

THE ONLY
One Cent Morning Paper
IN CANADA
18 KING ST. EAST, TORONTO

THIRD YEAR.

DR. WILD ON LIBERALISM.

CHRISTIANITY AND INFIDELITY
COMPARED.

The latter arranged for a lack of being good—infidelity the cost of Christianity. The cost of freedom and the cost of infidelity—answers to correspondents—Lecture to Young Ladies.

The doctor's budget of letters last evening was exceedingly large. This feature of the evening service is evidently becoming very popular. Among the answers given were the following:

"C. J." was informed that the Israelites—the Saxon people—would ultimately possess Constantinople. The Psalmist says, "who will bring me into the strong city; who will lead me into Edom?" Edom, the strong city, clearly means Constantinople. This city is coveted by Russia. The struggle for it will soon commence. The Prophet says the Pole and Hungarian will join England in the conflict, and they are to be victorious.

A correspondent from "the gallery" was informed that in reality Canada is 1,236,000 square miles larger than the whole of the United States put together.

"A Christian friend could not understand how God in Christ could die. He was told that the body of Christ died a natural death, as ours will, but that his soul did not cease to exist. The correspondent had a mistaken idea of death.

In reply to a query about the architecture of the New Jerusalem, the doctor said according to the bible it would be 1500 miles high, broad and long. On account of being built on the centre of the earth it would be built in any direction. The attraction of gravitation would be equal in the world's centre.

"I have several letters," the doctor said, "saying why so many sermons are preached to young men and young women. I am thinking of that same thing last Sunday evening. I will preach to the young ladies Sunday night. I have just much interest in them as I have in the young gentlemen."

Text—Prove all things, hold fast that which is good. This is the fifth day, 21st.

The Toronto World.

MONDAY MORNING, NOVEMBER 20, 1882.

SUBSCRIPTION
THREE DOLLARS A YEAR
TWENTY-NINE CENTS A WEEK
DELIVERED CITY BY SUNDAY
18 KING ST. EAST, TORONTO

PRICE ONE CENT

have they destroyed? We only leave them one to attack, and they even want to slay that one. Christianity has slain more gods than all the other gods put together.

The doctor's budget of letters last evening was exceedingly large. This feature of the evening service is evidently becoming very popular. Among the answers given were the following:

"C. J." was informed that the Israelites—the Saxon people—would ultimately possess Constantinople. The Psalmist says, "who will bring me into the strong city; who will lead me into Edom?" Edom, the strong city, clearly means Constantinople.

A correspondent from "the gallery" was informed that in reality Canada is 1,236,000 square miles larger than the whole of the United States put together.

"A Christian friend could not understand how God in Christ could die. He was told that the body of Christ died a natural death, as ours will, but that his soul did not cease to exist.

In reply to a query about the architecture of the New Jerusalem, the doctor said according to the bible it would be 1500 miles high, broad and long. On account of being built on the centre of the earth it would be built in any direction.

"I have several letters," the doctor said, "saying why so many sermons are preached to young men and young women. I am thinking of that same thing last Sunday evening.

Text—Prove all things, hold fast that which is good. This is the fifth day, 21st.

THE CONFEDERATION LIFE.
Attacked for Rejecting a Claim—Why is the Insurance Times so Severe?
The Insurance Times, as its name indicates, devotes its attention to insurance matters. It is a large monthly, published in New York, and considered one of the authorities in this line. In the November issue it contains an attack on the Confederation life association of Toronto, which the editor says was crowded out of the October number.

The managers of some life companies seem to imagine that their part consists in prevailing upon people to insure, and they promise to avoid their own and insure the payment of their heavy salaries, and, with the same view, as soon as the insured dies, they endeavor to bring the insurance life association into disrepute. It is not to be noted that after the company was formed, the managers of the company were not to be noted as doing anything to bring the insurance life association into disrepute.

Notwithstanding this and the fact that the manager was removed on the 2nd of March, the manager decided to sue for the amount of the policy. The company refused to pay the amount, and the manager decided to sue for the amount of the policy. The company refused to pay the amount, and the manager decided to sue for the amount of the policy.

Such is the attack, and those who know the company will not be likely to take much stock in the general tirade with which the article opens. The merits of the Eaves case cited by the Times. The personnel of the company ought to be a sufficient answer to the general charges of the Times. It is made up as follows:

FATHER MURPHY'S CHARITY SEMINAR.
A Large Attendance at St. Michael's Cathedral Last Night—The course.

Last evening there was grand success and a charity sermon at St. Michael's cathedral. The services were in aid of the poor of St. Michael's parish, who are assisted by St. Vincent de Paul's society, which gives aid to all without reference to creed or nationality. The sermon was preached by Rev. Father McBrady, C. S. B., who took for his subject, Almsgiving. He began by giving an explanation of that passage of scripture which says, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven."

THE VICTORIAN ARMY.
LONDON, Nov. 18.—The queen to-day reviewed 8000 of the troops who participated in the Egyptian campaign. The troops afterwards marched through several streets which were gallantly decorated. There were immense crowds of spectators and extraordinary enthusiasm. The Duke of Connaught marched at the head of the guards. The Prince and Princess of Wales, the Crown Prince of Germany and the Duke of Cambridge also witnessed the march. The queen on leaving was greeted with tremendous cheers. There were grand illuminations at night.

THE VICTORIAN ARMY.
LONDON, Nov. 18.—The queen to-day reviewed 8000 of the troops who participated in the Egyptian campaign. The troops afterwards marched through several streets which were gallantly decorated.

THE OLD WORLD'S NEWS.
WHAT IS TRANSPIRING ON THE OTHER SIDE OF THE ATLANTIC.
The Prussian Budget Speech—A Large Deficit—Causes of the Fall in the Revenue and the Remedy Proposed by the Minister.

