

too great a price for the luxury of having a Bismarck. They may be fanatics, but such folly always proves a fruitful soil from which fools may grow, and Germany will have to take into serious consideration her present attitude in Europe. She is a great military power, but the nation is not rich; poverty among the masses will breed and foster discontent, and Socialism feeds upon that. It has before happened in world-history that great armies have killed the Empire they were raised to protect. The world cannot live on armies, but only on industry of brains and hands.

MR. MACKENZIE ON THE STUMP.

The Prime Minister, along with some ardent supporters, is making a great effort to teach the public to know who are their true friends, and how they ought to vote at the coming election. It is a great institution—and not at all a bad one—this of stumping the country to make speeches. It gives an opportunity for public men to air themselves and their sentiments, to make manifest their powers of rhetoric or logic, to appeal to the passion and reason of those who have to make choice of men to represent them in Parliament. There is a very evident advantage in having a statesman tell his thoughts and purposes before an assembly of people, because he may then be expected to speak with calmness and clearness, after careful preparation and in view of important issues.

It is almost, if not quite, a pity that Mr. Mackenzie should have so loudly proclaimed his peculiar mission to the workingmen. The workingmen are a great class, an important part of the community, but only a part, and with no separate and distinct interests of their own. What is good for the nation is good for the workingmen. Mr. Mackenzie told the workingmen of Toronto that "they were the true source of political power—that the workingman has made the country, and it is the workingman who is to give the country power for the future, and make it great in the eyes of the world." That is toadyism with a vengeance. If the workingman is all this, why did Mr. Mackenzie step down to work on a lower and less honourable level? What may be said of the men who think, and plan, and guide the workingman; what of those who employ their capital; are they to be counted only as fine dust in the balance? Mr. Mackenzie speaks of "those who may be a step *above* the workingman in the social scale," who are they? The workingmen "are the true source of political power;" they have made the country, and are going to make it great in the eyes of the world, and yet, there may be some a step above the workingman in the social scale. Surely power, honour, greatness cannot rise higher than its source. Not the masters, but the clerks make the business; we must not look to the mistress of the house for the comforts of a home, but to the servants, according to Mr. Mackenzie. Those who think, who give impulse and direction to those who work with their hands are nothing at all in Mr. Mackenzie's estimation; are not the true source of political power; have done nothing to make the country what it is, and give no promise of doing anything to make the country great in the eyes of the world.

And yet, Mr. Mackenzie went back once again to the time when the pyramids were being built in Egypt, to show that the workingmen have bettered their own condition. Did it ever occur to Mr. Mackenzie that the change was brought about by the exercise of those faculties by the workingmen which characterise those "who may be a stage above them in the social scale." Hear how pleasantly the summer rain patters about the ears of the Toronto workingmen: "It is the workingman to whom we must all look, not merely for the fruits of mechanical pursuits common to cities and towns, but also to the cultivation of our fields, the clearing of our forests, the construction of our public works, and in short, everything that gives character, power, and prosperity to a civilized country." Yes, verily—"in short, everything." Nobody else needed, according to Mr. Mackenzie. We would take it this way, say with public works—the need for certain of them is felt, not by the workingmen, but by "those who may be a stage above them in the social scale"—then comes in the Minister of Public Works—then surveyors and architects—then capital—and then, the workingman. You can do nothing without the workingmen, says the Prime Minister. Quite true, but neither can you do without brains and capital. This exalting of one class—of any class—as being of supreme importance—the source of power, and such like rubbish, may do well enough as answering the purpose of a mere politician, but when a man claiming the right to be considered as a statesman does it, the thing is a crime, and fraught with incalculable mischief. This is the kind of doctrine which has been declared in the ears of English workingmen for years; it produced among them a most exaggerated sense of importance; engendered strife between capital and labour; created trades' unions, strikes followed, and a great deal of the English trade was driven off to foreign fields. In the United States the same thing has happened, with a slight difference. They have sowed to the wind, and will yet reap the whirlwind. We can only hope that the Canadian workingmen will not be misled by any such sophistry.

