

amph
Econ
Tariff
&)

Gibbons, George Christie

'''

Canada: her mistakes and opportunities



CANADA: HER MISTAKES AND OPPORTUNITIES.

AN ADDRESS ON THE SITUATION BY

Mr. Geo. C. Gibbons, Q.C., of London.

(1848-1912)

The Anglo-Saxon race must be in the front rank of progress or discontented.

The people of Canada will never be satisfied with less prosperity than their neighbors, nor can they ever become stagnant in national growth, or be mossbacks, commercially or otherwise, without protest and struggle.

To those to whom office promises or provides a greater reward than they could hope to attain by any forward movement of the nation—to those who owe their prosperity to public moneys paid directly or by forced tribute of the tariff, I do not address myself.

It would be a hopeless task to attempt to convince these men that there is any need of a change. They are contented and well may be. To all who are satisfied with the present condition—to those who have not by the evidence of every day facts been convinced that this country, one of the grandest on the globe, is handicapped and hindered in its race no words of mine will avail anything.

But to that great mass of Canadians who seek to find a remedy for a condition of things that is conceded to be anything but satisfactory I address these words.

The great natural resources of the country are conceded, its magnificent farming lands, its unsurpassed waterways, its timber plentiful and of the best quality, its mineral resources almost unbounded, coal, iron, nickel, copper, and the rest in profusion; its fisheries the best in the world; a climate suitable for "seed-time and harvest" and healthful to all animal life. A sturdy, energetic race, the Canadian has been the forerunner of civilization everywhere on this continent. With all these advantages what has been the result?

THE SYSTEM OF PROTECTION.

Since the commencement of time the history of man has been the history of struggle on the part of the oppressed for liberty. Man's inhumanity to man has been the greatest curse of our race. At all times nations against other nations and peoples against peoples have sought to obtain what was not theirs by right. In every community there have arisen certain men who claimed that either by the chance of birth or for some other reason they were entitled to certain exclusive privileges not enjoyed by the people at large. Barons in all nations, in all ages have exacted tribute as their right at the expense of and in contemptuous disregard of the common people. The church too often, and the "flag", upon all occasions have been their allies. It has ever been disloyal to rebel against the tyranny of caste or class. History is but repeating itself in this age, and we now have a privileged class in a form more dishonest, more insidious, more dangerous and more hurtful than ever before, sustained through the system of so-called "Protection."

Obtaining its foothold in the guise of a pauper seeking State aid to assist it in its weakness and infancy, it soon becomes the aggressive bully using its strength to crush those who created it. By a misplaced sympathy

IT HAS HESITATED AT NO MEANS

to accomplish its ends. In the neighboring Republic it coined money and grew strong out of the blood of the nation. The war tariff of 1864 was passed without debate and without amendment as being necessary "to save the Union." It was the opportunity of the knave who sought to grow rich out of the forced contributions of the people—he had but to suggest a tax upon his neighbors and his desire was gratified.

Grown more gluttonous still in 1890, McKinley yielded to their demands and added from 5 to 50 per cent. more to the schedules. Twenty years after the close of the war their greed had not been appeased but only whetted. By what influence was this brought about? Who went to Washington? Did the farmer or artisan go? Did they want to be compelled to pay more tribute to the millionaire monopolists? Who went and in whose interests did they go? Why, the men went in their own interest only who wanted to levy taxes upon the people

for their exclusive benefit. And yet these men pretend that all this effort on their part is made on behalf of the man who stays at home and is unconscious of it. Is that reasonable, or does any one believe it? If these men obtain the power to tax the general public for their benefit "the tariff is a tax," and not a tax for public purposes, but to serve private ends in fraud of the commonwealth. All they gain and oft-times much more is lost to those who are assessed for their benefit. If the manufacturer who seeks this special tribute were asked as a condition to give the same advance as he obtains to his workmen and those from whom he buys, what would be his answer? He would promptly decline, as then there would be no benefit to him; what he wants is not equality but advantage. And yet we are told that all this special pleading at Washington and Ottawa is for the general good in furtherance of a "National Policy."

