

London Advertiser.
FOUNDED IN 1852.
NOON AND EVENING DAILY.
WESTERN ADVERTISER WEEKLY.
THE LONDON ADVERTISER CO.
Limited, Publishers.
191-193 Dundas Street, London, Ont.

PHONE NUMBERS.
Business Department..... 197
Editorial Rooms..... 194 and 195
Job Printing Department..... 175

TO SUBSCRIBERS.
Readers of The Advertiser are requested to favor the management by reporting any irregularities in delivery.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.
Daily, Delivered in City: 10
One week..... \$5.00
One year..... \$50.00

ELECTION PROPHECIES.
LONDON, FRIDAY, OCT. 23.

Mr. Fielding predicts that seven out of the nine Provinces will go Liberal. The two exceptions which he has in mind are doubtless Ontario and Prince Edward Island, the only Provinces saved to the Conservative party in 1904.

The Halifax Chronicle says the Opposition has a fighting chance in only three ridings in Nova Scotia, but it looks for another clean sweep—a solid eighteen behind Mr. Fielding.

The St. John, N. B., Telegraph has collected reports from all the counties in New Brunswick, and says the Province will do much better for the Government than in 1904. In the old House the Liberals had eight New Brunswick seats, and the Conservatives five. No Liberal seats are seriously threatened in the present election, and Conservative hopes are confined to four seats—York, Charlotte, King's-Albert and Queen's-Sunbury. The Liberals profess to be confident of defeating the notorious Fowler in King's-Albert, and Mr. Wilmot in Queen's-Sunbury.

Prince Edward Island has four seats and a majority or all of them may go to the Opposition, thanks to Foster's promise of a tunnel to the mainland.

In Québec the Conservative Montreal Star, which is holding aloof from its party in this contest because Mr. Borden persists in keeping bad company, says that the Conservative election estimates in that Province "dare not venture out of their teens." Liberals doubt whether the number of Conservative seats will even get into the teens. They are claiming 55 out of the 65 seats.

If, by a miracle, the Opposition got 15 seats in Québec, five in New Brunswick, five in Nova Scotia and four in Prince Edward Island—which no eastern Liberal will concede—the Government would come to the Ottawa River with a majority of 42.

As for the West, the Liberals maintain that they will carry all four western provinces by a two-to-one majority. They will be surprised if they do not get at least ten majority out of the thirty-five seats.

The above calculation gives the Government a majority of fifty-two, with which to confront the expected Conservative majority in Ontario; but this is from ten to twenty lower than any Liberal estimate we have seen. Even the minimum estimate is a lead which the most exuberant Conservative prophet would not venture to say the Opposition could overcome in Ontario.

Some of the Opposition claims in Ontario are manifestly ridiculous. The most exaggerated is that of the Toronto News, which is showing the extravagant zeal of a convert. It claims 52 safe Conservative seats and nine Conservative probabilities, allowing the Liberals only nine reasonably secure constituencies. It predicts defeat for Hon. George Graham, Hon. Charles Murphy, Hon. Wm. Patterson and Speaker Sutherland, although Liberals say that only one is dubious. The News thinks it doubtful whether North and West Middlesex will be retained by the Liberals, and puts East Middlesex as safely Conservative. This alone is sufficient to discredit the News as an election prophet. The Liberals of West and North Middlesex have no idea of losing, and Dr. Routledge's friends consider his prospects in East Middlesex as good as his opponent's. The News has no justification for placing these ridings in the Conservative column.

If the rest of the News' forecast shows as little knowledge of local sentiment it is not worth the paper it is printed on. Hon. George Graham, an experienced campaigner, claims 40 Liberal seats in Ontario, and the most pessimistic Liberal will not allow the Opposition more than 26 majority in this province.

As a matter of fact, the election forecasts vary so widely as to ridicule the art of political prophecy. Correspondents survey the field through the medium of their personal prejudices and preferences. But the Liberals have just as much ground for their prognostications as the Conservatives. It will be noticed that the former are claiming all the way from 40 to 65 majority for Sir Wilfrid Laurier, while the Toronto News, the most sanguine Tory stretcher, can muster no more than 15 majority for Mr. Borden.

HANDS TIED AND TONGUE-TIED.

Mr. Hugh Clark, of the Kincardine Review, who is stumping with Mr. Borden, writes to his paper:

"He (Mr. Borden) will assume the premiership without a heritage or public or private pledges to embarrass him. One cannot but admire the caution and ingenuity with which he avoids entangling alliances or embarrassing pledges."

Hugh is half right. Mr. Borden is certainly avoiding pledges so far as questions of public policy are concerned. It was imagined for a time that he had committed himself to something definite in the Halifax platform. There was quite a flutter over his public ownership pronouncement, although it was pointed out that Mr. Borden had astutely tied to a string to every plank. Mr. Borden has since pulled the strings. He denies that he is an advocate of the nationalization of railways, and in his latest manifesto he blue-pencils the clause in the Halifax programme, which called for "a system of national telegraphs and telephones." He substitutes a milk-and-water plea for the "cheaper and wider use of telegraphs and telephones."

