

quantity was expended at home and not in foreign countries. It must be a thick skull that cannot comprehend that corn and wheat raising is not an experiment, and therefore needs no bonusing. Why does the *Gazette*, which professes to be an advocate of encouragement to home industries, belittle and discourage one which is capable of doing so much for the farmers?

LAST summer I became acquainted with an old fisherman who lives some distance up the lake shore. He is hale and hearty, though nearly seventy years of age, and is quite a character. The old man is somewhat hampered by rheumatism at times, and in one instance allowed a travelling quack doctor to prescribe for him. The prescription was something out of the ordinary. "The old fool told me to fill a kettle full of spring water," said the fisherman, "and then go out and shoot a robin. I was told to hold the body of the bird so that when the kettle was on the fire the shadow of the robin would be cast into the water. Then what do you think he said? Told me to boil the shadow of that old bird for three hours and rub my legs with the water while it was hot!"—*Buffalo Enquirer*.

If you would call that man an old fool, what would you call some people here in Canada? There are quite a number of quacks here who for years have been advising the people how to rid themselves of some of their imaginary ills. Their suggestion is to go out and shoot an unrestricted reciprocity robin or an annexationist goose, and hold the bird so that the shadow of it may fall in a kettle of boiling water, and continue the boiling until the water becomes thick broth. This broth must then be applied to the seat of the trouble while it is hot. The *Toronto Globe* and *London Advertiser* are keeping up a great ebullition in their little kettles, but the broth doesn't seem to appreciably thicken and become fit for use.

UNTIL the enforcement of the McKinley tariff prevented, the firm of Edward T. Steel, & Co., operated a large woolen factory at Bradford, England, entirely upon goods for the American market. The increased duties under the McKinley tariff, however, left them but a choice as to whether they should endeavor to hold their American trade by reducing the quality and weight of their goods, or to remove their work to the United States. They chose the latter, and have established themselves at Bristol, Pa., where they are now in full operation. In a circular which they have issued to the trade is an engraving of their new American mills; and in the circular it is stated that this is "where the manufacture of goods will be carried on with the guarantee that they will be up to their previous English standard of weight, wealth, and quality without any advance in prices over former rates for the same class of goods." Last year the value of imports of woolen goods into the United States was nearly \$25,000,000 less than the year before; but no one supposes that the American people abstained from the use of such goods to that extent. Not a bit of it. They used just as much goods, but it was of American instead of foreign production; and it was manufactured by American instead of foreign workmen. Was this increased occupation of American workmen of benefit to the country? If yes, then the McKinley tariff benefitted the country to that extent at least.

HON. MR. DRUMMOND writes, re Sir Richard Cartwright's

statement that two million dollars a year are by some tariff arrangement transferred from the pockets of the people to those of the sugar refiners, that he does not discredit Sir Richard's intelligence so far as to assume that the Liberal chief believes his monstrous invention. Mr. Drummond, no doubt, judges the situation correctly so far; but he misses Sir Richard's point. It is not what Sir Richard himself believes, but what he believes he can make the people believe that is the issue. Hence the monstrosity.—*Montreal Gazette*.

A very remarkably queer thing about this question is that neither the *Gazette*, the *Empire*, or any other Government journal, nor any minister of the Government, nor any of its supporters in Parliament or out of it, have ever yet undertaken to analyze the charge made by Sir Richard Cartwright and show its falsity. The policy seems to be to entirely ignore the charge and to abuse the accusers. Whether the sum unfairly diverted from the people to the sugar refiners be two million dollars, or more or less, is not material to the issue; but it is of the utmost importance to the people to know if any money is thus diverted. This continual shrinkage of the question creates a feeling of disquiet in the minds of many which does not strengthen confidence in the Government, and which should be allayed. This could be done either by showing by facts and figures that there is no truth in the charge, nor can there be, or by a frank acknowledgment of an error that should be corrected. Abuse of Sir Richard is no answer to his accusation.

PARLIAMENT dealing with the duty on saw-logs, has acquiesced in the principle that it may be a mistake sometimes to correct a mistake. The United States got decidedly the best of the bargain by which, in return for a reduction of a dollar a thousand feet on sawn lumber, United States lumber manufacturers were given the opportunity to obtain free for sawing in their own mills the logs that under ordinary conditions would be expected to be cut up in Canada, giving work to Canadians instead of their rivals. It is a question, too, if the reduction of the United States duty by \$1 a thousand benefited the Canadian producer. The week after it went into force *Bradstreet's* announced a reduction of \$1 a thousand in the price to the United States consumer.—*Montreal Gazette*.

The axiom "never too late to mend" is far better than "it may be a mistake to correct a mistake." If it was a mistake to remove the export duty on logs, it would have been perfectly right to restore that duty, and the most grievous mistake consists in not having done so. We all know that while the duty was enforced the Canadian lumber trade was in a flourishing condition, and that although at that time the American duty on lumber was a dollar per thousand feet higher than it is now, yet, as *Bradstreet's* shows, that duty was paid by the American consumer, not by the Canadian producer. At that time Canadian manufacturing establishments which produced saw-mill supplies, machinery, saws, belting, etc., enjoyed a prosperity which they do not now enjoy, and which they will not again enjoy until the saw-mill interest revives. The Government made a mistake in refusing to restore the duty on logs.

A BOSTON correspondent of the *Philadelphia Manufacturer*, discussing the proposed Canadian export duty on saw-logs, says:—

In order to take advantage of the clause of the McKinley law, lowering the rate of duty on white pine lumber entering