The artisan knows too well that he is paid just such wages as his employer is forced to pay him and he has to market his labor in competition with all comers. He knows that the Government not only does not protect him against "the pauper labor" of Europe, but has spent millions to bring it here to compete with him. He does not go to Ottawa for aid—it is not for such as he.

The farmer need not go—there is no bonus for raising wheat or cattle. The lumberman only asks to be left alone, and taxed as little as possible. No one can be taxed for his benefit. The only man who asserts the right to compel people to buy from him at a price higher than his goods are worth is the protectionist manufacturer. By what right does he claim this exclusive privilege? No one would pay this extra price if not compelled by law to do so. That individual would be lacking in sense who bought by choice in the dearer market. The manufacturer who can and does produce as cheaply as the goods can be bought for elsewhere needs no protection, and is a benefactor to the country. But if it costs him \$85 to produce in this country what can be bought elsewhere for \$70, and he wants a profit of say \$15 added to his cost 85

 Making \$100.00

 In order to keep out the \$70 article 70.00
 he must have a protection equal to say 45 per cent. 31.50

\$101.50

He makes \$15 profit, but the purchaser pays \$30 more than he could buy the goods for. This is not an imaginary case—it but illustrates what is applicable to the vast majority of manufactured goods in this country under present conditions. Our limited market, high tariff upon raw material, and cost of distribution, render it impossible for our manufacturers now to compete in most lines with other nations having less of these disadvantages.

NOW BY WHAT REASONING

is it either just or advisable that one class of the community should pay \$30 that another may make \$15? Why should they pay the \$30 were it all made? What is it but a tax to support a class who cannot support themselves? How can that tax be paid out of the earnings of the rest of the people without impoverishing them by just so much? The individual loses his \$30 it is certain. How does he get it back again? Does he get more for his wheat because he paid \$30 more for a binder? Will his horse sell for more because he paid 4 cents a pound for barb wire instead of 3 cents? Will his hay bring more per ton because he paid 13 cents instead of 6 cents for his oil? Does the operator in the cotton factory get higher wages now that the combine has been enabled to take full advantage of the "protection" of 30 to 60 per cent.

The slave of the South had to submit to the demands of his master because the latter was sustained by the power of the law. The slaves of the tariff pay the price of their slavery for the same reason—the law compels them. In the case of the slave might made right, and he could not help himself. That was an older form of autocracy, and it was only a few years ago that on this continent the state, and a good part of the church too, said that God's creatures because they were black should serve those who were white. But the slave of the south did not forge his own chains as the slave of the tariff does. The latter deliberately directs law-makers to pass laws to compel him to pay prices that without such compulsion he could not be induced to pay. He calmly compels himself to contribute a goodly portion of his earnings to enhance the profits of men whom he does not know and in whom he has no interest. The result is natural. The slaveholder of the South thought that the efforts of the slave for liberty were crimes against the laws of God and man, and all abolitionists were traitors, disloyal, disturbers of the peace, and were told to leave a country they did

not know how to appreciate. So, too, the protected manufacturer, grown insolent, talks of "vested rights," and looks upon himself as of a privileged class whose claims it is high treason to impugn.

Protection so called is the same everywhere, disguised in its name, its real character is aggression and extortion. It is as merciless as it is avaricious, using its riches to bribe legislatures and corrupt the press, deceiving and stifling opinion by insidious falsehoods, and where it cannot deceive it seeking to crush. Its power of money, concentrated in centres, gives it great influence with all worshippers of success and brings in its train all that class of sycophants, toadies, and parasites, who rejoice to bask in its favor and feed upon the crumbs it spares them. Added to its adherents come, too, others of a like kind, great railroad and other corporations seeking government aid for business enterprises—in which the public take the risk while the promoters reap the profit. Who dare stand up against all these? Let him know that he is marked as a very "disagreeable" person and the parasites will decry him as a man who runs down his own country and advise him to leave it.

