in the entire country to satisfy the railways. The railways will own all the land, and will still be unsatisfied." It must not be forgotten, moreover, that the lands already bestowed are largely "the pick and choice of the country." The *Commercial* goes on to argue with much force that, apart from the danger of exhausting the supply, the policy of land grants to corporations or private speculators is iniquitous in principle. "The public lands should be held for the people." We have not now space to follow the argument in detail, or to discuss the important question involved. Whatever may be said in favour of the cautious giving of land-grants as the only available means, if it be such, of building railroads and opening up the country, the giving or selling for a trifle of large tracts or small to private speculators and corporations is demonstrably wrong. Vastly better it would be to distribute it in second homesteads, for in that case no one man could acquire more than three hundred and twenty acres. The *Commercial* is right, too, in insisting that in cases where the injury has been already done, it should be counteracted as far as possible by holding the corporations strictly to the conditions upon which the grants were given, and reclaiming for the public, on equitable terms, the lands, in all cases in which the conditions have not been fulfilled. We agree with our contemporary in commending the subject to the thoughtful consideration of the people of Canada, as one which concerns the welfare of all.

WHILE we are by no means sure that it would be sound in principle, or wise in practice, for the Government of Canada to commence a policy of "encouraging talent" by providing places in the public service for her budding or blooming geniuses, it is impossible not to sympathize with the proposal made the other day in Parliament by Mr. McNeill and heartily concurred in by Mr. Laurier, that a position in the Library be given to William Wilfred Campbell. Mr. Campbell is, it appears, already in the public service, being employed in the Railway Department at \$1.50 per day. No one who has read the poem "Mother" can doubt that Mr. Campbell is endowed with poetic talent of a very high order, and, though there is much to be said in favour of leaving genius, as well as mediocrity, to make its own way, there can be no harm in throwing an opportunity in the line of that way, when it can be done without loss to the public or injury to the self-respect of the individual. Both these conditions could no doubt be met, in the way proposed, for there must be service that could be rendered by such a man in connection with the Parliamentary Library which would be a fair equivalent for a moderate salary, and in the performance of which he could gain time and opportunity for the fuller development of his rare poetic powers.

EITHER the Emperor of Germany is a man of most uncertain moods, or the responsibilities of his high position have wrought a salutary change in his character. We all remember the jingoistic speeches which in the early months after his accession threatened the peace of the world. The diplomatists of Europe for a time almost held their breath as they waited for his next utterance or movement. After a little, a turn of the kaleidoscope showed the Emperor in the rôle of a social reformer, interesting himself in the welfare of the workingman, listening to the tale of his grievances and trying, in what we may now regard as genuine earnestness, however sceptical we may have been at the time, to master the industrial situation with a view to its improvement. For a year or more past all the acts and utterances of the man whose advent to the throne was dreaded, as would be that of a firebrand in a storehouse of combustibles, have been those of a peacemaker. His last reported words are such as would do honour to the heart as well as the head of any Christian monarch. Sooner than precipitate a war which seemed inevitable, for the sake of securing a preliminary advantage, he would use his influence to postpone it even for a month, in the hope that a way of peace might be found. If this is, in truth, the Emperor's feeling, and we see now no reason to doubt his sincerity, the effect in prolonging, and possibly perpetuating, the peace of Europe must be very great. Nor has he confined himself to words alone. His recent action in removing of his own free will the irritating passport regulations, which have done so much to exasperate the French on both sides of the Alsace and Lorraine border, was an act of justice and good sense bordering on the magnanimous. His withdrawal of the edict prohibiting German capitalists from

subscribing to the Russian loan is perhaps of a more doubtful character. It seems to be suspected in diplomatic circles of having been prompted by a shrewd confidence that the Germans would of their own accord refuse to subscribe, thus making the Czar's rebuff all the more marked and cutting. If it stood alone it might suggest that as the most reasonable interpretation. Viewed in connection with other acts, such as those referred to, there is at least room to ascribe the more charitable motive and hope that the change was prompted by a genuine desire to remove unnecessary causes of irritation, and pave the way to a better state of feeling between the two great Powers concerned. The future course of Emperor William will be followed with increased interest by reason of late meritorious words and doings.