THE CONGO BILL RATIFIED.
Amid Applause in the French Chamber of Deputies—The Archbishop of Algiers.

THE YELLOW FEVER SCARE.
PENNSYLVANIA, Pa., Nov. 18.—Five new cases of yellow fever are reported.

THE GELTNER STARTS FOR NEW YORK.
NEW YORK, Nov. 18.—The steamer Geltner left the dock this morning and proceeded to New York. Four new blades have been fitted on the propeller.

NEW EXtradITION TREATY.
WASHINGTON, Nov. 18.—The Belgian minister called at the state department today and exchanged ratifications of the treaty of extradition between Belgium and the United States.

MR. GRAY'S FUNERAL.
HAMILTON, Nov. 19.—The funeral of Mrs. Thomas Gray, who committed suicide by shooting herself at the home of her husband on Thursday last, took place from the hospital to Burlington cemetery this afternoon. It is now certain that jealousy was the cause of the self-murder.

THE VICTORIAN ARMY.
LONDON, Nov. 18.—The queen to-day reviewed 8000 of the troops who participated in the Egyptian campaign. The troops afterwards marched through several streets which were gallantly decorated.

THE VICTORIAN ARMY.
LONDON, Nov. 18.—The queen to-day reviewed 8000 of the troops who participated in the Egyptian campaign. The troops afterwards marched through several streets which were gallantly decorated.

RAILROAD WAR IN THE WEST.
Rates Cut 50 Per Cent from St. Paul to Chicago—A Big Fight Begun.

THE GREAT ELECTRIC STORM.
Effects on Telegraphic Communications—Something New Before Us.

THE FIRE RECORD.
FORT WORTH, Texas, Nov. 18.—A flour mill and nine houses were burned here yesterday. Loss \$40,000.

THE WORLD WOULD LIKE TO KNOW.
The difference between Ryan Irishman and an O'Donnell Irishman.

SOME WRONG IMPRESSIONS.
That the picture in Graham's window represents William Penn.

THE BATTLE IS ORDERED OUT.
On the requisition of a number of prominent citizens the Toronto field battery has been ordered out to shoot all the white hats worn in the streets.

WORLD BALLADS.
A BALLAD OF THE SEASON.
Gently sighs the wistful breeze
Through the leafless luscious trees,
Broken by a sound afar—
Somebody has caught a star.

WORLD BALLADS.
A BALLAD OF THE SEASON.
Gently sighs the wistful breeze
Through the leafless luscious trees,
Broken by a sound afar—
Somebody has caught a star.

THE GREAT ELECTRIC STORM.
Effects on Telegraphic Communications—Something New Before Us.

THE FIRE RECORD.
FORT WORTH, Texas, Nov. 18.—A flour mill and nine houses were burned here yesterday. Loss \$40,000.

THE WORLD WOULD LIKE TO KNOW.
The difference between Ryan Irishman and an O'Donnell Irishman.

SOME WRONG IMPRESSIONS.
That the picture in Graham's window represents William Penn.

THE BATTLE IS ORDERED OUT.
On the requisition of a number of prominent citizens the Toronto field battery has been ordered out to shoot all the white hats worn in the streets.

WORLD BALLADS.
A BALLAD OF THE SEASON.
Gently sighs the wistful breeze
Through the leafless luscious trees,
Broken by a sound afar—
Somebody has caught a star.

WORLD BALLADS.
A BALLAD OF THE SEASON.
Gently sighs the wistful breeze
Through the leafless luscious trees,
Broken by a sound afar—
Somebody has caught a star.

WORLD BALLADS.
A BALLAD OF THE SEASON.
Gently sighs the wistful breeze
Through the leafless luscious trees,
Broken by a sound afar—
Somebody has caught a star.

THE MIRROR OF CITY LIFE.
DASHES AROUND TOWN BY WORLD REPORTERS.

THE GRAND TRUNK SMASH UP.
About 50 men left yesterday morning to complete the transhipment of freight in the recent run-off two miles west of Brampton.

CROWDED SUNDAY TRAINS.
The Sunday trains between Hamilton and Toronto were both crowded yesterday. Passengers on the through trains find it the greatest advantage to be able to get to Toronto on Saturday.

ALTERNATE ASSISTANTS.
Numerous friends of ex-Ald. John Ritchie have invited that gentleman to stand for St. Thomas ward for alderman.

A TORONTO MAN DROWNED.
A telegram was received in this city on Saturday announcing that Ernest McQuig, formerly purser of the wrecked steamer Pictou, and cousin of Capt. McQuig, was drowned in Round Bay, Eastport, on Friday night.

ASSASSINATE TO-NIGHT.
Miss Lizzy May Ulmer's company will open a week's engagement at the Royal opera house to-night in the Danites. This is McKee Rankin's only authorized company.

THE WEATHER.
All day Saturday the weather was clear and bright and the atmosphere was very bracing. King street on Saturday afternoon presented a good old old day scene, the ladies were appraised in furs or heavy cloaks, with head-gear to match, and the keen November air touched their cheeks with carmine freckles. Yesterday was raw and wintry.

MR. SWEETNAM TO BE PROMOTED.
It is rumored on good authority that the deputy postmaster-general is to be superannuated on the first of next year, and that his successor will be Mr. M. Sweetnam, postoffice inspector of this city. It is also said that Mr. D. Spry will succeed Mr. Sweetnam.

SIGNED ARTICLES.

The World is striving first of all to be a news paper and next to be a journal of opinion. While in this latter capacity we hope to always have opinions of our own to express we shall equally endeavor to give those who hold opposite, or somewhat different views, a chance to present their case.

