

The analysis by the laboratory branch of the Inland Revenue Department, of milk served in Ontario towns and cities, does not give satisfactory results. Still it is something to know that a majority of the samples—97 out of 165—were found to be genuine good milk, while 68 were either adulterated or inferior. This classification leaves doubtful the number of cases of adulteration, for inferior milk may be the result of poor feeding. Toronto fares worse than any other place, only two samples out of twelve being genuine. The abuse will never end until consumers learn for themselves the difference between genuine and watered milk. It is so comforting to believe that the Government can and will perform this service for us, that few try to do it for themselves. But the Government cannot be omnipresent, and see what is going on in every house in a quarter of a hundred of towns and cities every day. This service can be performed only by the large body of persons who are most interested in being honestly served. To them the work may not be easy, but it is not impossible. One of the professors of the Ontario Agricultural College has come to the conclusion that it is folly to fine people for sending poor milk to cheese factories, the true method being for the factories to test the quality, and pay only for value. This is a timely protest against the foolish demand, set up on all possible occasions, for Government to do all sorts of impossible things.

UNDER THE NEW AMERICAN TARIFF.

While the new American tariff will restrict imports, its effect will be different on high and low class goods. As a general rule, it may be admitted there is only a given amount of money applicable to the ordinary purchases of the mass of the people, and a rise of prices must curtail consumption. The curtailing will take place in goods that have hitherto been imported. But this will not be the whole extent of the diminution of the import trade; many goods previously imported will now be manufactured at home, and sold at a higher cost than before, with the increased duty added. But there is a class of people who will have what they want, in spite of the McKinley tariff. When an American has set his heart on anything, and has the money to buy it, a rise in price will not deter him from purchasing. There are rich people who prize a thing the more on account of the extra price they have to pay for it. The finer class of European goods will continue to be imported, though not to the extent that they were before, while all goods not of the highest quality will suffer severely. This is the opinion of many who are in the best position to form a sound conclusion. If this view be correct, the production of the highest class of manufactures in the United States will not be ensured by this new hot-house measure.

The Canadian barley trade with the United States is not after all likely to be destroyed. The opinion has been expressed by persons on both sides of the line that Canadian barley will continue to be im-

ported in spite of the high duty. The fact that the Americans grow barley in excess of their own wants, while they make use of ours, is marshalled in support of this view; but, while a duty of 30 cents a bushel may not wholly exclude, it may well lessen the consumption of it. If a bushel of our barley will make fifteen gallons of beer, the duty will be only two cents a gallon. The difficulty will be to distribute the duty when the retail buyer is dealt with. But only part of the duty is new; there was before a duty equal to $\frac{1}{3}$ of a cent a gallon, and it will now be two. Can the brewer add one or two cents a gallon to his beer? One cent would not cover interest on the extra duty he advanced, and to save himself he would need to charge two cents extra. But how is the retailer to get those two cents back, with a reasonable interest or profit on the advance? If there were only silver coin representing six cents, the task would be easy. The difficulty will arise from the alternative which will present itself of charging five or ten cents for a glass of beer. There will be buyers for a superior quality of beer, though at the higher price they will naturally be less numerous than before. It is reasonable to believe that though our barley trade with the States will be injured, it will not suffer total eclipse.

The duty on animals is high, but not, we should think, high enough to keep out Canadian horses. On horses of a superior kind it will have little or no effect. Evidence taken before the Ontario Agricultural Commission a few years ago went to show that Canadian horses bring more than American by \$25 to \$50 a head in New York and Boston. Canadian horses, owing to the feeding they get, wear better. Western American horses are apt to be injured by the corn on which they feed, peas and barley, which are better food, being wanting. The duty on peas, 40 cents, and on barley, 30 cents a bushel, will make the importation of these grains for feeding purposes out of the question. Canadian Clydesdales for heavy work are in demand; brewers' dray horses are largely drawn from Canada. Nor will roadsters, carriage and saddle horses be kept out by the new duty. Potatoes this year are likely to go across the frontier in spite of the 15 cents duty. The price, on the other side, is already 70 to 80 cents a bushel, and is expected soon to rise to a dollar. At Charlottetown, P.E.I., it is 24 cents, but the crop is short, the potato beetle having appeared there this year for the first time. But in ordinary years, and even in the present, when potatoes are scarce, the Canadian export of them thence may be expected to decline.

The fact remains that both the United States and other countries will be injured; to what extent, or in what proportions, we cannot yet know. The export of eggs from Canada to the United States will be affected to a great degree by a duty of five cents a dozen; but there does not appear to be any conclusive reason why we should not send eggs in large quantities to England. But this tariff, so hostile to international trade generally, has some redeem-

ing features from a Canadian point of view. Conditioned on Canada suspending the export duty which it levies on logs, the wood schedule is in our favor; and the only question is whether our Government is prepared to exercise the authority with which it is entrusted to pass an Order-in-Council setting aside this export duty. As Canada imports more logs than she exports, the impolicy of a duty which invited retaliation is too plain to require to be emphasised. An export duty is one which the importing nation pays, and revenue raised in this way is not a direct burthen to the nation imposing it; still it is among the most barbarous of duties. Cuba gains by her export duties on cigars, but it remains to be seen at what cost. If equally good cigars could be got without the burthen of the duty, the argument against imposing it, even in that exceptional case, would be complete. Canada had more to lose than to gain by an export duty on logs, if it existed on both sides. The United States has not made the retaliation in kind, but nearly so. The McKinley tariff has given us an additional motive to repeal this duty, and one which we should think will bring all the lumberers into line, some having previously favored and others opposed repeal; it is now the common interest of them all that repeal should take place. Hemlock, white wood, sycamore, basswood, and white pine, on which the duty is conditionally lowered, may, under the impulse of the reduced rate, add considerably to our timber exports. Hemlock is inferior to pine, and many trees have been cut down merely for the bark which is used in tanning. Pickets, palings and shingles also benefit by a reduction of duty. These reductions afford some, though not complete, compensation for the increases in other directions. The benefits will be felt by the lumberers, who are comparatively few, while the agriculturists, who are many, will suffer. Still it is something to know that the new tariff presents one aspect that is not unfavorable to Canada. This is sufficient to redeem it from the suspicion that the agricultural schedule was intended merely for coercive purposes.

The danger to Canada is not great, we should hope, that this tariff may be used as an excuse still further to increase our own. Sir John Macdonald is author of the epigram which asserts that we must either have reciprocity in free trade or reciprocity in tariffs. What reason can there be for reciprocity in high duties? The excuse would be that if Americans keep out our manufactures, we ought to fence out theirs. But under an American tariff no higher than our own, we could not send manufactures to the States. The Americans had the start of us and can manufacture in most cases as cheaply as we can, if not more so. Reciprocity in tariffs, obtained by raising ours to the height of the American, would serve no useful purpose. Interested parties will press this policy on the Government; but even Sir John, let us hope, will hesitate to accept it. But we must not be too confident on this point. In Mr. Foster's St. John speech, last Saturday, he promised that "if any industry and any interest in this country were jeopardized by the McKinley tariff, and it were in the power