

THE SEMI-WEEKLY TELEGRAPH. An eight-page paper and is published every Wednesday and Saturday at \$1.00 a year, in advance, by the Telegraph Publishing Company, of St. John, a company incorporated by act of the legislature of New Brunswick.

ADVERTISING RATES. Ordinary commercial advertisements taking the run of the paper: Each insertion \$1.00 per inch. Advertisements of Wants, For Sale, etc., 50 cents for insertion of six lines or less.

NOTICES OF BIRTHS, MARRIAGES AND DEATHS 25 cents for each insertion.

IMPORTANT NOTICE. Owing to the considerable number of complaints as to the misarrangement of letters alleged to contain money remitted to this office we have to request our subscribers and agents when sending money for the Telegraph to do so by post office order or registered letter, in which case all correspondence will be at our risk.

FACTS FOR SUBSCRIBERS. Without exception, names of new subscribers will not be entered until the money is received. Subscribers will be required to pay for papers sent them, whether they take them from the office or not, until all arrears are paid. There is no legal discontinuance of a newspaper subscription until all that is owed for it is paid.

It is a well settled principle of law that a man must pay for what he has. Hence whoever takes a paper from the post office, whether directed to him or somebody else, must pay for it.

RULES FOR CORRESPONDENCE. Be brief. Write plainly and take special pains with names. Write on one side of your paper only. Address your name and address to your communication as an evidence of good faith.

THIS PAPER HAS THE LARGEST CIRCULATION IN THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

AUTHORIZED AGENTS. The following agents are authorized to receive and collect for the Semi-Weekly Telegraph: WM. SOMERVILLE, W. A. FERRIS.

Subscribers are asked to pay their subscriptions to the agents whom they call.

SPECIAL NOTICE. As a great number of our subscribers are interested in the Census Guessing Competition, for which prizes were offered to the persons coming nearest to the correct enumeration of the population of the Dominion of Canada, as given out by the Minister of Agriculture from the results of the original census, we wish to advise the readers of THE TELEGRAPH that no announcement had yet been made by the Minister of Agriculture.

As soon as the Hon. Mr. Fisher has made the official statement showing the results of the Census, the coupons will be sorted out by the Press Publishing Association of Detroit, and the announcement made of the prize winners for several issues, so that all may know who the successful competitors were.

This will save our readers and ourselves any trouble or correspondence in regard to the competition.

THE TELEGRAPH PUBLISHING CO. OTTAWA, Ont., Aug. 16. To Press Publishing Association, Toronto:

Official figures are Five Million, Three Hundred and Thirty-eight Thousand, Eight Hundred and Eighty-three, but they are not final.

Director of Census. As soon as final figures can be obtained, the awards will be made.

BRITISH PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATION. The speeches recently delivered by Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain at the political picnic at Henham has caused considerable comment. The speakers referred to the obstruction of government measures before the House and the reduction of parliament to absolute futility.

They laid the responsibility at the doors of the Irish members, and then proceeded to argue that with a smaller number of Irish members there would be less obstruction and more work done. The idea set forth in the speeches was to reduce the Irish representation to the proportion of its population, in other words to encourage an agitation for the complete redistribution of the electoral districts of the British Isles. There is certainly a number of curious anomalies in the present representation. Cardiff, with over 21,000 registered electors, has one member of parliament, while the borough of Glasgow with less than 2,000 voters has precisely the same representation. The constituencies of Birkenshead with 15,000 electors, and Wandsworth with 17,000 electors are each entitled to send one member to Westminster, while Newry and Kilkenny with about 1,700 each are entitled to send the same number. This anomalous condition is not confined to Ireland but also exists in England. Oldham is an electoral district of 20,000, and Ipswich of 20,000, yet both of these constituencies return two members each as against Cardiff's one.

It has been calculated that at the present time Ireland has an over-representation of 31 and Scotland of 3. It will be a difficult matter for any government to make a redistribution of the electoral districts. Any movement in that direction will be vigorously opposed by the Irish members and it would be next to impossible to pass a redistribution bill through the British parliament.