For some months back The World has been publishing occasional signed articles from the pen of Mr. Philip, Argus, Delta and others. These writers are men who all hold decided views on our political and commercial relations, and whose views would not be tolerated in either the Globe or the Mail, though their articles on "subjects not dangerous" have often had a place in their editorial columns.

PERSONAL POLITICS IN MUSKOGA. Muskoga, delightful resort of summer travelers and land of rock and pine, is also, politically considered, a constituency fond of elections. It had an innings in common with the rest of the Dominion last June; it was favored with one of those by-elections which so unkindly upset the calculations of our friends, the conservatives, and as a result of the petition now pending before the court there is every probability that it will soon have an opportunity of again saying who shall be its representative in the house of commons.

It is quite in accordance with the fitness of things that the Toronto Globe and the Hamilton Times, both free trade papers, should join the Bulletin in calling the recent vote of York state an act of folly. In one sentence the Times quotes from the Bulletin and gives its own opinion thus: "Never did a commercial community commit an act of more ludicrous folly, but Canada will follow the example and vote her share of the bonus to the Western States. See if she doesn't." And the Globe thus delivers itself on the subject:

"There is evidently going to be no end to the free canal business until the New York and Canadian governments provide canals free of tolls and do all the towing for nothing. Having secured the passage of their free canal amendment, the Erie canal interest has already commenced an agitation for enlargement and improvement of the waterway. The Canadians, they say, will be sure to follow the lead of New York in abolishing the tolls. Hence New York must, at the public expense, double the size of the Erie, or that canal will get no business. It is only two weeks ago that the voters of New York were assured that if the tolls were abolished the Erie could hold its own. The change of tone is somewhat sudden. With what will the canal men be satisfied?"

These sentences have the true free trade ring about them. For the people—the commonwealth—to resort to state action as a means of protection, against either foreign competition or private monopoly is an infraction of the inflexible laws of political economy, and an act of folly. Do nothing at all, just let things take their course, and by-and-by we shall have the survival of the fittest. We propose to consider on another occasion the contention that in making free canals the east robs itself to give a bonus to the west.

On another point the Globe is probably in the right. The late Mr. Frank Shanley, whose opinion on such a matter should command consideration, used to say that to get water enough for an enlarged Erie canal was impossible. As the Globe says, the water supply not infrequently proved insufficient for the canal as it is.

ARGUS. THE TRUE TRADE POLICY FOR CANADA. I have been reading with some interest the platform of the "National Liberal Union," the exposition of that platform by the president of the association, and the comments upon both by various contributors to the daily papers. With your leave I propose to say a few words about the trade policy embodied in the platform of the union, with special reference to the remarks of Mr. McMurich on that point, and the criticisms of your contributor "Argus." The trade plank of the platform are the following:

public expense in the first place. Had the people of the neighboring state been wiser from the start, they would have suited some big company got a charter and took the job in hand, after which the company aforesaid would have charged such tolls and given such accommodation as suited themselves and not the public. "The public be damned," said Van-orbit recently. His injudicious freedom of expression, which occasion has done the anti-monopoly cause more good than could have been done by hundreds of able articles and speeches together. The people have had enough experience of what monopolists like Van-orbit and G-old will do when and where they have the power. And, in the light of this experience, the people of "York State" and others interested have abundant reason for rejoicing to-day that once upon a time there was a man named DeWitt Clinton, through whose energy and perseverance mainly it happened that the Erie canal was built.

On the same principle, too, it was an act of folly for Canada to have built the Welland and St. Lawrence canals at the public expense. Far better to have carried out thoroughly the free trade principle of leaving everything to private competition, if these Canadian canals on the main waterway east and west were really wanted, and would pay, some company or other would have built them. If not, the fact would be proof that no such canals were wanted. Leave canals, as well as everything else, to private competition. This is exactly what the monopolists want, and the Bulletin pleads their cause.

I am not going to discuss here the question of free trade versus protection, that is too large a subject to argue in a single letter. What I want to point out to the promoters of the new movement is that they had better not hamper themselves with either a protectionist or a free trade platform. If I understand the signs of the times at all they indicate that only on the broad platform of Canadian nationality can any new party plant itself firmly. To attempt to "fit the principle of nationality" by any protectionist band of protection is absurd; it would be equally absurd to regard free trade as one which more essential. "Argus" would have all nationalistic protectionists; others would have them all free traders; I want them all for Canadian interests whatever policy may for the time be best adapted to promote them. I happen to believe that the best policy is one of lightest possible taxation, but I am not one of those heavy taxation is good for the country and I am with you. Another believes that protection to home industries is the best policy just now; let him be equally ready to adopt absolute free trade, if that can be demonstrated to be best for our country. On this compromise a truly national party is possible, without it the National Liberal Union will follow the Canada first party into the limbo of long-forgotten. The Canada first principle is a dead dog; if the National Liberal Union were to pass away this would not mean that either nationalism or liberalism was no more. It would only mean that some national liberals had organized themselves into a party with inefficient standing room, that some of them had been crowded off, and that the trade plank on which the remnant had huddled for protection—excuse the apparent pun—had broken ground and let them descend to more solid ground.

Why cannot we have a national party without any trade policy at all, except the policy of preferring Canadian interests to all others? Let us abandon not merely the trade plank, but the entire platform of protection. If it points to increased protection to home manufactures, so be it; if it points to an imperial preference, so be it; and if it points to a customs union with the United States, who shall draw back, and why? I am not intentionally afraid of commercial union if that is clearly our best trade policy. Am I told that it will prove incompatible with British connection; then in the immortal words of the conservatives in 1878, "so much the worse for British connection." Am I told that it will lead eventually to annexation? Then I reply (1) that the people of Canada need to be trusted to judge for themselves about the expediency of annexation when the issue becomes a live one, and (2) that the surest way to promote a feeling in favor of annexation may be to prevent our people from trading freely with the United States. There are many in all the provinces who want to trade freely, and if they are not allowed to do it as Canadians they will hanker after being allowed to do it as citizens of the United States. Men who hanker after to be free traders are not prepared to grapple with these problems are quite unfit to launch successfully a great political crusade, and the coming agitation will soon sink a cockle shell. DELTA.