The administration of a country elected by "Protected" interests becomes at once their victim. There is no choice in the matter but to do their bidding. Their organization is its life. President Harrison

COULD NOT RETRACE HIS STEPS.

He had to go on to McKinleyism. Sir John A. Macdonald, after 1879, became of necessity, to a great extent, the creature of those who put him in office; and, per force, carried the tariff by stages, at their command, to a height never originally contemplated. Sir John Thompson cannot retrace. These men put him where he is, and he must carry out the bargain implied when he took their money and their aid. All interests are subservient to theirs. When their "privileges" are interfered with, all else must yield. Whatever is done must be upon the lines of "The National Policy." If Secretary Foster's account be true, it was largely because Sir John Thompson dare not consider the question of Reciprocity as to manufactured goods that the conference failed. It is a money combination, and the men who draw \$8,000 each a year at Ottawa are mere puppets in the hands of the men who are making their

millions. The organization and system are all one, but the real controllers of the legislation at Ottawa

ARE NOT ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE.

It is amusing when the puppets put on a pretense of real life, and promise to look into things on their own account. They actually have talked about lopping off the branches of their family tree. Whatever is done will be done at the dictation and direction of the combines as matters of expediency, and will be undone as quickly as possible by every conceivable regulation to that end.

THIS IS THE CONSPIRACY

that purposes to represent National government by the people for the people. Stripped of its false covering, this gigantic system of hypocrisy stands forth here as everywhere—the greatest menace to liberty of this century, and the most powerful oligarchy the world has ever known.

PROTECTION IN CANADA.

Free Trade or any other economic arrangement cannot prevent times of depression. If people have the privilege of buying where they please it is an advantage at all times, but it does not follow that if they buy more than they want evil will not ensue. The greed of money leads to over-trading and speculation; and these to illegitimate inflation of values. Then comes the reaction when the inexorable law of supply and demand asserts itself. Free Trade alleviates these results and in a degree prevents them. Protection naturally leads to over-production and the "combine" is its necessary ally to control the output as well as to fix the price. Combinations are impossible under Free Trade. A wall is necessary to the existence of a monopoly, it must have a confined territory upon which to work and to which it limits its operations. If there is no obstruction to the free importation of goods of what avail a combination of the manufacturers within any country.

In Canada, as in all the world, the years of 1877-8 were years of great commercial depression, following a period of unparalleled expansion.

Under a 15 per cent tariff our foreign trade had grown from \$129,553,000 in 1868 to \$216,755,000 in 1874, *i. e.*, it had

ALMOST DOUBLED IN SIX YEARS.

In 1878 it had gone down to \$170,522,000, and yet was \$40,000,000

and over 30 per cent. greater than ten years before. It went up too fast and had to be followed by years of contraction and penance. So it was the world over. The remedy sought and urged in the United States was a lowering of the tariff, and only the great revival of trade in 1881-2 prevented a movement on that line being successful then. In the United States more than anywhere else there is a continuous natural and proper increase of trade owing to the prodigious growth of population and increased production. One would have thought that they would have felt this depression less than the over-crowded mother land. But what are the facts? In 1877-8 when the depression was at its height workmen left the United States in large numbers in order to return to England. Throughout the continuance of this depression there had been an almost continuous decline of pauperism in England; her people purchased an increased quantity of articles of general consumption, while in the United States on the contrary there was a steady increase in pauperism and destitution.

In a petition presented in 1878 by some of the leading merchants and manufacturers in the United States to the Senate and House of Representatives in favor of

UNRESTRICTED TRADE

it is stated that there was at the time "unspeakable distress" among the working classes of America. "Pauperism and crime increase daily within our borders, skilled mechanics tramp the country over in vain search for the means of living, and instances are not lacking where some of our best artisans have been induced to leave our shores to accept the so-called pauper wages of other countries. A day's labor in England will purchase from 25 to 30 per cent. more than a day's labor in the United States."

While the people of the United States were inclining towards "unrestricted trade" for relief, what was happening in Canada? If we had done so well under a 15 per cent. tariff why change our policy because of a temporary depression that was world-wide in its influences, and much more disastrous in Protected countries than in Free Trade England?