MORE RESEARCH WORK. The citizens of Halifax tendered Professor MacGregor a farewell banquet on Tuesday evening. The guest embraced the opportunity of expressing his opinion on education, and particularly on instruction in the science branches. He said: "What we must encourage is research work. We must not work only with the examinations in mind." Recently we referred to the fact that probably more original research was performed in Dalhousie under the direction of Professor MacGregor, than in all the other physical institutions in Canada. Dr. MacGregor knows the value of original research and therefore is in a position to speak on the subject. The Canadian institutions have been very much behind the age in the matter of original investigation. It cannot be said that the fault, in all cases, lay in the equipment of the institutions. Some of our Canadian colleges were, in certain branches, equipped in a manner which would admit of a great deal of original work being carried out, but for some reason or other none was ever performed. We have in mind, at present, a thoroughly equipped department of science in Canada, with a specialist on one branch of the subject, and yet we have never heard of one research having been carried out in his specialty, during the past three years. The smallest German university turns out, in one year, more original work than all the Canadian colleges in two years. The German student has his examination to pass, but before he can go up for it he must have carried out, to completion, an original research which is satisfactory to the professor of the branch of science and to the whole faculty. The Canadian student, as a rule, graduates without the slightest knowledge of the method of scientific research and also of properly interpreting an original investigation when placed in his hands. The students are generally recommended certain text books and during their college career they adhere closely to these authorities. Even in our larger universities the student seldom sent to read the matter in the original publication. If Canada ever hopes to develop scientists the universities must adopt other methods than those employed in the past, and the professors must think less of their holidays. Let the professors adopt the methods of Professor MacGregor, and encourage, by personal effort, research work, and they will soon find that the students will become interested in their labors.

OPPOSITION RESOURCES. To any one who watches with any thing approaching an open mind the criticisms appearing from day to day in opposition journals it must be apparent that little real or serious fault can properly be found with the administration of Dominion affairs. It may be retorted that an observation of this nature is to be expected from a journal supporting the government of the day, and such a reply is not without some force as the game of politics is played; but, all said and done, the journals opposing the government really have very little to bring forward which is calculated to impress public judgment. This much, as we have said, must be apparent to any unprejudiced observer.

It would be an extraordinary state of affairs if the conduct of the government was such that the mouths of opposing critics would be absolutely closed. Some people would be disposed to suspect the near approach of the millennium under such circumstances. There is, however, no likelihood of such ideal conditions being developed. The opposition have resources at their command which will always save them from any danger of lockjaw, one of these being suspicion. No matter how irreproachable may be the course of the government in the eyes of Liberals, it will always be found that Conservatives will take a different view. In this way suspicion gets in its deadly work.

The difference between what a friend may do without exciting hostile criticism and what a person who is disliked may do, is always very great in every day affairs. It is no less so in political life. When a Liberal reads an attack on the government he either discounts it, finds an answer to it that is satisfactory to his own mind, or suspends judgment until he obtains further information. Not so with the Tory. His suspicion has already paved the way for the greedy acceptance of the most extravagant statements. He regards as proofs what would be surmises, and is ready to condemn in the most offhand and irresponsible way imaginable.

It is all the time true, however, that even with the resources of suspicion and invention at their call the opposition are not able to make any substantial progress in the work of prejudicing the public mind against the present administration. This is due, in the first place, to the fact that their charges are very largely without foundation, and in the next place

they play their part very clumsily. They exaggerate and misrepresent and distort and conceal in such a glaring way as to make their criticism ineffective. A little display of candor would really be helpful if they only knew it.

The course of the leading Tory organ, the Mail and Empire, is an illustration of what their tactics lead to. It is practically discredited by the people at large. Since the day Sir Wilfrid Laurier acceded to power it has not published a single generous word in relation to either his personal integrity or his loyalty. The effect of this has been to lose the ear of those who might otherwise be disposed to heed what it has to say, and to offend the instincts of fair play in the hearts of many conscientious Conservatives who know that the Premier is just as honorable and just as deeply attached to the Empire as they are themselves. The Mail and Empire, like other party organs, has overreached itself.