HAMILTON IN DISGUISE. The city of Hamilton as a corporation has spent a large amount of money in trying to secure railway competition, and for the same end some of her enterprising citizens have spent very much more, in the way of time and effort and hard cash all together. If the Grand Trunk gobbles up the Northern and Northwestern, all this money and effort will have been wasted, and the ambitious little city will have been handed over body and bones to the tender mercies of the great alligator corporation, which swallows up all before it. The charge is openly made that some of her citizens, from

as a foe to British connection, and as guilty of "vicious treason" whatever that may mean. Now if that resolution meant anything, it assuredly meant that we ought to have the right to make with the United States whatever kind of commercial treaty might promise the greatest amount of advantage to ourselves. Even "Argus" will admit the possibility of a customs union becoming some day the best relation for this country to sustain to the United States. Suppose for example that the system of protection in that country were to break down, that the competition of English goods and the cheapening of production were to enormously diminish the cost of goods in the United States corresponding to those we make in Canada; that in addition to the above-mentioned duty to diminish a cost of production there existed an enormous excess of the assassination of smuggling. What should be done? The only thing that could save this country from being utterly smashed as between millstones would be the making of trade with the United States as free as possible—in other words, to enter into a commercial union and abolish the customs line between the two countries. Under such circumstances all classes would clamor for such a remedy—farmers, lumbermen, fishermen, miners, merchants and manufacturers of all classes.

Have I been exaggerating in my supposition? Cannot "Argus" see what is coming? The late democratic tide wave in the United States means more than is generally supposed. It means that the politicians on both sides must admit the necessity of a reform; that both sides must commence talking in the same key; that the idea must become more and more popular; that both parties must vie with each other in promising to do something to lessen the burden of taxation; and that some sort of a lessening of burden will eventually, and before long, result in reducing protection to a minimum amongst our neighbors and provincials. If the "National Liberal Union" and "Argus" climb their little hillocks and complacently fancy themselves secure because the flood is yet distant, they will find themselves speedily overwhelmed when the tide rises.

I am not going to discuss here the question of free trade versus protection, that is too large a subject to argue in a single letter. What I want to point out to the promoters of the new movement is that they had better not hamper themselves with either a protectionist or a free trade platform. If I understand the signs of the times at all they indicate that only on the broad platform of Canadian nationality can any new party plant itself firmly. To attempt to "fit the principle of nationality" by any protectionist band of protection is absurd; it would be equally absurd to regard free trade as one which more essential. "Argus" would have all nationalistic protectionists; others would have them all free traders; I want them all for Canadian interests whatever policy may for the time be best adapted to promote them. I happen to believe that the best policy is one of lightest possible taxation, but I am not one of those heavy taxation is good for the country and I am with you. Another believes that protection to home industries is the best policy just now; let him be equally ready to adopt absolute free trade, if that can be demonstrated to be best for our country. On this compromise a truly national party is possible, without it the National Liberal Union will follow the Canada first party into the limbo of long-forgotten. The Canada first principle is a dead dog; if the National Liberal Union were to pass away this would not mean that either nationalism or liberalism was no more. It would only mean that some national liberals had organized themselves into a party with inefficient standing room, that some of them had been crowded off, and that the trade plank on which the remnant had huddled for protection—excuse the apparent pun—had broken ground and let them descend to more solid ground.

Why cannot we have a national party without any trade policy at all, except the policy of preferring Canadian interests to all others? Let us abandon not merely the trade plank, but the entire platform of protection. If it points to increased protection to home manufactures, so be it; if it points to an imperial preference, so be it; and if it points to a customs union with the United States, who shall draw back, and why? I am not intentionally afraid of commercial union if that is clearly our best trade policy. Am I told that it will prove incompatible with British connection; then in the immortal words of the conservatives in 1878, "so much the worse for British connection." Am I told that it will lead eventually to annexation? Then I reply (1) that the people of Canada need to be trusted to judge for themselves about the expediency of annexation when the issue becomes a live one, and (2) that the surest way to promote a feeling in favor of annexation may be to prevent our people from trading freely with the United States. There are many in all the provinces who want to trade freely, and if they are not allowed to do it as Canadians they will hanker after being allowed to do it as citizens of the United States. Men who hanker after to be free traders are not prepared to grapple with these problems are quite unfit to launch successfully a great political crusade, and the coming agitation will soon sink a cockle shell. DELTA.

HAMILTON IN DISGUISE. The city of Hamilton as a corporation has spent a large amount of money in trying to secure railway competition, and for the same end some of her enterprising citizens have spent very much more, in the way of time and effort and hard cash all together. If the Grand Trunk gobbles up the Northern and Northwestern, all this money and effort will have been wasted, and the ambitious little city will have been handed over body and bones to the tender mercies of the great alligator corporation, which swallows up all before it. The charge is openly made that some of her citizens, from

as a foe to British connection, and as guilty of "vicious treason" whatever that may mean. Now if that resolution meant anything, it assuredly meant that we ought to have the right to make with the United States whatever kind of commercial treaty might promise the greatest amount of advantage to ourselves. Even "Argus" will admit the possibility of a customs union becoming some day the best relation for this country to sustain to the United States. Suppose for example that the system of protection in that country were to break down, that the competition of English goods and the cheapening of production were to enormously diminish the cost of goods in the United States corresponding to those we make in Canada; that in addition to the above-mentioned duty to diminish a cost of production there existed an enormous excess of the assassination of smuggling. What should be done? The only thing that could save this country from being utterly smashed as between millstones would be the making of trade with the United States as free as possible—in other words, to enter into a commercial union and abolish the customs line between the two countries. Under such circumstances all classes would clamor for such a remedy—farmers, lumbermen, fishermen, miners, merchants and manufacturers of all classes.