Misled and deceived, the people of Canada were taught to believe that they were afflicted with a chronic disorder, whereas it was merely the passing consequence of an overindulgence in the good things of life. It was the opportunity of the protectionist and he

speedily suggested as a remedy a free bleeding of the producing and artisan class for his benefit. Unfortunately the people were only too ready to accept the promise of immediate relief at the hands of any quack rather than trust

THE HONEST AND GUILTESS HAND

of the man who then controlled the administration of this country. The impatient farmer was promised "a home market" as a recompense for being thus cupped for the benefit of the manufacturer.

It is needless to say that the "home market" has been a failure. Wheat value is still fixed at Liverpool, not Ottawa. Cheese, cattle, barley, horses, hay, oats, peas, beans, poultry—even the eggs—have a price put upon them over which Minister Foster has as much control as the historic

"FLY ON THE WHEEL."

What an irony of fate it was that gave the farmer as a remedy for the low prices of his produce the privilege of selling in the cheapest markets and buying in the dearest. What a farce and failure the whole thing has been.

In 1874 our Foreign trade was \$216,000,000.

" 1891 " " 219,000,000.

For the year ending June, 1892, the wonderful crop of wheat and good price ran the total up, but the smaller crop and lower price of last season is likely to bring down the average again. In 1892, an extraordinary year, the United States increased their foreign trade \$135,000,000. Our Finance Minister is making the most of this dispensation of Providence in the crops of 1891.

Imagine McKinley pointing to the enormous output of the crop of 1891 as a reason for continuing to tax the farmer upon what he had to buy. Imagine any Republican statesman urging, as a reason why the duty should not be reduced upon woollen goods, the fact that Massachusetts has \$350,000,000 in her savings banks and that the deposits are rapidly increasing.

Yet we are favored with columns of this class of reading at Ottawa.

In no country are the effects of trade restriction more apparent than in Canada.

If any country can be said to be suited to a policy of protection is the United States. There, 85 per cent. of their trade is inter-

state, free and untrammelled. So diversified is their climate that they have within themselves the natural products of every clime, and a market so large and so rapidly increasing that a constant stimulus is afforded to production. They have Free Trade to such an extent that as to half their manufactured out-put they can and do produce as cheaply as anywhere else in the world. We buy forty per cent. of our total importations of manufactured goods from them in preference to all others.

They complain of McKinleyism, notwithstanding, but McKinleyism, in a 65 million country, is nothing like as oppressive in its consequences as a much lighter tariff in a small country. As to one half their manufactured products, the tariff has little or no relation. They produce machinery of all kinds, agricultural implements and harvest tools, furniture and musical instruments as

CHEAPLY AS ANYWHERE ELSE IN THE WORLD.

As to the staple productions of cotton, a small protection of 10 per cent. would be as effective as one of 60. We need a wall just as high as to most things against the Americans as against England. Even the Free Trade we have between the provinces is largely forced and unprofitable.

British Columbia has more in common in the way of trade with the people south of her than she can ever have with us. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island would, if permitted, trade by way of their natural highway—the sea—with Massachusetts.

Look in any direction in Canada and you find trade restrained and diverted from its natural channels and always at the expense of both the volume and the profit. The manufacturer, who has a market of 65 million of people for his products can and does specialize and produce so much cheaper than we do that the burden of "protection" in the United States means less cost to the consumer on nearly everything he buys. The object of a protective tariff is to

SHUT OUT COMPETITION.

The narrower the sphere to which competition is confined the greater the cost of production and the larger profit required to sustain the industry.

So McKinleyism, vicious as it is, means Free Trade as compared with the isolated condition of a people of less than five millions, shut out from all natural channels of trade on their own continent. The result has been what was inevitable. Population has sought our neighbors rather than us, not because their lands are better, their mines richer or their general natural advantages are greater, but because the opportunities for development are infinitely better.

The results of the census are admittedly discreditable and humiliating. The absurd and evidently cooked statistics as to manufactures cannot remove the painful impression.