So far Mr. Clark is right, but he is wrong when he goes on to say that Mr. Borden has avoided entangling alliances. Could anything be more entangling than his alliance with Foster—or with Fowler, Pope, Lefurgey and Bennett? These men have tied his hands, and he is tongue-tied on public issues.

MR. BEATTIE'S "BREAK."

Mr. Beattie complains that he was misreported in yesterday's Advertiser; that he made no disparaging references to Labor candidates as a class, and merely commented on the inactivity of Mr. Verville, the one Labor member in the last House.

Mr. Beattie is not the first candidate to lose his head when he got on his feet, and to wish that others would forget what he said. If there is one thing impressed upon members of the Advertiser staff, it is to put no partisan color or bias into reports of Conservative meetings. Mr. Beattie's attack upon Labor candidates was so impolitic that the reporter who attended the meeting, before his copy was "set up," was questioned whether he had correctly reproduced the speaker's remarks. He said he had been particularly struck by the major's "break," and had been extremely careful to catch his exact words. The Advertiser stands by the version of its reliable and conscientious reporter.

CANADA ADVERTISED.

The vast expansion of Canada's foreign trade, which grew from \$239,025,360 in 1896, the last year of the Conservative regime, to \$650,738,200 in 1908, has been in no small measure due to the systematic methods adopted by the Laurier Government to promote trade with other countries, a matter which had been practically neglected by the Conservatives.

The latter were content with four or five trade representatives abroad, who reported in a perfunctory way at odd intervals to the department of trade and commerce, the reports being published quarterly, which rendered them of little or no value to the business public.

The Liberals, realizing that what was worth doing at all was worth doing thoroughly, increased the number of these representatives to eighteen, every one of whom is of the first rank, locating them in the following countries: The United Kingdom, Australia, the British West Indies, France, China, Japan, Mexico, Newfoundland, South Africa and Norway.

Each of these commissioners is required to make frequent reports, which are published weekly by the department, and as the reports are of a practical, businesslike character, and are widely disseminated without charge to manufacturers and other business men throughout the country, they serve a useful purpose.

Another plan adopted by the Liberal Government which has had good results is a system of obtaining trade inquiries from all quarters of the world. Last year alone nearly 9,000 of such inquiries were received. Full and accurate information has also been procured as to the customs tariffs of other countries, and the department is thus in a position to be of valuable service to Canadian business men. Every few years Canada's trade commissioners come home to get in touch with the development that has taken place.

The resources of Canada have been well advertised abroad as a result of the attention paid by the Government to having the Dominion represented at exhibitions in various parts of the world. The money spent in this way has been of immense benefit to the Dominion. The various exhibits which have been made by Canada at Glasgow, Paris, St. Louis, Buffalo, Dublin, London, Japan, New Zealand and other places have been of the finest character, and Canadians who have seen them are unanimous in their praise and in their commendation of the Government's enterprise. The arch of Canadian wheat erected in Whitehall, London, at the time of the coronation of His Majesty King Edward

was worth much to Canada, as an advertisement of the country.

In this and other ways the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier has done much to make Canada and its resources known abroad, and it is little wonder, therefore, that Canadian products are taking a leading place in the markets of the old world, and that European capital and immigration are finding their way to Canada as never before.

A WEAK VESSEL.

(Montreal Star, Conservative.)

It is only the truth to say that Mr. Borden has impressed the country as being very much under the influence of the men who happen to sit about him in the Commons. He seems to choose his policies very often by a system of lumping together the opinions of these men—some of them agents of the corporations, some of them "graft" hunters, some of them betrayers of trust—and striking an average. If this be his system, it is thoroughly pernicious; but if it is not his system, then the results he shows us belie their origin.

"Keep It Munt."

"Choice Tomatoes."

"My Dear Lefurgey."

"Turn on the Tap."

Mr. Beattie has put his foot in it.

Slandering the British New-Comers

At a meeting at Pembroke recently Mr. Hanna spoke of what he termed the enormous increase in the cost to the province of Ontario of the maintenance of the "foreign born" in the asylums and prisons, for which he had the temerity to blame the Federal Government. What he said, is thus reported in a Conservative paper:

"He found, he said, that in the last five years the foreign element had increased in the province of Ontario by 20 per cent. If the Dominion Government had exercised reasonable supervision of the class of immigrants coming to the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and at the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 1903 and 1908 the increase had been about 80 per cent. Taking these figures as his basis and using the calculation that each of these 'foreign-born' unfortunates would require attention for twenty years at an average cost of \$200 a year, Mr. Hanna asserted that, as a consequence of the increase in the 'foreign-born' population of the country, the increase in the foreign element at the asylums and in the Central Prison would be 20 per cent. But instead of such an increase it was shown that in the five years between 19