Have I been exaggerating in my supposition? Cannot "Argus" see what is coming? The late democratic tide wave in the United States means more than is generally supposed. It means that the politicians on both sides must admit the necessity of a reform; that both sides must commence talking in the same key; that the idea must become more and more popular; that both parties must vie with each other in promising to do something to lessen the burden of taxation; and that some sort of a lessening of burden will eventually, and before long, result in reducing protection to a minimum amongst our neighbors and provincials. If the "National Liberal Union" and "Argus" climb their little hillocks and complacently fancy themselves secure because the flood is yet distant, they will find themselves speedily overwhelmed when the tide rises.

I am not going to discuss here the question of free trade versus protection, that is too large a subject to argue in a single letter. What I want to point out to the promoters of the new movement is that they had better not hamper themselves with either a protectionist or a free trade platform. If I understand the signs of the times at all they indicate that only on the broad platform of Canadian nationality can any new party plant itself firmly. To attempt to "fit the principle of nationality" by any protectionist band of protection is absurd; it would be equally absurd to regard free trade as one which more essential. "Argus" would have all nationalistic protectionists; others would have them all free traders; I want them all for Canadian interests whatever policy may for the time be best adapted to promote them. I happen to believe that the best policy is one of lightest possible taxation, but I am not one of those heavy taxation is good for the country and I am with you. Another believes that protection to home industries is the best policy just now; let him be equally ready to adopt absolute free trade, if that can be demonstrated to be best for our country. On this compromise a truly national party is possible, without it the National Liberal Union will follow the Canada first party into the limbo of long-forgotten. The Canada first principle is a dead dog; if the National Liberal Union were to pass away this would not mean that either nationalism or liberalism was no more. It would only mean that some national liberals had organized themselves into a party with inefficient standing room, that some of them had been crowded off, and that the trade plank on which the remnant had huddled for protection—excuse the apparent pun—had broken ground and let them descend to more solid ground.

Why cannot we have a national party without any trade policy at all, except the policy of preferring Canadian interests to all others? Let us abandon not merely the trade plank, but the entire platform of protection. If it points to increased protection to home manufactures, so be it; if it points to an imperial preference, so be it; and if it points to a customs union with the United States, who shall draw back, and why? I am not intentionally afraid of commercial union if that is clearly our best trade policy. Am I told that it will prove incompatible with British connection; then in the immortal words of the conservatives in 1878, "so much the worse for British connection." Am I told that it will lead eventually to annexation? Then I reply (1) that the people of Canada need to be trusted to judge for themselves about the expediency of annexation when the issue becomes a live one, and (2) that the surest way to promote a feeling in favor of annexation may be to prevent our people from trading freely with the United States. There are many in all the provinces who want to trade freely, and if they are not allowed to do it as Canadians they will hanker after being allowed to do it as citizens of the United States. Men who hanker after to be free traders are not prepared to grapple with these problems are quite unfit to launch successfully a great political crusade, and the coming agitation will soon sink a cockle shell. DELTA.

as a foe to British connection, and as guilty of "vicious treason" whatever that may mean. Now if that resolution meant anything, it assuredly meant that we ought to have the right to make with the United States whatever kind of commercial treaty might promise the greatest amount of advantage to ourselves. Even "Argus" will admit the possibility of a customs union becoming some day the best relation for this country to sustain to the United States. Suppose for example that the system of protection in that country were to break down, that the competition of English goods and the cheapening of production were to enormously diminish the cost of goods in the United States corresponding to those we make in Canada; that in addition to the above-mentioned duty to diminish a cost of production there existed an enormous excess of the assassination of smuggling. What should be done? The only thing that could save this country from being utterly smashed as between millstones would be the making of trade with the United States as free as possible—in other words, to enter into a commercial union and abolish the customs line between the two countries. Under such circumstances all classes would clamor for such a remedy—farmers, lumbermen, fishermen, miners, merchants and manufacturers of all classes.

Have I been exaggerating in my supposition? Cannot "Argus" see what is coming? The late democratic tide wave in the United States means more than is generally supposed. It means that the politicians on both sides must admit the necessity of a reform; that both sides must commence talking in the same key; that the idea must become more and more popular; that both parties must vie with each other in promising to do something to lessen the burden of taxation; and that some sort of a lessening of burden will eventually, and before long, result in reducing protection to a minimum amongst our neighbors and provincials. If the "National Liberal Union" and "Argus" climb their little hillocks and complacently fancy themselves secure because the flood is yet distant, they will find themselves speedily overwhelmed when the tide rises.

I am not going to discuss here the question of free trade versus protection, that is too large a subject to argue in a single letter. What I want to point out to the promoters of the new movement is that they had better not hamper themselves with either a protectionist or a free trade platform. If I understand the signs of the times at all they indicate that only on the broad platform of Canadian nationality can any new party plant itself firmly. To attempt to "fit the principle of nationality" by any protectionist band of protection is absurd; it would be equally absurd to regard free trade as one which more essential. "Argus" would have all nationalistic protectionists; others would have them all free traders; I want them all for Canadian interests whatever policy may for the time be best adapted to promote them. I happen to believe that the best policy is one of lightest possible taxation, but I am not one of those heavy taxation is good for the country and I am with you. Another believes that protection to home industries is the best policy just now; let him be equally ready to adopt absolute free trade, if that can be demonstrated to be best for our country. On this compromise a truly national party is possible, without it the National Liberal Union will follow the Canada first party into the limbo of long-forgotten. The Canada first principle is a dead dog; if the National Liberal Union were to pass away this would not mean that either nationalism or liberalism was no more. It would only mean that some national liberals had organized themselves into a party with inefficient standing room, that some of them had been crowded off, and that the trade plank on which the remnant had huddled for protection—excuse the apparent pun—had broken ground and let them descend to more solid ground.

