

asunder and to some extent commingle, only to be reformed on new lines and with new battle cries. What the coming issues will be is a question of the greatest importance to the future of Canada.

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND has on several occasions shown himself brave and strong above the average, but his message to Congress the other day was, almost unquestionably, his strongest and bravest deed. It is of course always open to the cynical to say of such an act of seeming daring that it is the offspring of shrewd forecast, and a nice calculation of chances. The great majority of honest men will in this case prefer to believe that this bold challenge of what had come to be regarded as the fixed "national policy," this single-handed and vigorous assault upon the combined forces of capital, monopoly, prejudice, and intrigue, is the outcome of sterling patriotism. It is the work of a man who finds, or thinks he finds, the path of public duty and strikes into it without hesitation and without ostentation. What will be the immediate result, either upon his own prospects of a second term or, what is of vastly more importance, upon the action of Congress and the welfare of the Nation, a few weeks or months will tell. This much may be safely said. The singular force of the message, intensified as it is by abstention from all other topics, will set the whole people to thinking, as nothing else of which it is easy to conceive could have done. And when a law or custom indefensible in itself, and upheld only by selfish interests or national prejudices, is once placed in such a light that the people of every grade are forced to think about it, to talk about it, to examine its foundations and look into its merits, the end, in an intelligent nation, is but a question of time. President Cleveland's message has, there can be little doubt, sounded the knell of exorbitant taxation in the United States, whether the end comes swiftly or slowly.

A SINGULARLY purblind view is that of a Canadian Conservative journal which observes that the President's message, in this instance, has not a particle of interest for any one outside of the United States. The matters with which it deals, however important in themselves, are, according to this view, of purely domestic concern. Some of the English newspapers see much farther. While naturally disposed to rejoice over any indication of advance in the direction of the British free-trade policy, they cannot close their eyes to the fact that any large reduction of the United States tariff might have a very serious meaning for England. Would it not mean, for instance, the resurrection of American commerce, and a keener competition than English manufacturers have yet known in the world's markets? If American ingenuity and energy, fettered and enervated by high protective duties, have already wrought such wonders, what might they not achieve, if thrown more completely upon their own vast resources, freed from the incubus of heavy taxation upon much of their raw material, and so entering the contest upon equal terms? To Canada, overburdened with debt and comparatively destitute of capital, the effect of any radical change in the fiscal policy of her powerful neighbour would be still more serious. If the exodus across the border is already so great as to prove a considerable drain upon her strength, what would it become were the United States to be made the cheaper country to live in, while her energies were stimulated, her commercial marine resuscitated and all her industries made to feel the thrill of the new and larger life which free intercourse with the whole outside world could not fail to bring?

ANOTHER interesting question suggested by the President's Message we do not remember to have seen alluded to. Would the means he recommends accomplish the end in view? That end is, of course, the diminution of the revenue by the amount of the surplus now annually accruing. Whatever his own personal views, President Cleveland says nothing of free trade or of tariff reduction below the protective limit. The necessity for such reduction is, as he very forcibly, if not irresistibly, shows, imperative. The best and highest interests of the whole nation are absolutely imperilled by the enormous and rapidly growing surplus in the Treasury. This is now admitted on almost every hand, tacitly admitted even by Mr. Blaine in his proposal to reach the same end by the less feasible and more objectionable method of reduction of internal taxation. But suppose that President Cleveland's specific should fail. Mr. Gladstone in former days astonished the world with his wizard feat of increasing the national revenue by lowering the taxation. Might not the same cause produce the same effects in the United States? Might not the volume of importation, released in part from the heavy pressure to which it has been so long subjected, go up with a bound that would result in bringing more money into the treasury under the lighter scale of duties? What would follow? To retrace the steps already taken would be probably out of the question. What other way of escape save through throwing open the doors still more widely in the direction of Free Trade?

