"shall not be kept for the promotion of the interests of British and Canadian ports, whether it is well to spend millions for great highways of commerce, and allow the larger part of the benefit to go to Boston and Portland and New York?" Is this intended as side-tracking the question of subsidies? Great lines of communication are presumably built for the benefit of the country, especially in the opening up of great areas of agricultural and mineral lands; and if we are to do this, in the best way, they cannot be made subservient to minor local interests, in which there would be danger of sacrificing the greater to the less.

Mr. Foster took great credit to himself and the Government, in which he was Minister of Finance, for sacrificing so large an amount of revenue through the sugar duties. Speaking of the year, 1895—96, he says: "I had a deficit in that period of $1,600,000, and made an addition to the debt of $16,000,000, but if I had kept on the sugar taxes, I would have paid every cent of the deficit." True, the remission of duties gave some temporary relief, in the matter of one item of consumption; but between the sixteen millions borrowed and the $19,000,000 represented as saved, there is this clear difference, not stated by the Speaker. The $16,000,000 will cost at least $30,000,000 before it is paid, perhaps—depending on the time of payment—twice as much; whereas the $19,000,000 was only remitted once. Instead of any real saving, there is a cost of perhaps double the amount of the alleged saving. In the case of almost any other article, a remission of duties would have made a real saving, in the price of the domestic product, if there were such product, nearly equal to the amount remitted. In the case of sugar, this saving would be but comparatively little.

It will be remembered that Sir Richard Cartwright, in comparing the estimates of the two parties for years near together, said Mr. Foster had intended to bring forward a supplementary estimate, which had not gone before the House, when the adverse wind sent their vessel ashore. In reply to this, Mr. Foster says the items in question were mere memoranda of tabulated statements, embracing demands made. "This tabulated statement," Mr. Foster says, "of mine, was never considered in Council, was never authorized, never presented to the House, and never intended to be." This recital Mr. Foster previously gave in the House, but it escaped our attention, and in noticing Sir Richard's charge, we did not give the reply.

NATURAL GROWTH AND FORCED GROWTH IN BUSINESS.

A subscriber in Chatham asks for some information as under, and adds a comment, which shows a not uncommon feeling with respect to trusts: "I notice that in your article or letter on 'Lake Freights and Lake Vessels,' last week, you speak about the Bessemer line of steamers, and then you refer, or the letter refers, to a steamer of that line, as 'a Standard Oil tub.' Are you right in naming the line the way you do? I have always heard them called, down in Detroit and Windsor, 'the Rockefeller boats,' and they are commonly called the Standard Oil Company's line. I believe Andrew Carnegie is a large owner in it, and perhaps we should not wonder at their building bigger boats than any body else, and doing bigger things, for Carnegie has piled up 'a bigger fortune than has been,' they say, and probably Rockefeller is not far behind him. But how do they do it? By grinding other people down."

Replying to our correspondent, we would say that the proper name of the line of steel steamers described is the Bessemer line. They are a dozen or more in number, steamers and consorts, and each is named after some inventor—James Watt, Robert Fulton, Geo. Stephenson, Sir Lowthian Bell, are specimens, and there is one of 4,300 tons named after Sir William Bessemer. We are not aware whether Mr. Carnegie is interested in these steamers; we have always understood that he confined his business attention and his capital to iron and steel manufacture. As to the matter last touched upon, above, we have opportunely received, this week, the last quarterly issue of Current Literature, which gives us some particulars about the much-discussed and often-abused Carnegie. The statement made authoritatively on May 5th, by Mr. H. C. Frick, who is the head of the new organization, was this: "What was in contemplation, and what is now practically consummated, is the amalgamation under one corporate organization of all of the properties and interests of the Carnegie Steel Company (Limited), and the H. C. Frick Coke Company, and their subsidiary and allied organizations. Practically the only change in the situation will be the retirement of Mr. Andrew Carnegie from the organization, he having sold to his partners his entire interest, Mr. Carnegie's intention being to give his entire time in the future to the prosecution of his great philanthropic works."

What is said of the growth of the Carnegie business and the Carnegie fortune by Current History is that "there is, perhaps, no parallel record in history of a man, who, entirely unaided, without the direct help of anyone, and without even the advantages of an ordinary school education, within 40 years, in legitimate manufacturing business enterprise, without adventitious aid from speculation, as such, has amassed any such fortune." This is worthy of careful reading, and if true tends to dissipate much that has been abusively said of Carnegie. Distinction is made between him and other rich men in the following:

"In the case of John D. Rockefeller, his wealth was the outcome of organizing a vast monopoly. In the case of the Vanderbilts and Jay Gould, there was at bottom the dexterous manipulation of railways and railway stocks, involving now and then a grand *coup*, which brought in enormous hauls, neither more or less than stock exchange gambling. In the case of the Astors, the unearned increment of land values secured vast wealth, which was not materially influenced by any action of the owners of Manhattan Island, but depended on circumstances which they neither did, nor could to any extent, control. Indeed, no other fortune of the first rank, whether in the United States, or in Great Britain, has been, like Mr. Carnegie's, due to manufacturing enterprise alone. In Europe, again, the fortunes of the Rothchilds, of Baron Hirsch, and of other notable men in the world of British finance, have been founded either on large financial operations, as such, or on the appreciation of land, or other securities upon which they were dependent." As to grinding other people down, and thus raising himself up, as our friend puts it, that is often alleged against rich men and against