Letters to the Editor.

PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH versus CANADA.

SIR,--The importance of the subject at this crisis of our national existence must be my excuse for thus assuming to add to your indictment, in your issue of the 12th inst., on this head. Your comment, in editorial on it, is, I take it, in accord with the sentiment of the mass-at least ninetenths-of the Dominion. The subject, and the case itself involving such a body as the University of Toronto, is a broad one, and of imminent vital importance, calling for larger and graver comment, but that I leave to others. the moment I would only refer to an incident or two, pertinent to the issue, which is not generally known, and which, I think, should be brought to public notice, viz.:

In the quotation (page 690, head of second column of yours of 12th inst.) from the Professor's article ad rem (British connection) in the London Saturday Review, 14th December, 1895, is the following passage: "Of mere territorial aggrandisement I have never in thirty years of intercourse detected

the slightest desire in the American breast," etc. This, for a leading professor of history, is a singular statement—a suggestio falsi—simply disgraceful. Why! In the very same article he incidentally alludes to the Alaska purchase, also to Mexico, but in these instances with some manner of excuse for the grab. As to Canada, however, there is a studied ignorement of past, historical, effective and emphatic resistance to such aggrandizement.

That the desire-hunger ever growing-for our richer North still burned at the time the Professor wrote in December last, he must have known. Even the press of the United States and its leading tribunes of Congress, and the executive itself, blatantly rang the changes on the ad captandum theme. Amongst other modes demonstrative of such desire of "territorial aggrandizement" was the notable Banks' Bill of Congress, July 2, 1866, introduced "on leave" by Mr. Banks, read twice, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed, and printed accordingly, headed thus:

"A BILL

"For the admission of the States of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Canada East and Canada West, and for the organization of the territories of Selkirk, Saskatchewan,

The Bill, in legislative terms, provides for such admission "whenever notice shall be deposited in the Department of State that the Governments of Great Britain and the Provinces [in question] have accepted the proposition hereinafter made by the United States.

Article 1.—Provides for transfer of lands and all other property and civil rights to Federal and State Governments respectively.

Article 2.—Provides for the assumption of the public debts and liabilities of the Provinces, to certain specified amounts with interest, at 5 per cent.

Article 3.—Provides for representation in Congress, specifying Newfoundland as part of Canada East and Prince Edward Island as part of Nova Scotia.

Article 4.—Defines territorial divisions.

Article 5.—Prescribes representation in the House of Representatives.

Article 6.—Applies to the "territories of Selkirk, Saskatchewan and Columbia, all the provisions of the Act organizing the Territory of Montana, so far as they can be made applicable."

Article 7.—Undertakes to open the navigation of the St. Lawrence to vessels of fifteen hundred tons, "expenditure not to exceed fifty million dollars."

Article 8.—Appropriates two million dollars to "The European and North American Railway Company of Maine' on certain conditions.

Article 9.—"To aid the construction of a railway from Truro in Nova Scotia to Rivière du Loup in Canada East, and a railway from the city of Ottawa by way of Sault Ste. Marie, Bayfield and Superior, in Wisconsin, Pembina and Fort Garry on the Red River of the North, and the valley of the North Saskatchewan River to some point on the Pacific Ocean north of latitude forty-nine degrees"; and in land grant 12,800 acres ("selected") per mile, with guarantee

(Government) of five per cent per annum on authorized stock, not exceeding thirty thousand dollars per mile.

Article 10.—Survey.

Article 11.—"The United States will pay ten millions of dollars to the Hudson's Bay Company in full discharge of all claims to territory or jurisdiction in North America, whether founded on the charter of the company or any treaty, law or usage."

Article 12 (last).—Constitutions of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Canada East and Canada West to be "conformable to the constitution and laws of the United States,

subject to revision of Congress."

QUESTIONS.

Who or what inspired the above?

The incident falling within the "thirty years" preceding Professor Smith's article in question, was he aware of it when he wrote as aforesaid?

Was he aware of the persistent recurrence, since, of

such effort for such aggrandizement?

How (if possible) excuse such perversion of public fact in rank treason to the State which harboured such a calchas?

More, much more, than what you have said might be charged against the traitor and his abettors in our midst, but that may be left to its appropriate Nemesis in due course and time.

Canada keystone tower of the arch of the Empire she belongs to—is now unconquerable. That is the dominant fact of our hour, and to that we hold in firmest faith.

June 13th, 1896. BRITANNICUS.

A VOICE FROM THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

The real issue which the people of Canada will be called on to decide at the coming elections is that which has been for botton as fer better as for botton as for botton as fer better as for botton as fer better as for botton a for better or for worse, the working principle of the constitution during the past eighteen years—the time-honoured National Policy. It is the same old policy, say the Liberal Conservatives, on the principles of The Liberal Conservatives. Conservatives, on the principles of which we have staked our existence for eighteen years; and it may be added that that party of politicians are still continuing to use the same old methods of provide in the same of methods of provide in the same of the same methods of proving its expediency in the current campaign. It would be fortunate for the country if less public speaking were resorted to and resorted to an accountry if less public speaking the resorted to an accountry it is a speaking to a second to a were resorted to and more calm thinking indulged in. ever easy it may be to the political economist to point out the proper matheda at the proper methods of estimating prosperity and true programs and the proper it ress, and the proper methods of taxation and expenditure, it is not an easy task to bring these methods home to the minds of the masses of our people.

Canada is plainly moving in the path which is being trod by the neighbouring Republic. Large, wealthy and dangerous corporations are coming into existence. No ernment, whether Liberal-Conservative or Liberal, despise this fact in an election campaign at the present day. Compelled to swear fealty to the interests of a Coal are Trust and a few other huge corporations, in order to make sure of their shape of the descriptions. sure of their share of the floating vote of the electorate, no government whatever can, under such circumstances, such constilly steen their cessfully steer their craft among the monohippic establishments without monohippic destablishments without monohippic establishments. ments without pampering their wishes. The principle which underlies protection cannot be applied without fostering a dangerous form of selfishness. The infant industry glides smoothly on into the condition smoothly on into the condition of giant manhood. point in the process dare a government say here its infancy ends and there its infancy ends and there its manhood begins. More than this, no government can have the government can have the courage to draw any distinction between the locitimeter. between the legitimate and the illegitimate infant industry.

Tariff revision is clearly a process of adapting the prove system to the shift. tective system to the shifting centres of political influence and "substantial aid" and "substantial aid" in elections. In theory the man on the stump very wisely denied the stump very wisely denies such a statement, but in practice the same tice the same man in Parliament gives documentary evidence of its validity. dence of its validity. Under existing circumstances, what party of politicians would be so disinterested in their own personal welfare as to the confidence of t personal welfare as to openly fight against such a system? To whatever party they may belong there are surely some in our country impartial enough to assent to the truth of such statements as these. such statements as these. Every student of the history of the leading doctrines of the leading doctrines of political science can foresee that needless complexities are beginning to cluster around our Canadian policy of protestion. Canadian policy of protection. The old story of which we