Why cannot we have a national party without any trade policy at all, except the policy of preferring Canadian interests to all others? Let us abandon not merely the trade plank, but the entire platform of protection. If it points to increased protection to home manufactures, so be it; if it points to an imperial preference, so be it; and if it points to a customs union with the United States, who shall draw back, and why? I am not intentionally afraid of commercial union if that is clearly our best trade policy. Am I told that it will prove incompatible with British connection; then in the immortal words of the conservatives in 1878, "so much the worse for British connection." Am I told that it will lead eventually to annexation? Then I reply (1) that the people of Canada need to be trusted to judge for themselves about the expediency of annexation when the issue becomes a live one, and (2) that the surest way to promote a feeling in favor of annexation may be to prevent our people from trading freely with the United States. There are many in all the provinces who want to trade freely, and if they are not allowed to do it as Canadians they will hanker after being allowed to do it as citizens of the United States. Men who hanker after to be free traders are not prepared to grapple with these problems are quite unfit to launch successfully a great political crusade, and the coming agitation will soon sink a cockle shell. DELTA.

HAMILTON IN DISGUISE. The city of Hamilton as a corporation has spent a large amount of money in trying to secure railway competition, and for the same end some of her enterprising citizens have spent very much more, in the way of time and effort and hard cash all together. If the Grand Trunk gobbles up the Northern and Northwestern, all this money and effort will have been wasted, and the ambitious little city will have been handed over body and bones to the tender mercies of the great alligator corporation, which swallows up all before it. The charge is openly made that some of her citizens, from

as a foe to British connection, and as guilty of "vicious treason" whatever that may mean. Now if that resolution meant anything, it assuredly meant that we ought to have the right to make with the United States whatever kind of commercial treaty might promise the greatest amount of advantage to ourselves. Even "Argus" will admit the possibility of a customs union becoming some day the best relation for this country to sustain to the United States. Suppose for example that the system of protection in that country were to break down, that the competition of English goods and the cheapening of production were to enormously diminish the cost of goods in the United States corresponding to those we make in Canada; that in addition to the above-mentioned duty to diminish a cost of production there existed an enormous excess of the assassination of smuggling. What should be done? The only thing that could save this country from being utterly smashed as between millstones would be the making of trade with the United States as free as possible—in other words, to enter into a commercial union and abolish the customs line between the two countries. Under such circumstances all classes would clamor for such a remedy—farmers, lumbermen, fishermen, miners, merchants and manufacturers of all classes.

Have I been exaggerating in my supposition? Cannot "Argus" see what is coming? The late democratic tide wave in the United States means more than is generally supposed. It means that the politicians on both sides must admit the necessity of a reform; that both sides must commence talking in the same key; that the idea must become more and more popular; that both parties must vie with each other in promising to do something to lessen the burden of taxation; and that some sort of a lessening of burden will eventually, and before long, result in reducing protection to a minimum amongst our neighbors and provincials. If the "National Liberal Union" and "Argus" climb their little hillocks and complacently fancy themselves secure because the flood is yet distant, they will find themselves speedily overwhelmed when the tide rises.

I am not going to discuss here the question of free trade versus protection, that is too large a subject to argue in a single letter. What I want to point out to the promoters of the new movement is that they had better not hamper themselves with either a protectionist or a free trade platform. If I understand the signs of the times at all they indicate that only on the broad platform of Canadian nationality can any new party plant itself firmly. To attempt to "fit the principle of nationality" by any protectionist band of protection is absurd; it would be equally absurd to regard free trade as one which more essential. "Argus" would have all nationalistic protectionists; others would have them all free traders; I want them all for Canadian interests whatever policy may for the time be best adapted to promote them. I happen to believe that the best policy is one of lightest possible taxation, but I am not one of those heavy taxation is good for the country and I am with you. Another believes that protection to home industries is the best policy just now; let him be equally ready to adopt absolute free trade, if that can be demonstrated to be best for our country. On this compromise a truly national party is possible, without it the National Liberal Union will follow the Canada first party into the limbo of long-forgotten. The Canada first principle is a dead dog; if the National Liberal Union were to pass away this would not mean that either nationalism or liberalism was no more. It would only mean that some national liberals had organized themselves into a party with inefficient standing room, that some of them had been crowded off, and that the trade plank on which the remnant had huddled for protection—excuse the apparent pun—had broken ground and let them descend to more solid ground.

Why cannot we have a national party without any trade policy at all, except the policy of preferring Canadian interests to all others? Let us abandon not merely the trade plank, but the entire platform of protection. If it points to increased protection to home manufactures, so be it; if it points to an imperial preference, so be it; and if it points to a customs union with the United States, who shall draw back, and why? I am not intentionally afraid of commercial union if that is clearly our best trade policy. Am I told that it will prove incompatible with British connection; then in the immortal words of the conservatives in 1878, "so much the worse for British connection." Am I told that it will lead eventually to annexation? Then I reply (1) that the people of Canada need to be trusted to judge for themselves about the expediency of annexation when the issue becomes a live one, and (2) that the surest way to promote a feeling in favor of annexation may be to prevent our people from trading freely with the United States. There are many in all the provinces who want to trade freely, and if they are not allowed to do it as Canadians they will hanker after being allowed to do it as citizens of the United States. Men who hanker after to be free traders are not prepared to grapple with these problems are quite unfit to launch successfully a great political crusade, and the coming agitation will soon sink a cockle shell. DELTA.