INCREASE OF POPULATION IN TEN YEARS.

New York.....	898,000	Ontario.....	186,000
Pennsylvania.....	966,000	Quebec.....	129,000
Nebraska.....	604,000	Manitoba, the North-	} 178,000
Minnesota.....	520,000	west and British	
Ohio.....	468,000	Columbia.....	
Michigan.....	453,000	Nova Scotia, New	} 10,209
Massachusetts.....	450,000	Brunswick and Prince	
Kansas.....	427,000	Edward Island.....	
Washington State.....	350,000		
California.....	340,000		

While our Foreign trade has been stationary since 1874, that of the United States has increased from \$900,000,000 to over \$2,000,000,000 since 1870, or 120 per cent. The trade of the South American countries increased 69 per cent. in the 20 years from 1870 to 1890, while the trade of the United Kingdom has grown from \$2,663,620,718 in 1870, to \$3,616,930,122 in 1890.

See the effect of isolation and restriction upon our shipping interests :

In 1873 our gross registered tonnage was 1,073,718 ; in 1878 it had risen to 1,333,015, an increase of over 30 per cent., but in 1891 it had fallen to 1,005,475, or less than it was in 1873. There was a further decrease of 20,000 tons in the Maritime Provinces last year. We have spent \$57,000,000 on canals alone, but with what result? The total tonnage built in 1891 was 52,145, and of this 43,000 tons were built in the Maritime Provinces, Ontario only furnished 2,662 tons, and Quebec, 4,200 tons.

Why do we build canals if we have not ships or ship-yards?

The total registered tonnage in Ontario was 138,914 tons in 1891. Ontario Boards of Trade can discuss eloquently the question of a

FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE,

but wholly disregard the fact that they have no shipping at their doors. It is almost inconceivable that a people should spend, as we have done, quite \$100,000,000 in building canals, lighthouses, harbors and in their maintenance, and pay so little attention to the lack of result.

Yet our neighbors are building on these same waters a wonderful fleet. Since 1886 they have more than doubled their tonnage on the great lakes. In 1889 they had 2,784 vessels of a gross tonnage of 926,355, valued at \$48,941,000, moving 53,000,000 tons of freight, employing 16,000 hands, and paying out in wages \$5,322,000.

In 1890 the new tonnage built for this trade alone was 108,523 tons and in 1891 and 1892 it was quite as great.

Look at the result in the growth of population in American cities on the great lakes :

LOCALITIES.	1880.	1890.
Ashland	————	9,956
Duluth	5,415	33,115
Marquette	4,690	9,093
Superior	————	11,983
Total Lake Superior	10,105	64,147
Alpena	6,153	11,283
Bay City	20,693	27,839
Detroit	116,340	205,876
Port Huron	8,883	11,283
Saginaw	29,541	46,322
Total Lakes Huron and St. Clair ..	181,610	304,863
Appleton	8,005	11,869
Chicago	503,185	1,099,850
Grand Rapids	32,016	60,278
Green Bay	7,464	9,069
Manistee	6,930	12,812
Menominee	3,288	10,630
Michigan City	7,366	10,776
Milwaukee	115,587	204,468
Muskegon	11,262	22,702

LOCALITIES.	1880.	1890.
Oshkosh.....	15,748	22,836
Racine.....	16,031	21,014
Sheboygan.....	7,341	16,359
Total Lake Michigan.....	734,196	1,502,633
Ashtabula.....	4,445	8,338
Buffalo.....	155,134	255,664
Cleveland.....	160,146	261,353
Dunkirk.....	7,248	9,416
Erie.....	27,737	40,634
Sandusky.....	15,838	18,471
Toledo.....	50,137	81,434
Total Lake Erie.....	420,685	675,310

Why is it that we have not such cities? Why is it that less and less in proportion is seen the Union Jack on the Detroit or Sault Ste. Marie rivers? It is because of trade restriction. The traffic between the Eastern and Western and North-western States is free and untrammelled, and goes on increasing in leaps and bounds, necessitating new means of carriage by water and land each year. We are

SHUT OUT BY BARRIERS OF MAN,

not of nature. Fortunately our railways are not so restricted and they are permitted to do and are doing a large share of the American carrying trade. Mr. Van Horne, while taking advantage of this privilege for his road at the Sault, Detroit and everywhere East and West where he can get a foothold, professes to believe that every one else is better off because they are prohibited doing business they would gladly do if not prevented.