HOW FREE TRADE WITH THE WORLD WOULD BENEFIT CANADA.

IT is a well known historical fact that the manufacturers of Great Britain first opposed the doctrine of free trade, and then warmly adopted it. It is also an indisputable fact that the reason for their change of mind was, largely, the recognition of the fact that free trade, by enabling them to buy their materials in the cheapest markets, and by cheapening the cost of living for the workingman, would enable them to greatly lower the cost of production, and increase their margin of profit. While free trade, however, gave a vast impetus and a solid foundation to the manufacturing industry of Great Britain, it disturbed for a time the agricultural industry, and it is only now, indeed, that careful observers are able to inform us that the British farmers in general are successfully adapting their methods and their productions to the new conditions that were brought about by the adoption of free trade. That the British farmer has had a strong undercurrent belief that the principle is the right one in the end is surely evidenced by the fact that during these many years of his struggle no protectionist party has gained a serious foothold with the people.

I propose to endeavour to show in this article that the principle which has so vastly benefited Great Britain on the whole would also vastly benefit Canada as a whole. It would be absurd, of course, to argue that *because* free trade has benefited Great Britain it would benefit any other country, and therefore Canada, as the conditions in the two countries are entirely different; and it is the conditions always which must govern any political or fiscal theory. Great Britain is essentially a manufacturing country. Her cultivatable area is not sufficient to afford food-stuffs for her great population, and her wealth has therefore to depend upon the fullest and most economical use of the natural and other advantages which make her a world workshop and a world carrier. *Cheapness of production* is the simple, open secret of her commercial and manufacturing power, and cheapness of production is best obtained by the freest of free trade.

Now let us apply that principle to the conditions of Canada. Canada is essentially an agricultural country. Her cultivatable area is vastly in excess of the needs of her population, and the exports of surplus products of the soil have always been greatly larger than the exports of manufactured articles. She is not, and is not likely to be for many years to come, a world workshop. But she is a world food-raiser, and any policy that will most strengthen her position in that respect is the one that will most greatly add to her general wealth. Now, I contend that the farmers of Canada need to be placed in the same position as the manufacturers of Great Britain. They should be enabled to produce their exports at the lowest possible cost. To do this they must be allowed to buy everything they need in the cheapest markets, whether their wants refer to the household or to the farm. They should be allowed to buy clothing and every other necessary of life where they can buy them cheapest, and no restriction should be placed upon the implements, the machinery, the raw materials and the fertilizers required for the farm. Free trade, and free trade only, can enable our farmers to buy in the cheapest markets, and therefore produce at the lowest possible cost.

Such, in bold outline and plain words, is the free trader's position; but there remain to be considered the practicability of the principle and its general effects apart from the advantages that would accrue to the agricultural interest.

For the purposes of Government a tariff, whether it be for protection or for revenue, is necessary as long as the people are unwilling to accede to direct taxation. The practical difficulty which arises is the question whether the difference between direct and indirect taxation can be made sufficiently clear to the electorate. By both of the political parties, directly and indirectly, direct taxation has been made so much of a bugbear to frighten the timid that it is doubtful if an intelligent expression of opinion on the subject could be obtained at the polls at the present time. The farmers of Canada are as blind to their own interests as the manufacturers of Great Britain were when Mr. Villiers and Mr. Cobden began to speak to them. But there is more in the way than the ignorance of the electorate regarding direct and indirect taxation; there is the natural hesitancy as to the effect of free trade upon our manufacturing interests. Some of our manufactures

would suffer; there is not the slightest room for doubt about that. Some workshops (let me state it frankly) which should never have been opened, would be closed, and there would be a temporary disturbance of the manufacturing interest in Canada just as there was a temporary disturbance of the agricultural interest in Great Britain. But the manufactures indigenous and proper to the country would not suffer, and would have no further burden laid upon them than to adapt their productions and their methods to the needs of the home market. By a parity of reasoning with what has been observed in Great Britain, the manufacturers of Canada would see that their most substantial interests lie in the best development of the chief source of the country's general wealth. The parity of reasoning, of course, can only be properly carried out by a recognition of the fact that the conditions in the two countries are almost opposite.