Mr. Mackenzie laboured hard to prove that the legislation of the Liberal party had been in the interests of the workingmen. The proof given by figures of enormous saving made in the price of goods bought by Government, and contracts entered into, was not worth the time Mr. Mackenzie took in telling it. Not one of his audience but would remember how tremendously the prices of the stuff he named have come down within the last two or three years. But of course all this was preliminary to the discussion of the great question of Free Trade versus Protection, or, as the Conservative papers call it, "a National Policy." The advocates of a Free Trade policy in Canada always refer to England for example and proof, and fall back then upon the philosophy of the thing. Each is good in its way, but each may be misleading. To take the last first: few men will be found who would deny that Free Trade is the very best thing for the commercial world. Only a few now will deny that Free Trade was the best policy England could have adopted at the time. But we should remember the insular position of England; its wealth; its vast resources in consequence; and the skill of its artisans. Thought also should be taken of the extraordinary impulse given to trade at the time by the discovery of gold, the opening up of colonies, &c. We believe that neither Protection nor Free Trade should be adopted as a general and particular policy. Each branch of trade should be considered separately and dealt with accordingly. Mr. Cartwright—at Lindsay, we think it was—showed that Canadian farmers did not want Protection; that it would do them no good, but harm. If that is so, and we think it is, then let the farmers go in the ways of Free Trade. But in other matters it is clearly different.

The word of our merchants must be taken, and they tell us that certain trades are driven out of Canada. It is a matter of fact that the tradesmen of Ontario find it cheaper to buy tea, &c., in New York than in Montreal. The reason is that the United States have made a duty against Montreal, and the trade has passed over to New York. The Conservatives when in power allowed a duty in favour of Montreal, but the present administration will not. There would be no cause for complaint against this if Ontario were benefitted by the change; for the chief city must be sacrificed, if need be, for the general good. But it is not so. The tradesmen get their goods no cheaper than they would do if the Montreal markets were opened again. Montreal is impoverished for the good of New York. What is loss to Montreal may be regarded as loss to the country. If Mr. Mackenzie would deal less with the philosophy of these questions; less in mere meaningless praise of one class of the community; and more practically with things as they are, we should have more hope of the usefulness of his life and work.

THE ERA OF EXHIBITIONS.

For some thirty years now it has been a great part of the business of nations to get up Exhibitions. England set the example in 1851, by inviting the world to her Fair, and this act of courtesy seemed to be looked upon pretty much as any such act would be regarded in private life; that is, when Jones gives a party, Brown feels it his duty to give a "return" party, and the same thing goes on throughout a circle until every body has been entertained, and has entertained every body else, and then the same round is gone through all over again, to every body's entire content, and in satisfaction of the stern requirements of etiquette and "society." In this way, France, as being England's nearest neighbour, gave a "return" Exhibition; then New York; then England gave another; and in time Austria got within the circle and received Europe; then America, not to be outdone, invited the world to Philadelphia; this example was followed by Australia and Capetown; even England came to the conclusion that it would be a pleasant thing to see her friends every year, and so endeavoured to arrange for ten annual Exhibitions, beginning with 1872—an undertaking so preposterous that it surprised nobody when it was proved to be hopeless, and had in a short time to be abandoned.

This failure, might perhaps have satisfied every body that the world had had enough of Exhibitions. The idea, which was pretty enough to begin with, seemed exhausted. It had degenerated from the high science and art stage, into mere shopkeeping. The Exhibition had shrunk to the limits of a Bazaar. Rival firms took stalls, and the public were expected to pay so much per head for the privilege of buying things in a superior mart. This sort of thing could not answer, and it might have been thought that the spirit of the original idea was so departed from, that when the experiment referred to was abandoned, the collapse would have been fatal to any further attempt in the same direction.

It was therefore a matter of surprise when it became known that France had resolved on another Exhibition, and that on a grander and more magnificent scale, than had ever yet been attempted. It seemed absurd, especially considering the position in which France stood. Her conflict with Germany only a few years back had left her weakened and impoverished—how weak and how poor it was not easy to say; only there was this patent fact that she had sunk from a first-rate Power into at least a second-rate position, and did not seem to be pursuing a course—regard being had to the struggles of parties in her midst—likely to restore her very speedily to her aforesaid dignity. It was, of course, easy to understand her motives. The mainspring of action in a Frenchman is vanity, and the first and the most obvious motive was to show off. An undertaking of this kind practically said to the world:—"We may have been shaken by the struggle in which we engaged, and in which we undoubtedly came off second best, but the wounds we received were not fatal. France is still vigorous and