It must be a source of satisfaction to Liberals, who very naturally wish to see their leaders grow in public confidence and esteem, to realize that the desperate campaign which has been waged against the government since 1896 has practically failed of its purpose. The opposition have availed themselves of all their resources of warfare and have only served to show that a clean and honest administration cannot be injured by unfair attacks. The government has made mistakes—that much may be admitted as a proof of the fact that ministers are human—but it has not done anything dishonorable or corrupt. In fact, despite all that may be said to the contrary, it occupies a singularly strong position before the people.

A CONSOLING FACT. The Premier spoke candidly and, we feel assured, acceptably about the census at Toronto. He pointed out that the result had been disappointing to all the Provinces, as much to Quebec as to Ontario; but there were compensating features in the matter. If we had not grown in population as we have done. But I look on the figures of our trade and on the figures of their trade, and I find that in their last fiscal year they exported and imported \$2,125,000,000, that means, with a population of 75,000,000, a trade of about \$29 per head. Canada exported and imported to the extent of \$380,000,000, which with a population of five and one-third millions, means a per capita trade of about \$78. (Applause.) So that they see even with our limited resources we can trade man for man about two-thirds more than our American neighbors, so that we are not disposed to take much of their commiseration, but we will say to them, "You try to do better and then come and tell us where we fail." (Laughter and applause.)

The reference to our doing per head about "two-thirds" better than our neighbors is probably a reporter's error. The Premier no doubt said "three times" as well as the context indicates. The proportion of \$78 to \$29 is not quite three to one; but it is nearly so. Under any circumstances, it must be a source of great consolation to Canadians to know that while the people who live across the line are making great growth in population, we are even over them like a giant in the matter of foreign trade. It is also worthy of note that this progress on our part has been particularly marked during the last decennial period.

Divided into census periods, and carrying the comparison down to date, the expansion in trade on the per capita basis has been as follows:

1881. \$18
1891. 100.1
1901. 78

This indicates that between 1881 and 1891 we fell back somewhat, and yet it is true. Our aggregate trade in 1881 was \$203,621,063, while in 1891 it had grown to \$218,384,934. It was, therefore, being grown up and had the larger growth took place, the total having risen during that period to \$381,517,236. As a matter of fact, we did better between 1871 and 1881 than between 1881 and 1891; for during the former decade our foreign trade increased from \$170,206,589 to \$203,621,063.

This may not be pleasant reading for our Tory friends, who controlled the trade policy of the country between 1881 and 1891 without interruption; and what is equally significant, they cannot claim any of the credit for the growth which has occurred during the last decennial period; for while the increase amounted to less than \$1,000,000 between 1891 and 1896, it amounted to \$142,000,000 between 1896 and 1900. The fact which we desire to emphasize in this connection, however, is the relative progress in trade made by Canada and the United States, and to point to the splendid position we have attained in that regard.

CONCERNING ADDRESSES. So much controversy has arisen over the question of addresses to the Duke of York and Cornwall, that it has occurred to us the time should be drawing near when these rather useless relics of bygone times might be done away with. They never would be missed. We know very well what customs die slowly, and it is perhaps a good thing to let the utilitarian spirit of modern days have the full sweep that some of us in our impatient yearning for the novel and practical might wish to see; but all said and done, this reading and presentation of formal addresses might very conveniently drop into desuetude.

In the first place, no one ever hears the address read which is being presented. The person whose duty it is to read the illuminated document is unable to make his voice heard by the multitude before him, because he usually stands with his back to them, and is without the lung power to make himself audible more than a few feet away. This is, of course, of no consequence to the dignity that is receiving the address. He does not need to listen to it, having been provided with a copy in advance for the purpose of preparing his reply. Therefore, unless done through a megaphone, we submit that the reading of addresses in public is a sheer waste of time and effort.

