

readily to come to a conclusion with respect to the merits of the system either country has followed. That the weight of argument, however, is in favour of England's free-trade policy, Prof. Fawcett substantially insists upon, as he considers that the severity of the trade depression is greater in the United States than in England, while there is less reason for this considering the great natural resources of the United States and the other advantages that country possesses over England. One prevalent and mischievous idea the Professor gets rid of, by the conclusive argument of figures, viz: that American industries are killing off the trade of England; and no little handle has been made of this erroneous notion among the Party-economists in Canada who exultantly point to the circumstance as the result of a protectionist policy. We have been so much accustomed to hear of this boast on the part of Americans themselves—that England's trade is being ruined by United States competition—that even the logic of figures is slow to convince one.

But the figures Prof. Fawcett quotes, are taken, of course, from authentic sources, and are not to be belied. Moreover, to those who have read the recent lugubrious articles in the *N. Y. Herald* on the export trade of the United States—a trade that that otherwise boastful journal speaks of, in its manufacturing features, as being pitiful in amount—the citations of Prof. Fawcett cannot be challenged. Their testimony is that nine-tenths of the volume of the American export trade is of agricultural produce, and the raw material of England's manufactures; and of the tenth but a trifling proportion is of manufactured goods. To take the figures, in comparison with the English Export trade in manufactures for the year 1876, the relative values is thus stated: For England, one hundred and twenty-nine millions sterling; for the United States, four millions sterling!

The figures may well allay the vague alarm that unfamiliarity with the facts here stated has occasioned, and the statement may also reassure any sensitive lover of the Mother Country that England's decadence has not yet set in.

Other erroneous notions prevalent with respect to England's danger in exporting vastly more than she imports, Prof. Fawcett satisfactorily replies to, as well as in combatting many heresies which attach to the doctrines of Free Trade and Protection. But I will not discuss these now. A.

—Some recent remarks from a friend at 'the table' on the subject of hammocks, lead me to discourse a little longer on the same subject, having a somewhat intimate acquaintance with the particular hammock to which he refers, and a very high appreciation of the luxury of a hammock as a retreat for holiday hours. One could hardly indeed improve upon such an easy undulating, flexible couch, which, swinging between earth and sky, seems to partake more of the ethereal nature of the air than of the solid hardness and immobility of earth. With the sweet air blowing freely about you, and interlacing boughs of oak and pine making a waving canopy above—far more beautiful than any velvet canopy of state—and the blue river rushing beneath, sparkling with golden sunshine, or with silver moon-beams, or rosy with the crimson flush of evening, you feel for the time being raised out of the earthly sphere of mortals into that of the birds that are twittering about you, or singing even song from boughs high overhead. I only wonder hammocks are not far more commonly seen and do not figure far more largely in our modern light literature. In the United States they have within the last few years, become a 'feature' to a considerable extent. Every one who has not already done so should read that exquisite little romance of a hammock