No one knows better the evil that would result to our railways were they deprived of their American connections, and these are no more necessary to his road than is trade with these people to every other legitimate business in the land.

OUR MINERALS

That Canada is rich in minerals we all know. Why no result? The American output last year was \$670,000,000, ours about \$20,000,000. Their's increased at the rate of \$25,000,000 a year. The Canadian year book for 1892 says: "It would appear that mineral production in Canada is, at present, not increasing to any great ex-

tent, the value having remained practically stationary for the last three years, though this may be in a large measure due to sluggish markets and a consequently reduced demand for some of the principal articles."

Well, where is our demand? In 1890 out of \$4,855,757 in spite of the tariff against us we sent to the United States \$3,963,257.

Does not the statistician know well that were the "tariff" barriers removed our trade would double in a year and be ten-fold in ten years.

A friend came back from British Columbia the other day. As he is a great protectionist he takes his cue from Ottawa and with perfect confidence claims every mineral deposit as the natural result of trade restriction and the N. P. If McKinley had only been trained in the same school he would have justified the increased duty on tin plate by reference to the growth of Lake shipping. But my friend was in great glee. He said: "We have some of the finest lead deposits in the world in the Kootenay district." I said: "Yes, and are they being worked." "Well, no," he replied, "not now, there is no market." "When will there be?" he was asked. "The natural and only market," he said, "is the American and that is closed by the tariff, freight would prohibit export."

If Christopher Columbus were to return to this benighted earth, after 400 years absence, and proceed to the boundary between British Columbia and Washington State, he would naturally ask the Canadian: Do you not want to sell your lead and does not the American want to buy? It is in your mutual interest to trade, is it not? and, if so, what incomprehensible idiocy prevents you and keeps these mines idle? The only answer possible would be that the McKinleys at Washington and Thompsons at Ottawa, in league with and controlled by an organization of monopolists, declared that nature and the people themselves were all wrong, and the lead must stay

IN THE HILLS OF KOOTENAY

until that fire which shall destroy the world should melt it, rather than that the principle of plundering the many for the benefit of the few should not prevail.

As we have an exportable surplus of farm products, fish and lumber, the price of all these is fixed by an outside demand. The Government cannot add to the value of the product by any legisla

tion. People who can't be helped in their selling surely do not want to be hindered in their buying. Our shipping and mining interests would be wonderfully aided by Free Trade, especially Free Trade of this continent.

A large proportion of our manufacturers are ready to hold their own—those that are self-supporting are all anxious for a more extensive market. Must the whole country be sacrificed for the benefit of a few pampered combines?

All restriction to trade is injurious. The inventor of tariffs was a robber. Freedom of trade is a benefit to everyone. Freedom of trade on this continent, even with McKinleyism, would be a great step in advance of our present condition. Now, we are handicapped on all sides in what we sell and what we buy. Our mines are idle, and we have no ships. The Americans, prosperous with Free Trade of a continent, rebel against McKinleyism. Shall we submit to pay McKinley prices with 20 to 60 per cent. added? Shall we be content to be isolated from our profitable markets? All for what? Because Mr. Foster says that he cannot abandon his promises to the Red Parlor.

A better era is dawning. President Cleveland in his inaugural address has struck the right chord. He says :

“The verdict of our voter, which condemned the injustice of maintaining protection for protection's sake, enjoins upon the people's servants the duty of exposing and destroying the brood of kindred evils which are the unwholesome progeny of paternalism. The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned and the better lesson taught, that while the people should patriotically and cheerfully support their government its functions do not include the support of the people. When we proclaim that the necessity for revenue to support the government furnishes the only justification for taxing the people, we announce a truth so plain that its denial would seem to indicate the extent to which judgment may be influenced by familiarity with perversions of the taxing power; and when we seek to reinstate the self confidence and business enterprise of our citizens, by discrediting an abject dependence upon governmental favor, we strive to stimulate those elements of American character which support the hope of American achievement.”