We have long been of the opinion that, if addresses are to be permitted at all, they should be the accompaniment of a purely state function. For many good reasons they ought not to be used in the way that is now common—that is, in connection with political meetings. If the premier, or a minister of the crown comes to address a gathering of electors, it is always a pity to take up the time when the audience is most comfortable and most disposed to listen with the reading of a meaningless address, which no one hears, or wants to hear. Let the minister make his speech; that is what he came to do, and that is what the people came to hear. The address is a needless interruption.

A REBUKE FROM THE INSIDE. It is never well to be impulsive. Even those persons who are inclined to be hasty admit this. It is so in private life; it is equally true in political controversy, as our friends of the Tory press are commencing to realize. To jump to a conclusion before adequate data is at hand, or to announce an extreme view before the facts have been carefully digested, generally leads to humiliation. Two weeks ago the census figures were announced. They were disappointing to say they were disappointing to everybody. This fact was seized upon by Conservative journals to seek a party advantage, and in order to reach that end they felt compelled to advance a theory which should lead up to the condemnation of the government. They announced, therefore, that the Quebec figures had been stuffed, while those relating to the other provinces had been skimmed. They resuscitated Mr. Ogle's circular in garbled form and did not pause in their mad career to admit that the figures of our trade and on the figures of their trade, and I find that in their last fiscal year they exported and imported \$2,125,000,000, that means, with a population of 75,000,000, a trade of about \$29 per head. Canada exported and imported to the extent of \$380,000,000, which with a population of five and one-third millions, means a per capita trade of about \$78. (Applause.) So that they see even with our limited resources we can trade man for man about two-thirds more than our American neighbors, so that we are not disposed to take much of their commiseration, but we will say to them, "You try to do better and then come and tell us where we fail." (Laughter and applause.)

The reference to our doing per head about "two-thirds" better than our neighbors is probably a reporter's error. The Premier no doubt said "three times" as well as the context indicates. The proportion of \$78 to \$29 is not quite three to one; but it is nearly so. Under any circumstances, it must be a source of great consolation to Canadians to know that while the people who live across the line are making great growth in population, we are even over them like a giant in the matter of foreign trade. It is also worthy of note that this progress on our part has been particularly marked during the last decennial period.

Divided into census periods, and carrying the comparison down to date, the expansion in trade on the per capita basis has been as follows:

1881. \$18
1891. 100.1
1901. 78

This indicates that between 1881 and 1891 we fell back somewhat, and yet it is true. Our aggregate trade in 1881 was \$203,621,063, while in 1891 it had grown to \$218,384,934. It was, therefore, being grown up and had the larger growth took place, the total having risen during that period to \$381,517,236. As a matter of fact, we did better between 1871 and 1881 than between 1881 and 1891; for during the former decade our foreign trade increased from \$170,206,589 to \$203,621,063.

This may not be pleasant reading for our Tory friends, who controlled the trade policy of the country between 1881 and 1891 without interruption; and what is equally significant, they cannot claim any of the credit for the growth which has occurred during the last decennial period; for while the increase amounted to less than \$1,000,000 between 1891 and 1896, it amounted to \$142,000,000 between 1896 and 1900. The fact which we desire to emphasize in this connection, however, is the relative progress in trade made by Canada and the United States, and to point to the splendid position we have attained in that regard.

CONCERNING ADDRESSES. So much controversy has arisen over the question of addresses to the Duke of York and Cornwall, that it has occurred to us the time should be drawing near when these rather useless relics of bygone times might be done away with. They never would be missed. We know very well what customs die slowly, and it is perhaps a good thing to let the utilitarian spirit of modern days have the full sweep that some of us in our impatient yearning for the novel and practical might wish to see; but all said and done, this reading and presentation of formal addresses might very conveniently drop into desuetude.

In the first place, no one ever hears the address read which is being presented. The person whose duty it is to read the illuminated document is unable to make his voice heard by the multitude before him, because he usually stands with his back to them, and is without the lung power to make himself audible more than a few feet away. This is, of course, of no consequence to the dignity that is receiving the address. He does not need to listen to it, having been provided with a copy in advance for the purpose of preparing his reply. Therefore, unless done through a megaphone, we submit that the reading of addresses in public is a sheer waste of time and effort.