as a foe to British connection, and as guilty of "vicious treason" whatever that may mean. Now if that resolution meant anything, it assuredly meant that we ought to have the right to make with the United States whatever kind of commercial treaty might promise the greatest amount of advantage to ourselves. Even "Argus" will admit the possibility of a customs union becoming some day the best relation for this country to sustain to the United States. Suppose for example that the system of protection in that country were to break down, that the competition of English goods and the cheapening of production were to enormously diminish the cost of goods in the United States corresponding to those we make in Canada; that in addition to the above-mentioned duty to diminish a cost of production there existed an enormous excess of the assassination of smuggling. What should be done? The only thing that could save this country from being utterly smashed as between millstones would be the making of trade with the United States as free as possible—in other words, to enter into a commercial union and abolish the customs line between the two countries. Under such circumstances all classes would clamor for such a remedy—farmers, lumbermen, fishermen, miners, merchants and manufacturers of all classes.

Have I been exaggerating in my supposition? Cannot "Argus" see what is coming? The late democratic tide wave in the United States means more than is generally supposed. It means that the politicians on both sides must admit the necessity of a reform; that both sides must commence talking in the same key; that the idea must become more and more popular; that both parties must vie with each other in promising to do something to lessen the burden of taxation; and that some sort of a lessening of burden will eventually, and before long, result in reducing protection to a minimum amongst our neighbors and provincials. If the "National Liberal Union" and "Argus" climb their little hillocks and complacently fancy themselves secure because the flood is yet distant, they will find themselves speedily overwhelmed when the tide rises.

I am not going to discuss here the question of free trade versus protection, that is too large a subject to argue in a single letter. What I want to point out to the promoters of the new movement is that they had better not hamper themselves with either a protectionist or a free trade platform. If I understand the signs of the times at all they indicate that only on the broad platform of Canadian nationality can any new party plant itself firmly. To attempt to "fit the principle of nationality" by any protectionist band of protection is absurd; it would be equally absurd to regard free trade as one which more essential. "Argus" would have all nationalistic protectionists; others would have them all free traders; I want them all for Canadian interests whatever policy may for the time be best adapted to promote them. I happen to believe that the best policy is one of lightest possible taxation, but I am not one of those heavy taxation is good for the country and I am with you. Another believes that protection to home industries is the best policy just now; let him be equally ready to adopt absolute free trade, if that can be demonstrated to be best for our country. On this compromise a truly national party is possible, without it the National Liberal Union will follow the Canada first party into the limbo of long-forgotten. The Canada first principle is a dead dog; if the National Liberal Union were to pass away this would not mean that either nationalism or liberalism was no more. It would only mean that some national liberals had organized themselves into a party with inefficient standing room, that some of them had been crowded off, and that the trade plank on which the remnant had huddled for protection—excuse the apparent pun—had broken ground and let them descend to more solid ground.

Why cannot we have a national party without any trade policy at all, except the policy of preferring Canadian interests to all others? Let us abandon not merely the trade plank, but the entire platform of protection. If it points to increased protection to home manufactures, so be it; if it points to an imperial preference, so be it; and if it points to a customs union with the United States, who shall draw back, and why? I am not intentionally afraid of commercial union if that is clearly our best trade policy. Am I told that it will prove incompatible with British connection; then in the immortal words of the conservatives in 1878, "so much the worse for British connection." Am I told that it will lead eventually to annexation? Then I reply (1) that the people of Canada need to be trusted to judge for themselves about the expediency of annexation when the issue becomes a live one, and (2) that the surest way to promote a feeling in favor of annexation may be to prevent our people from trading freely with the United States. There are many in all the provinces who want to trade freely, and if they are not allowed to do it as Canadians they will hanker after being allowed to do it as citizens of the United States. Men who hanker after to be free traders are not prepared to grapple with these problems are quite unfit to launch successfully a great political crusade, and the coming agitation will soon sink a cockle shell. DELTA.

HAMILTON IN DISGUISE. The city of Hamilton as a corporation has spent a large amount of money in trying to secure railway competition, and for the same end some of her enterprising citizens have spent very much more, in the way of time and effort and hard cash all together. If the Grand Trunk gobbles up the Northern and Northwestern, all this money and effort will have been wasted, and the ambitious little city will have been handed over body and bones to the tender mercies of the great alligator corporation, which swallows up all before it. The charge is openly made that some of her citizens, from

as a foe to British connection, and as guilty of "vicious treason" whatever that may mean. Now if that resolution meant anything, it assuredly meant that we ought to have the right to make with the United States whatever kind of commercial treaty might promise the greatest amount of advantage to ourselves. Even "Argus" will admit the possibility of a customs union becoming some day the best relation for this country to sustain to the United States. Suppose for example that the system of protection in that country were to break down, that the competition of English goods and the cheapening of production were to enormously diminish the cost of goods in the United States corresponding to those we make in Canada; that in addition to the above-mentioned duty to diminish a cost of production there existed an enormous excess of the assassination of smuggling. What should be done? The only thing that could save this country from being utterly smashed as between millstones would be the making of trade with the United States as free as possible—in other words, to enter into a commercial union and abolish the customs line between the two countries. Under such circumstances all classes would clamor for such a remedy—farmers, lumbermen, fishermen, miners, merchants and manufacturers of all classes.