Let trade be free and let us support each and every measure to that end.

Let us, as the Americans have done, repudiate “Protection for Protection's sake.” Let us then strive for the greatest measure of

Free Trade possible, either by way of Reciprocity or otherwise, but remember that we never will accomplish anything until we have wholly and entirely abandoned the belief that the functions of a Government include the support of any class of the people by taxation of the rest.

It is the first duty of every man who believes these things to do his part, however unpleasant the task or at whatever cost.

We have come to the crossing of the ways. Let us preserve our National life. Many, despairing of relief, are looking to a change of allegiance. Let us be patient. Our Canada is worthy of the effort and must be saved. The paralysis which now hinders her activity is the result of wandering from the true path. When we adopted the protective policy we of necessity were led into all the evils of the spoils system. It is a comparatively small matter what the price of barb wire is but it is

A MATTER OF VITAL IMPORTANCE

that no Government should be allowed to say to the general public what price they must pay for their wire. If the Government fix the the profits of the manufacturer it is inevitable that they will "fix" them for a consideration to themselves thoroughly understood.

A Government that was willing to grant favors to the combines in exchange for liberal subscriptions and support had not far to go before making similar arrangements with the contractors. One step more and it could without shame openly bid for constituencies by a promised dispensation of public moneys. After that it required no great strain of conscience to make even the franchise a matter of manipulation or to arrange the constituencies to serve their ends.

All this tends to lower the tone of the whole body politic. The office does not seek the man but the professional place hunter is everywhere seeking to get his share of what is going. So great is the demand on the part of followers in the House for the looked for reward that the Cabinet must be extended from time to time to satisfy them. And

WHO ARE CHOSEN?

There must be an Irishman or two who wear the green and show their hatred of the orange, but only on useful occasions; then there must be some of the other kind of Irishmen, who wear the lily

and consign the Pope properly on lodge nights ; then two or three kind of Frenchmen are taken in because they are Frenchmen of different kinds ; a brewer is added judiciously, and a temperance advocate follows, and Heaven knows what else. No one of all these is chosen as a true Canadian or because of any peculiar ability to serve the state. A man may be made a Finance Minister who never knew the use of a ledger. The Minister of Agriculture is likely to have obtained his knowledge as to the "raising" of barley in the malt house or from Blackstone.

They are all chosen because they have the "pull" on some organization—lay or clerical—and men who have to use "pulls" to get places are not the material out of which statesmen can be made. Canada has nothing to do with the feuds of other lands. She has the right to demand that her citizens be no longer English, Irish, Scotch or French, but Canadians. How can this be brought about while the reward of narrowness and bigotry is high place in the control of National affairs? If we are to ever have

A CANADIAN NATIONAL LIFE

worthy of the name, we must retrace our steps, and do it quickly. With the downfall of protection we will have the downfall of all "paternalism." If the Government cannot corrupt the people by granting any "special" advantages, the people in turn will not corrupt the Government. Place hunters will be frowned upon and men will be sought for who are not mere spoilsmen, but seek to build up the country upon the true foundation of a united people.

We have in Canada all that we could wish or hope for, it is only isolation, restriction and corruption that are strangling our efforts and making great natural advantages of little avail.

With the prosperity that would follow freedom of trade, economy, integrity and self-reliance in the citizen as the only safe foundation of a free government administered solely for the general good, would come new blood into the Colonial life, our young men would stay here and build up with pride their native land,

AND AFTER A WHILE PERHAPS

we shall have on this continent a new nation, not English or Irish or Scotch or French, not a part of the American Union, but a liberty-loving, prosperous, sturdy, self-asserting and self-maintaining race, who shall be Canadians first, last and always.