We have long been of the opinion that, if addresses are to be permitted at all, they should be the accompaniment of a purely state function. For many good reasons they ought not to be used in the way that is now common—that is, in connection with political meetings. If the premier, or a minister of the crown comes to address a gathering of electors, it is always a pity to take up the time when the audience is most comfortable and most disposed to listen with the reading of a meaningless address, which no one hears, or wants to hear. Let the minister make his speech; that is what he came to do, and that is what the people came to hear. The address is a needless interruption.

A REBUKE FROM THE INSIDE. It is never well to be impulsive. Even those persons who are inclined to be hasty admit this. It is so in private life; it is equally true in political controversy, as our friends of the Tory press are commencing to realize. To jump to a conclusion before adequate data is at hand, or to announce an extreme view before the facts have been carefully digested, generally leads to humiliation. Two weeks ago the census figures were announced. They were disappointing to say they were disappointing to everybody. This fact was seized upon by Conservative journals to seek a party advantage, and in order to reach that end they felt compelled to advance a theory which should lead up to the condemnation of the government. They announced, therefore, that the Quebec figures had been stuffed, while those relating to the other provinces had been skimmed. They resuscitated Mr. Ogle's circular in garbled form and did not pause in their mad career to admit that the figures of our trade and on the figures of their trade, and I find that in their last fiscal year they exported and imported \$2,125,000,000, that means, with a population of 75,000,000, a trade of about \$29 per head. Canada exported and imported to the extent of \$380,000,000, which with a population of five and one-third millions, means a per capita trade of about \$78. (Applause.) So that they see even with our limited resources we can trade man for man about two-thirds more than our American neighbors, so that we are not disposed to take much of their commiseration, but we will say to them, "You try to do better and then come and tell us where we fail." (Laughter and applause.)

The reference to our doing per head about "two-thirds" better than our neighbors is probably a reporter's error. The Premier no doubt said "three times" as well as the context indicates. The proportion of \$78 to \$29 is not quite three to one; but it is nearly so. Under any circumstances, it must be a source of great consolation to Canadians to know that while the people who live across the line are making great growth in population, we are even over them like a giant in the matter of foreign trade. It is also worthy of note that this progress on our part has been particularly marked during the last decennial period.

Divided into census periods, and carrying the comparison down to date, the expansion in trade on the per capita basis has been as follows:

1881. \$18
1891. 100.1
1901. 78

This indicates that between 1881 and 1891 we fell back somewhat, and yet it is true. Our aggregate trade in 1881 was \$203,621,063, while in 1891 it had grown to \$218,384,934. It was, therefore, being grown up and had the larger growth took place, the total having risen during that period to \$381,517,236. As a matter of fact, we did better between 1871 and 1881 than between 1881 and 1891; for during the former decade our foreign trade increased from \$170,206,589 to \$203,621,063.

This may not be pleasant reading for our Tory friends, who controlled the trade policy of the country between 1881 and 1891 without interruption; and what is equally significant, they cannot claim any of the credit for the growth which has occurred during the last decennial period; for while the increase amounted to less than \$1,000,000 between 1891 and 1896, it amounted to \$142,000,000 between 1896 and 1900. The fact which we desire to emphasize in this connection, however, is the relative progress in trade made by Canada and the United States, and to point to the splendid position we have attained in that regard.

CONCERNING ADDRESSES. So much controversy has arisen over the question of addresses to the Duke of York and Cornwall, that it has occurred to us the time should be drawing near when these rather useless relics of bygone times might be done away with. They never would be missed. We know very well what customs die slowly, and it is perhaps a good thing to let the utilitarian spirit of modern days have the full sweep that some of us in our impatient yearning for the novel and practical might wish to see; but all said and done, this reading and presentation of formal addresses might very conveniently drop into desuetude.

