

ating all other issues to this. Mr. Crisp is a man of two ideas—his chief hobby being the free and unlimited coinage of silver dollars. On this issue the man is a monomaniac. "Whom the gods destroy they first make mad." The average Democrat may always be depended upon to put his foot in his mouth every time he opens it. Mr. Mills might have carried his party to power in the next presidential election with the help of disaffected Republicans. Mr. Crisp will drive all Democratic advocates for honest money to at least refrain from voting, thereby giving the election to the Republican candidate. A Bourbon Democrat, like a Canadian Grit, never learns and never forgets.

OUR contention has always been that the Canadian duty upon pig iron is not high enough: that if it was made considerably higher than it now is, we would soon be able to manufacture all the pig iron we require. The following figures will illustrate our argument. In it they show the production of the article in Great Britain under free trade, and in the United States under protection, for a series of recent years:

	Great Britain. Tons.	United States. Tons.
1882 .....	8,586,680	4,623,323
1885 .....	7,415,469	4,044,526
1896 .....	7,009,754	5,683,329
1887 .....	7,359,518	6,417,148
1888 .....	7,998,969	6,489,738
1889 .....	8,522,824	7,603,642
1890 .....	8,001,000	9,202,703

In 1890 the production of finished iron in Great Britain amounted to 1,854,000 tons, and in the United States 2,558,000 tons. Of course protection did it; and if it did it for the United States it will do it for Canada. Free trade sophistry cannot obliterate this fact.

HON. GEORGE E. FOSTER, Minister of Finance, in his admirable speech at Perth, said: "They talk about taxation, but they leave entirely out of view in their unrestricted reciprocity scheme when they come to you with it, the other side of taxation. Take away all limits and barriers to trade between ourselves and the United States and what is the meaning? In plain English it is that you strike a fatal blow at the labor of the country. Further than that, you take off at one swoop \$18,000,000 of your revenue, and there is no way under heaven or among men in this country whereby you can get that deficit made up to you except by coming down to each individual elector and gathering the direct taxation from his pocket. They leave that out. They ask us to enter into an agreement with a country, one of the fundamental conditions being that we shall discriminate in their favor against every other country in the world, and thereby raise a protective tariff of about 50 per cent. on manufactured goods all round this country and the United States. Thus, while cutting off ourselves from contact and from the life-blood of commerce of the world, making all our channels of intercourse and trade run directly and solely between these two countries, let me ask you what would be our position? Suppose we made a treaty of that kind for five or ten years, and suppose it had been running for that time and all outside communications had been cut off and the channels of commerce dried up in other directions and turned entirely between these two countries; suppose the greater country, the

United States, imposes some conditions which would be prejudicial to us where should we be? We would have to refuse it or agree to it. If we refused it the price would be the rupture of these relations and the restoration of the tariff. Then where would we be with our commerce, with our industries, and in our condition of isolation from the rest of the world? It would produce such a cataclysm of business and industry that we should be no longer free. We would have to submit to whatever conditions were imposed upon us by the other country."

BEFORE the new tariff law went into operation the Hawaiian Islands had the privilege of free entry of their sugar to this country, and under the influence of this advantageous arrangement unprecedented prosperity came to the people. The treaty conferred small benefits upon us, for sugar was no cheaper than before in the California market, and we sacrificed about two million dollars a year in custom receipt by making the Hawaiian sugar free. The solitary gain to us, if it were a gain, appeared in the fact that relations were established between the two countries which forbade England to exert undue influence in Hawaii. The general admission of sugar free of duty, under the McKinley act, and the giving of a bounty to American growers, deprived the Hawaiians of all the advantages possessed by them under the treaty. Special provision would have been made for them had it not been that another treaty, negotiated between the governments, giving the United States a kind of protectorate over the islands, was defeated by British influences exerted through a Canadian member of the Hawaiian cabinet. Meddling as usual with the affairs of other people with which they have no right to meddle, the English simply brought about a condition of affairs which threatens the sugar interests of the islands with bankruptcy. Commissioners from Hawaii are now in Washington endeavoring to regain for their country that which has been lost by the insolent interference of England with their relations with this country. There can be no doubt that the disposition at Washington is to deal in a liberal manner with the subject; but the basis of all negotiation must be the complete exclusion of British influence from the government of the islands. This nation will never consent that any European power shall obtain a foothold in that important part of the Pacific ocean.—*Philadelphia Manufacturer.*

Did you ever? According to this the object of the Hawaiian treaty was not to benefit trade, but to forbid England to exert her influence in those the Sandwich Islands, and to give the United States a protectorate over them. It is indeed refreshing to hear this American journal speaking of England as "meddling with the affairs of other people." The American protectorate has not yet been established over Hawaii and if England sees proper to "meddle" in the affairs of that country, "exerted through a Canadian member of the Hawaiian cabinet," what is Uncle Sam going to do about it? England is not in the habit of asking permission of the United States to negotiate with any country, and it is late in the day for the United States to attempt to restrain her in so doing. If England should obtain a foothold in that important part of the Pacific Ocean how would the United States oust her from it?

PROF. ROBERTSON, the Dairy Commissioner, has procured the shipment to England of thirty New Brunswick cheese, mostly from Carleton County. He believes the cheese of the Province is of fine quality, and desires to encourage its export, which it has not yet attempted. The boxes will be labelled New Brunswick cheese and placed in the British market.