

sion became really serious only about two years ago, with the passage of the McKinley Bill. And just here let us observe that, from the protectionist point of view, this ill-fated bill is far from deserving the abuse which has been so freely poured out upon it. As a protectionist measure, it is demonstrably more logical and consistent than any which preceded it. The one aim of genuine protectionism should surely be to stop, or reduce to the lowest figure, the importation of all such articles as can be produced in the country and to give the freest possible ingress to everything necessary for life or comfort which cannot be produced in the country. If the resources of the nation are fairly equal, or capable of being made equal, to the task of supplying its people with horses, or cereals, or manufactured cotton or woollen goods, your true protectionist should, if he has faith in his system and is prepared to follow it to its logical results, seek to have his tariff so constructed as to keep out all foreign goods of these descriptions and secure the whole business for native producers. If a tariff wall of a given height suffices to cause three-fourths of the total consumption of a given manufactured article to be produced in the country, why should not he, on the same principle, raise the wall a storey higher and add the remaining one-fourth to the national industries? On the other hand, he should, in the interests of these same national industries, refuse to permit any taxation of either the raw materials of any industry which the country cannot supply, or of those articles of necessity or comfort which it cannot produce. In a word, your consistent protectionist should be as truly an advocate of direct taxation for revenue purposes as your most ultra free-trader. Thus do extremes meet.

WELL, the McKinley Bill, while it did not fulfil all the conditions of a thorough-going protectionist measure, approached the ideal much more nearly than any which had preceded it. This was a good thing in the long run, for all concerned. It has passed into a proverb that the most effective way to secure the repeal of a bad law is to enforce it rigidly. On the same principle, the best possible way to bring the two theories of tariff policy to a crucial test, is to try one or the other thoroughly. The Republicans, the party of protection, being in power, the opportunity was afforded to put their theory to such a test, and under the leadership of McKinley they have done so. The specific has been fairly tried. The object-lesson has been before the eyes of the people for two years. Hundreds of thousands have felt as well as seen its effects. During all that period, not only have the operations of the system been watched with lynx-eyed keenness, but the whole question has been discussed, from foundation principles to minute effects. As the decisive day drew nearer the discussion waxed more earnest. In fact, the whole history of the campaign afforded striking proof of this earnestness, and of the determination of the electors to fight the battle out on this one line. No secondary question of any kind was allowed or was able to turn the current of even popular thought into any side issue. Circumstances were undoubtedly favourable to this concentration of thought and energy. The high character of both candidates prevented the raising of any effective cry on personal grounds. The nation was at peace with the world, all international disputes having either been settled or put in the way of settlement. The "Force Bill," the only other internal question of anything like national importance, had so far been given up by the dominant party that its effect on the campaign was but slight. To render the verdict still more emphatic, the nation went about the business with a quiet dignity never before attained, at least in recent days, in its history—a dignity and seriousness which have distinctly raised it in the respect of all on-looking nations.

THE result is the overthrow of McKinleyism, and, by implication, of the system of political economy upon which it is based. This is conceded on all hands. It would be folly to expect that this result will fully appear immediately on the installation of President Cleveland. That brave yet sagacious leader in nothing showed both those qualities more clearly than in the "letter of acceptance," in which he guarded his adherents against expecting rash and revolutionary changes, in terms which exposed him to the charge in some quarters of having fallen below the lofty ground taken by his party at the nominating convention, when they declared it a crime against the Constitution for any Government to take

more money from the people by taxation than the amount needed for the economical administration of public affairs. Mr. Cleveland saw, with statesmanlike precision, that it would be both impracticable and criminal, in undoing the mistakes of predecessors, to throw the whole business of the nation into confusion by overturning at a blow a system which has been inwrought into the very warp and woof of its trade and manufacturing industries. The hint is commended to the consideration of all who are desirous of effecting a similar reform in Canada. Any measure which threatens, or which can be made to appear to threaten, a sudden and violent overturning of industries which have been brought into being and are upheld by the "National Policy," simply invites defeat. Such industries must be given time to adapt themselves to the new and healthier order. The crutches which have been supplied at the public expense, and upon which they have relied with debilitating effect, must not be too suddenly snatched away. To hint at any other course is to frighten the timid and put a powerful weapon into the hands of the self-interested. But none the less is it evident that in the United States the Democratic party *must* make thorough work. Those who have put them in power will accept nothing less at their hands, and their opponents will taunt them beyond endurance if they fail to prove that they have the courage of their convictions. The great American nation has changed front and taken up its line of march towards freer trade and a higher civilization. The march may be long and arduous, for the enemies to be faced are powerful and strongly entrenched. But we have little fear of the ultimate result, for we have faith in the power of great ideas to rule the world. We rejoice that it is another great Anglo-Saxon people which is falling into line with Great Britain in this grand crusade. Where these lead the van all others must sooner or later fall into the ranks or be left hopelessly behind in the progress of the world.