AN anti-immigration bill is to be introduced during the current session of the American Congress. Its essential features are a tax upon every foreigner coming into the country, and a certificate by the United States Consul in the district from which the immigrant comes, that he is a suitable person for citizenship in the great Republic. The proposal, which, seems likely to meet with favour, opens up some very large questions. The fundamental one is that of the abstract right of the people of any country to forbid the poor of other lands from entering upon, and occupying its unoccupied places. We use, of course, the word "right" in its broadest sense, that of moral justice. At what particular stage of progress does a nation acquire such a right? How many people, for instance, were needed in the United States, or what percentage of its area had to be occupied before such a right was acquired? Such legislation, again, appears rather ungrateful in view of the fact that so many of the best citizens of the States were once themselves "strangers and foreigners," and that so much of the blood shed for the preservation of the Union was alien blood. As has been pointed out once and again, if the Anarchists, who a few weeks ago paid the penalty of their crime of wholesale murder, were foreigners, so were almost to a man the brave policemen who lost their lives in defence of law and order. A more practical question, and one worthy of serious consideration, is raised by the *Christian Union*, based upon the fact that the incursions of the great bodies of Poles, Hungarians, and Italians, who now do the mining and railroad building, have been rendered necessary by the fact that the Welsh, English, and Americans who formerly did this work have risen to be shop-keepers, farmers, lawyers, and the like. The question is, whether it "is not better to have immigration come in at the bottom and force native populations up, than to have it come in at the top and force native populations down?" There is a point in this worth considering in Canada as well as for the United States.

SOME startling facts with reference to the operations of American land-monopolists are given in the published abstracts of Secretary Lamar's forthcoming report. He shows that since March 4, 1885, there have been recovered and restored to the public domain upwards of 45,000,000 acres. Nearly half of this has been re-taken from the railway companies, and a large part of the remainder by the cancellation of illegal or fraudulent land entries. The Secretary urges upon Congress the necessity for more stringent legislation for the prevention of land-grabbing practices. No doubt a large part of the enormous frauds thus frustrated were perpetrated upon the Indians, whose reservations are considered in too many cases fair booty for the greedy whites in the vicinity. The Government and people of the United States seem at last to be thoroughly aroused to a sense of their obligations to the Indians, and are taking vigorous measures for their protection from the cruel rapacity which not only despoils them of the property given them by treaty, and crowds them off the best lands of their reservations, but is the chief cause of the so-called Indian outbreaks.

THE facts brought out in the discussion raised by the meeting of the International Conference on the Sugar Bounties, in London, go far to show that if the French and Germans are satisfied with the arrangement the British have little cause to complain. A system which enables the Londoner to buy his sugar for 3d., while the Frenchman pays 8d. for the privilege of having the manufacture carried on in his country, should, one would suppose, be vastly more satisfactory to the former than to the latter. It is no wonder that the consumption of sugar increased in the United Kingdom from less than seventeen pounds per head in 1841, to over sixty-eight pounds in 1883, seeing that the cost of the sixty-eight pounds in the latter year was but a trifle more than that of the seventeen pounds in the former. The *London Times* may well compliment the "Foreign Governments," on being "good enough to subsidize our (British) consumers to the amount of £2,000,000 or upwards." Nor in the matter of industrial employment has the matter worked so badly for Great Britain. While by reason of increased consumption the importation of sugar has not lessened the demand for labour in its manufacture in England, it has largely increased that demand in other directions by making London, instead of Paris, the head-quarters of the confectionery business, and the seat of immense jam factories. More than twice as many labourers, it appears, are employed in these industries as in the establishments of the sugar-refiners, while for the reason indicated the business of the latter has largely increased. The strangest fact in connection with the exhibit is that the consumers of France and Germany are willing to go on paying twice as much, or more, for their sugar as their British neighbours, and consequently to stint themselves in its use from one-half to one-fourth the quantity, all for the advantage of a few manufacturers.