In the first place, no one ever hears the address read which is being presented. The person whose duty it is to read the illuminated document is unable to make his voice heard by the multitude before him, because he usually stands with his back to them, and is without the lung power to make himself audible more than a few feet away. This is, of course, of no consequence to the dignity that is receiving the address. He does not need to listen to it, having been provided with a copy in advance for the purpose of preparing his reply. Therefore, unless done through a megaphone, we submit that the reading of addresses in public is a sheer waste of time and effort.

We have long been of the opinion that, if addresses are to be permitted at all, they should be the accompaniment of a purely state function. For many good reasons they ought not to be used in the way that is now common—that is, in connection with political meetings. If the premier, or a minister of the crown comes to address a gathering of electors, it is always a pity to take up the time when the audience is most comfortable and most disposed to listen with the reading of a meaningless address, which no one hears, or wants to hear. Let the minister make his speech; that is what he came to do, and that is what the people came to hear. The address is a needless interruption.

A REBUKE FROM THE INSIDE. It is never well to be impulsive. Even those persons who are inclined to be hasty admit this. It is so in private life; it is equally true in political controversy, as our friends of the Tory press are commencing to realize. To jump to a conclusion before adequate data is at hand, or to announce an extreme view before the facts have been carefully digested, generally leads to humiliation. Two weeks ago the census figures were announced. They were disappointing to say they were disappointing to everybody. This fact was seized upon by Conservative journals to seek a party advantage, and in order to reach that end they felt compelled to advance a theory which should lead up to the condemnation of the government. They announced, therefore, that the Quebec figures had been stuffed, while those relating to the other provinces had been skimmed. They resuscitated Mr. Ogle's circular in garbled form and did not pause in their mad career to admit that the figures of our trade and on the figures of their trade, and I find that in their last fiscal year they exported and imported \$2,125,000,000, that means, with a population of 75,000,000, a trade of about \$29 per head. Canada exported and imported to the extent of \$380,000,000, which with a population of five and one-third millions, means a per capita trade of about \$78. (Applause.) So that they see even with our limited resources we can trade man for man about two-thirds more than our American neighbors, so that we are not disposed to take much of their commiseration, but we will say to them, "You try to do better and then come and tell us where we fail." (Laughter and applause.)

The reference to our doing per head about "two-thirds" better than our neighbors is probably a reporter's error. The Premier no doubt said "three times" as well as the context indicates. The proportion of \$78 to \$29 is not quite three to one; but it is nearly so. Under any circumstances, it must be a source of great consolation to Canadians to know that while the people who live across the line are making great growth in population, we are even over them like a giant in the matter of foreign trade. It is also worthy of note that this progress on our part has been particularly marked during the last decennial period.

Divided into census periods, and carrying the comparison down to date, the expansion in trade on the per capita basis has been as follows:

the address read which is being presented. The person whose duty it is to read the illuminated document is unable to make his voice heard by the multitude before him, because he usually stands with his back to them, and is without the lung power to make himself audible more than a few feet away. This is, of course, of no consequence to the dignity that is receiving the address. He does not need to listen to it, having been provided with a copy in advance for the purpose of preparing his reply. Therefore, unless done through a megaphone, we submit that the reading of addresses in public is a sheer waste of time and effort.

We have long been of the opinion that, if addresses are to be permitted at all, they should be the accompaniment of a purely state function. For many good reasons they ought not to be used in the way that is now common—that is, in connection with political meetings. If the premier, or a minister of the crown comes to address a gathering of electors, it is always a pity to take up the time when the audience is most comfortable and most disposed to listen with the reading of a meaningless address, which no one hears, or wants to hear. Let the minister make his speech; that is what he came to do, and that is what the people came to hear. The address is a needless interruption.