IT is meet that the great event which has taken place across the border should occupy a large place in our columns this week. It is not the mere fact of Cleveland's election, which to many seemed fairly probable from the first, but the great revolution in American sentiment indicated by his immense majority, which gives this matter its chief significance. The mind naturally turns to consider the effect the change of Government and of fiscal policy is likely to have upon our commercial relations with our neighbours. Already the possibility of negotiating a reciprocity treaty is being discussed. That may come, but we are inclined to doubt whether any terms which would be granted even by the new administration would be acceptable to the majority of Canadians, especially to the present Government and its supporters. It may even be a question whether such a treaty will now be desirable; whether it may not be wiser and better to wait for the more or less rapid reduction of the hostile tariff which is sure to come. A reciprocity treaty is in itself an evil—though sometimes to be desired as the less of two evils. It is an evil because inconsistent with the highest freedom of commercial intercourse. If only, as there seems good reason to hope, the new Government and Congress shall prove able to rise so far above narrow national prejudices as to see the smallness and absurdity of the view which has so often led supporters of the Harrison *regime* to rejoice in any indications of a falling off in the trade of Great Britain and other nations, and to boast of them as triumphs of the McKinley Bill; if they can but reach the higher level at which they can see clearly that mutual prosperity is the only natural and Christian foundation of sound international trade, all the rest will follow in due course. Meanwhile the true policy for Canada is to recognize that the tide which has been setting in the direction of protection has at last turned. She should help forward the coming beneficent change by every means in her power. One most telling means would be the immediate commencement of a policy of tariff reform on her own account. What more effective stimulus could be given to the new movement across the line than the immediate reduction of duties on British and other goods in Canada? We have often found occasion to hold up reprehensible practices and especially partisan expedients in the United States by way of warning to Canada, and have, perhaps sometimes a little too pharisaically thanked God that we were not quite so bad as they. It is now devoutly to be wished that our people in large numbers could be brought to emulate the really admirable spirit of independence

which has led so many individuals of high standing in the Republican ranks to renounce their party allegiance in the interests of a sound fiscal policy and to openly champion the cause of freer trade. The same spirit, manifested on a larger scale, has impelled States, such as Ohio, Illinois and Wisconsin to wrench themselves free from the long worn fetters of partyism and to range themselves on the side of freedom and true progress. All honour to such. They have thereby dealt a blow to party bigotry from which it may never recover. Have we any good reason to hope that the same spirit of independence is reviving in Canada?

RECENT despatches represent it as very doubtful if the Government Army Bill can be passed in the German Reichstag. Its defeat will almost necessarily be followed by the resignation of the Government, or at least of the Chancellor. But much will depend upon the part the Emperor may play in the affair. An improbable rumour now represents him as not being strongly attached to the measure. Seeing that the Bill involves, as officially admitted, an addition to the already crushing taxation for military purposes, of about \$16,000,000 a year, it is not strange that the opposition to it should gather strength as the discussion proceeds. Of course, the reduction of the three years' service to two is a valuable concession* in return; but it, apart from the financial objection, seems to us to be fully offset by the fact, which some of the papers give, curiously enough, as a consideration which will operate in favour of the Bill, viz., that there can be nothing beyond it, no more military Bills authorizing larger drafts, for the simple reason that, under the present Bill, every able-bodied man of the fighting age is placed at the disposal of the State. Surely the consolation to be derived from such a reflection must be of a very desperate kind. France and Russia together will presently, it is computed, have eight and a-half millions of trained soldiers. Hence Germany, or rather the German Government, who seem not to place too implicit reliance upon their Austrian and Italian allies, deem it necessary to bring up the number of German trained men to the highest point of which her population will admit, four and a-half millions. Imagination fails to paint the horrors of a prolonged war—and it was Marshal Von Moltke's opinion that the next war will be prolonged—between such armies fitted out with all the terrible engines of modern warfare.

WE talk much of the present as an age of religious liberty and are accustomed to look back towards the Dark Ages as the days when men and women were persecuted for conscience' sake, forgetful of the fact that to-day, in so-called Christian Russia, men and women by the thousand are being subjected to indignities, cruelties and degradations which beggar description, simply because of their adherence to forms of religious belief and practice which we regard as evangelical. For some time past, the *Christian World*, London, Eng., has been publishing from sources which it deems perfectly reliable, accounts of the persecutions which the "Stundists" of that wretched Empire are made to suffer, such as send thrills of indignation and horror to the brain and heart of the reader. The latest number to hand, dated November 3, contains translations of two letters written by Stundist peasants of the government of Kieff, to friends of theirs. Both letters are dated at "Village Kapustintsi," the one September 27, the other October 4. Both concur in saying that the Protestants or Evangelicals in that place are being subjected to the most horrible persecutions by the order of the district governor (Ispravnik). Every day the Stundists, men, women, and children, are compelled to go out on communal work. If any of them have horses, these are taken for the same work. At night the men are not permitted to return home but are posted as watchmen for night duty. But this is by no means the worst. While the men are thus employed, their homes are visited by bands of drunken villagers, led by the police, and the women and children are subjected to degradations and brutalities too shocking to be described or even named in our columns. One of the poor men says that his wife is, as he writes, almost at death's door, as a consequence of the brutal abuse to which she has been subjected. Their appeals to their friends to try to find some means of succour are most pitiful. It is not necessary to suppose that all these horrors are perpetrated with the full consent and connivance of the Czar, or of the Russian Government. The truth is, probably, that the higher authorities know and care little about such matters. The Empire is so vast, and their attention