As to the general effects of free trade upon the country, apart from the advantages that would accrue to the agricultural interest, there is an immense *arcum* of thought opened, both political and national, or rather national and international. The free trader sees an unhampered, successful agricultural population, steadily growing in culture and knowledge and forming a solid and permanent national groundwork. He sees a whole people devoting themselves to the elevation and advancement of an industry for which the country as a whole is most suited, and which most greatly adds to its wealth. And he sees in it, moreover, the true Independence that will lead to the most lasting Federation of his Anglo-Saxon brothers. Is it merely a dream? The question has yet to be threshed out.

J. C. SUTHERLAND.

Richmond, Que.

A PARSON'S PONDERINGS ON "SUPPORT- ING YOUR SUPPORTERS."

I HAVE just read my WEEK of to-day (Sept. 18), and its first page has set me a-thinking. It discussed the New Frauds Bill, and took high moral ground—very high indeed; it demanded that the Frauds Bill should begin higher. It would make it hot, not only for the man who gives presents to a Minister, but even for "the man who, having sold or wishing to sell goods to a department, makes a contribution, voluntary or solicited, to the electoral fund of the party to which the Minister belongs." Now this would be indeed heroic treatment, and might eventually reverse the present order of things, driving out of existence "the unlimited collection and use of money for election purposes," which is confessedly the bane of our political system.

I am not enough of a politician to discuss the ethics of this question from a political standpoint, but, as a parson, I would suggest that the proposed legislation should begin even higher yet. Instead of confining itself to Ministers of State and their clients, suppose it should reach even to Ministers of Religion and their flocks? The enforcement of the maxim, "Support your supporters," sometimes falls heavily on the clergy. Many a time is a poor pastor remonstrated with by the members or officials of his congregation for *not* supporting his supporters; many a time does he get some such hint as this, "I want to tell you, as a friend, that Mr. Tozer is offended with you; he talks of leaving your church and joining Mr. Smith's or Mr. Brown's church, because you don't deal at his store." Now under such circumstances there are two courses open to the offending minister. On the one hand he may pursue his own independent way. In that case he will lose Mr. Tozer, and then he will soon hear the mutterings of discontent at his alienating the members of his flock. On the other hand he may submit and patronize Mr. Tozer henceforth; in that case he must "grin and bear it" if he should perchance find himself the victim of stale groceries, or tough meat, or ill-fitting garments, all purchased at the highest price, in order to retain the good graces of Mr. Tozer.

Now the question is: Supposing the parson adopts the latter course, is he a "Boodler"? I confess I cannot draw the line between his conduct and that of a contractor, let us say—who subscribes to the election fund. The difference seems to me to be one of degree and not of kind. To be sure there is a vast difference between the amount of the contractor's cheque and the poor parson's little grocery bill, but the principle in each transaction is the same, I ween; it is "supporting your supporters." Now, if I am correct in my premises, I must needs confess with a heavy heart that I have more than once in my life been guilty (or the victim) of this species of "Boodling."

The fact is the Old Adam in us all dies hard, and legislation, in order to exterminate him, must go very deep. How would it be for the Government to enact that, "Whosoever shall join any congregation or church and subscribe to its funds in order to obtain the custom and patronage of the members of such church or of the pastor thereof, shall be judged guilty of Boodling"; or again, "If any pastor of a church shall patronize any shop or store, and so make bad purchases or bargains, simply in order to secure or retain the attendance in his church of the master or owner of such shop or store, he shall be judged guilty of Boodling"?

Alas! if such laws were passed I wonder how many would escape of all the preachers who have of late aroused the indignation of the land with their eloquence concerning wickedness in high places!