A REBUKE FROM THE INSIDE. It is never well to be impulsive. Even those persons who are inclined to be hasty admit this. It is so in private life; it is equally true in political controversy, as our friends of the Tory press are commencing to realize. To jump to a conclusion before adequate data is at hand, or to announce an extreme view before the facts have been carefully digested, generally leads to humiliation. Two weeks ago the census figures were announced. They were disappointing to say they were disappointing to everybody. This fact was seized upon by Conservative journals to seek a party advantage, and in order to reach that end they felt compelled to advance a theory which should lead up to the condemnation of the government. They announced, therefore, that the Quebec figures had been stuffed, while those relating to the other provinces had been skimmed. They resuscitated Mr. Ogle's circular in garbled form and did not pause in their mad career to admit that the figures of our trade and on the figures of their trade, and I find that in their last fiscal year they exported and imported \$2,125,000,000, that means, with a population of 75,000,000, a trade of about \$29 per head. Canada exported and imported to the extent of \$380,000,000, which with a population of five and one-third millions, means a per capita trade of about \$78. (Applause.) So that they see even with our limited resources we can trade man for man about two-thirds more than our American neighbors, so that we are not disposed to take much of their commiseration, but we will say to them, "You try to do better and then come and tell us where we fail." (Laughter and applause.)

The reference to our doing per head about "two-thirds" better than our neighbors is probably a reporter's error. The Premier no doubt said "three times" as well as the context indicates. The proportion of \$78 to \$29 is not quite three to one; but it is nearly so. Under any circumstances, it must be a source of great consolation to Canadians to know that while the people who live across the line are making great growth in population, we are even over them like a giant in the matter of foreign trade. It is also worthy of note that this progress on our part has been particularly marked during the last decennial period.

Divided into census periods, and carrying the comparison down to date, the expansion in trade on the per capita basis has been as follows:

1881. \$18
1891. 100.1
1901. 78

This indicates that between 1881 and 1891 we fell back somewhat, and yet it is true. Our aggregate trade in 1881 was \$203,621,063, while in 1891 it had grown to \$218,384,934. It was, therefore, being grown up and had the larger growth took place, the total having risen during that period to \$381,517,236. As a matter of fact, we did better between 1871 and 1881 than between 1881 and 1891; for during the former decade our foreign trade increased from \$170,206,589 to \$203,621,063.

This may not be pleasant reading for our Tory friends, who controlled the trade policy of the country between 1881 and 1891 without interruption; and what is equally significant, they cannot claim any of the credit for the growth which has occurred during the last decennial period; for while the increase amounted to less than \$1,000,000 between 1891 and 1896, it amounted to \$142,000,000 between 1896 and 1900. The fact which we desire to emphasize in this connection, however, is the relative progress in trade made by Canada and the United States, and to point to the splendid position we have attained in that regard.

CONCERNING ADDRESSES. So much controversy has arisen over the question of addresses to the Duke of York and Cornwall, that it has occurred to us the time should be drawing near when these rather useless relics of bygone times might be done away with. They never would be missed. We know very well what customs die slowly, and it is perhaps a good thing to let the utilitarian spirit of modern days have the full sweep that some of us in our impatient yearning for the novel and practical might wish to see; but all said and done, this reading and presentation of formal addresses might very conveniently drop into desuetude.

In the first place, no one ever hears the address read which is being presented. The person whose duty it is to read the illuminated document is unable to make his voice heard by the multitude before him, because he usually stands with his back to them, and is without the lung power to make himself audible more than a few feet away. This is, of course, of no consequence to the dignity that is receiving the address. He does not need to listen to it, having been provided with a copy in advance for the purpose of preparing his reply. Therefore, unless done through a megaphone, we submit that the reading of addresses in public is a sheer waste of time and effort.

We have long been of the opinion that, if addresses are to be permitted at all, they should be the accompaniment of a purely state function. For many good reasons they ought not to be used in the way that is now common—that is, in connection with political meetings. If the premier, or a minister of the crown comes to address a gathering of electors, it is always a pity to take up the time when the audience is most comfortable and most disposed to listen with the reading of a meaningless address, which no one hears, or wants to hear. Let the minister make his speech; that is what he came to do, and that is what the people came to hear. The address is a needless interruption.