Have I been exaggerating in my supposition? Cannot "Argus" see what is coming? The late democratic tide wave in the United States means more than is generally supposed. It means that the politicians on both sides must admit the necessity of a reform; that both sides must commence talking in the same key; that the idea must become more and more popular; that both parties must vie with each other in promising to do something to lessen the burden of taxation; and that some sort of a lessening of burden will eventually, and before long, result in reducing protection to a minimum amongst our neighbors and provincials. If the "National Liberal Union" and "Argus" climb their little hillocks and complacently fancy themselves secure because the flood is yet distant, they will find themselves speedily overwhelmed when the tide rises.

I am not going to discuss here the question of free trade versus protection, that is too large a subject to argue in a single letter. What I want to point out to the promoters of the new movement is that they had better not hamper themselves with either a protectionist or a free trade platform. If I understand the signs of the times at all they indicate that only on the broad platform of Canadian nationality can any new party plant itself firmly. To attempt to "fit the principle of nationality" by any protectionist band of protection is absurd; it would be equally absurd to regard free trade as one which more essential. "Argus" would have all nationalistic protectionists; others would have them all free traders; I want them all for Canadian interests whatever policy may for the time be best adapted to promote them. I happen to believe that the best policy is one of lightest possible taxation, but I am not one of those heavy taxation is good for the country and I am with you. Another believes that protection to home industries is the best policy just now; let him be equally ready to adopt absolute free trade, if that can be demonstrated to be best for our country. On this compromise a truly national party is possible, without it the National Liberal Union will follow the Canada first party into the limbo of long-forgotten. The Canada first principle is a dead dog; if the National Liberal Union were to pass away this would not mean that either nationalism or liberalism was no more. It would only mean that some national liberals had organized themselves into a party with inefficient standing room, that some of them had been crowded off, and that the trade plank on which the remnant had huddled for protection—excuse the apparent pun—had broken ground and let them descend to more solid ground.

Why cannot we have a national party without any trade policy at all, except the policy of preferring Canadian interests to all others? Let us abandon not merely the trade plank, but the entire platform of protection. If it points to increased protection to home manufactures, so be it; if it points to an imperial preference, so be it; and if it points to a customs union with the United States, who shall draw back, and why? I am not intentionally afraid of commercial union if that is clearly our best trade policy. Am I told that it will prove incompatible with British connection; then in the immortal words of the conservatives in 1878, "so much the worse for British connection." Am I told that it will lead eventually to annexation? Then I reply (1) that the people of Canada need to be trusted to judge for themselves about the expediency of annexation when the issue becomes a live one, and (2) that the surest way to promote a feeling in favor of annexation may be to prevent our people from trading freely with the United States. There are many in all the provinces who want to trade freely, and if they are not allowed to do it as Canadians they will hanker after being allowed to do it as citizens of the United States. Men who hanker after to be free traders are not prepared to grapple with these problems are quite unfit to launch successfully a great political crusade, and the coming agitation will soon sink a cockle shell. DELTA.

REPLY TO A MALICIOUS LETTER!

The following is a reply just received from Mr. A. Weber, Piano Manufacturer, New York, when asked as to the authenticity of a certain letter which is being distributed in the form of a circular by Piano Agents in Canada, with a view to the malicious injury of the "R. S. WILLIAMS & S. N. Piano".

NEW YORK, Nov. 8, 1882. R. S. WILLIAMS, Esq., Toronto, Can. My Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your favor of the 2nd inst., enclosing a letter purporting to be a copy of one written by myself, which you ask if it is a correct copy, and whether it has my sanction. In reply, beg to say it is not a correct copy, nor has it my sanction or approval.

Yours truly, A. WEBER.

R. S. WILLIAMS, Piano Manufacturer, 143 Yonge St., Toronto, Ont.

FOOTS AND SHOES.

SIMPSON'S Mens' Hand Made Lace Boots \$2.50, COR. QUEEN AND TERAULEY.

SIMPSON'S Mens Gaiters, hand made, \$2.50, COR. QUEEN AND TERAULEY.

SIMPSON'S Boys' and Youths' Lace Boots, good value.

SIMPSON'S Stock of Childrens' wear unequalled.

SIMPSON'S Shows Ladies' Goods which can't be beat.

SIMPSON'S COR. QUEEN AND TERAULEY.

STOVES

ROYALS! ROYALS! ROYALS!

BUY

McCLARY'S FAMOUS

STOVES,

BEST IN THE MARKET.

I Guarantee every Stove to give satisfaction. 3000 Royals are now in use in Toronto and not one complaint.

IF YOU WANT SOLD COMFORT BUY A ROYAL.

I have now the largest Stock of Stoves in the city and can fill orders promptly.

JAMES NOLAN,

58, 60 AND 62 JARVIS STREET, TORONTO.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE.

1883. HARPER'S MAGAZINE, ILLUSTRATED.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE begins its sixtieth volume with the December Number. It is not only the most popular illustrated periodical in America and England, but also the largest in its class.

HARPER'S PERIODICALS.

HARPER'S MAGAZINE, \$4.00; HARPER'S WEEKLY, \$2.00; THE THREE MONTHS' MAGAZINE, \$2.00; HARPER'S YOUTH, \$1.00; HARPER'S FANTASY, \$1.00; HARPER'S PICTURE LIBRARY, \$1.00.

By order of the board, D. COULSON, Cashier.

REMOVALS.

W. WINDELER HAS REMOVED TO 283 QUEEN STREET WEST.

A LARGE AND CHEAP STOCK OF GOODS ON HAND.

GREAT REDUCTION IN PRICES.

Our ordered work is first-class and second to none in their line.

COFFEE MILLS.

ENTERPRISE COFFEE MILLS, ALL SIZES.

From \$2.00 to \$75.00 Each.

P. PATERSON & SON, 24 KING ST. EAST.

WM. TOZER BILL POSTER DISTRIBUTOR.

100 WOOD ST.

Orders left at Will & Weber's will be promptly attended to.

A. VOGELER & CO. Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