A REBUKE FROM THE INSIDE. It is never well to be impulsive. Even those persons who are inclined to be hasty admit this. It is so in private life; it is equally true in political controversy, as our friends of the Tory press are commencing to realize. To jump to a conclusion before adequate data is at hand, or to announce an extreme view before the facts have been carefully digested, generally leads to humiliation. Two weeks ago the census figures were announced. They were disappointing to say they were disappointing to everybody. This fact was seized upon by Conservative journals to seek a party advantage, and in order to reach that end they felt compelled to advance a theory which should lead up to the condemnation of the government. They announced, therefore, that the Quebec figures had been stuffed, while those relating to the other provinces had been skimmed. They resuscitated Mr. Ogle's circular in garbled form and did not pause in their mad career to admit that the figures of our trade and on the figures of their trade, and I find that in their last fiscal year they exported and imported \$2,125,000,000, that means, with a population of 75,000,000, a trade of about \$29 per head. Canada exported and imported to the extent of \$380,000,000, which with a population of five and one-third millions, means a per capita trade of about \$78. (Applause.) So that they see even with our limited resources we can trade man for man about two-thirds more than our American neighbors, so that we are not disposed to take much of their commiseration, but we will say to them, "You try to do better and then come and tell us where we fail." (Laughter and applause.)

The reference to our doing per head about "two-thirds" better than our neighbors is probably a reporter's error. The Premier no doubt said "three times" as well as the context indicates. The proportion of \$78 to \$29 is not quite three to one; but it is nearly so. Under any circumstances, it must be a source of great consolation to Canadians to know that while the people who live across the line are making great growth in population, we are even over them like a giant in the matter of foreign trade. It is also worthy of note that this progress on our part has been particularly marked during the last decennial period.

Divided into census periods, and carrying the comparison down to date, the expansion in trade on the per capita basis has been as follows:

1881. \$18
1891. 100.1
1901. 78

This indicates that between 1881 and 1891 we fell back somewhat, and yet it is true. Our aggregate trade in 1881 was \$203,621,063, while in 1891 it had grown to \$218,384,934. It was, therefore, being grown up and had the larger growth took place, the total having risen during that period to \$381,517,236. As a matter of fact, we did better between 1871 and 1881 than between 1881 and 1891; for during the former decade our foreign trade increased from \$170,206,589 to \$203,621,063.

This may not be pleasant reading for our Tory friends, who controlled the trade policy of the country between 1881 and 1891 without interruption; and what is equally significant, they cannot claim any of the credit for the growth which has occurred during the last decennial period; for while the increase amounted to less than \$1,000,000 between 1891 and 1896, it amounted to \$142,000,000 between 1896 and 1900. The fact which we desire to emphasize in this connection, however, is the relative progress in trade made by Canada and the United States, and to point to the splendid position we have attained in that regard.

CONCERNING ADDRESSES. So much controversy has arisen over the question of addresses to the Duke of York and Cornwall, that it has occurred to us the time should be drawing near when these rather useless relics of bygone times might be done away with. They never would be missed. We know very well what customs die slowly, and it is perhaps a good thing to let the utilitarian spirit of modern days have the full sweep that some of us in our impatient yearning for the novel and practical might wish to see; but all said and done, this reading and presentation of formal addresses might very conveniently drop into desuetude.

In the first place, no one ever hears the address read which is being presented. The person whose duty it is to read the illuminated document is unable to make his voice heard by the multitude before him, because he usually stands with his back to them, and is without the lung power to make himself audible more than a few feet away. This is, of course, of no consequence to the dignity that is receiving the address. He does not need to listen to it, having been provided with a copy in advance for the purpose of preparing his reply. Therefore, unless done through a megaphone, we submit that the reading of addresses in public is a sheer waste of time and effort.

We have long been of the opinion that, if addresses are to be permitted at all, they should be the accompaniment of a purely state function. For many good reasons they ought not to be used in the way that is now common—that is, in connection with political meetings. If the premier, or a minister of the crown comes to address a gathering of electors, it is always a pity to take up the time when the audience is most comfortable and most disposed to listen with the reading of a meaningless address, which no one hears, or wants to hear. Let the minister make his speech; that is what he came to do, and that is what the people came to hear. The address is a needless interruption.