

AMERICAN EXPORTS OF IRON AND STEEL.

No other feature of the wonderful success of American manufacturers in foreign markets has been quite so wonderful as that pertaining to iron and steel. While the exportation of manufactures in the fiscal year 1899 is likely to show an increase of more than \$30,000,000 over that of last year, that of iron and steel alone will supply more than one-half that increase. In the eight months of the fiscal year for which the Treasury Bureau of Statistics figures are now available, the exports of iron and steel are nearly \$16,000,000 greater than in the corresponding months of the preceding fiscal year, and show a gain of 36 per cent. over those of last year, and nearly 70 per cent. over those of the preceding year. In importations of iron and steel there is a reduction, as compared with last year, though not in so marked a degree, the falling-off in imports for the eight months being but 10 per cent., while the corresponding period of last year showed a reduction of 20 per cent. While a comparison of the exports of the eight months of the present fiscal year with corresponding months of the two earlier years shows a marked gain and is therefore interesting, a better view of the real progress of the iron and steel industry is obtained by a comparison of the imports and exports for a term of years. An examination of the figures of the imports and exports of iron and steel and the manufactures thereof from 1880 to 1898, shows that the imports are now but one-fifth what they were in 1880, while the exports are five times what they were in that year. Thus the American manufacturers, besides occupying four-fifths of the field which foreign manufacturers were then supplying, have at the same time increased their exportations 400 per cent.—*Railway and Engineering Review.*

ARKANSAS ANTI-TRUST LAW.

A subscriber in Strathroy asks us the character of the law lately passed in Arkansas, which interferes with insurance companies. We reply that the law is known as the Anti-Trust Law, introduced by a man named E. W. Rector. It was of the Populistic order, decidedly, and went into effect on March 6th. It called combinations, wherever made, a "conspiracy against trade," and prescribed a penalty therefor. Says the *Chronicle*: "Esteemed contemporaries of the Hon. Rector, anxious to get their own names in print, took innings and decided that combinations, calculated to destroy competition, came under the head of "conspiracy to defraud." The penalty prescribed is a fine of not less than \$200 and not more than \$5,000. It also provides that 25 per cent. of the amount collected should be divided between the prosecuting attorney of the district wherein the cases are tried, and the attorney-general." Attorney-General Jefferson Davis delivered his remarkable opinion that the legislature meant to proscribe combinations anywhere in the United States, on March 31st. Each day in which a concern does business in violation of the law constitutes a separate offence. Three Sundays intervened, by the mercy of Providence, between March 6th and March 31st. Each of sixty-three fire insurance companies were, therefore, according to the Hon. Davis, guilty of twenty-two separate violations of the law and liable to a fine of \$5,000 for each offence. Still the Hon. Davis was not unreasonable. He brought two suits for \$5,000 each, against everyone of the companies. We assume that the Hon. Davis does not expect to collect and divide 25 per cent. of \$630,000.

The effect of the measure has been to produce chaos. Loans and policies have been called in, mortgages are being foreclosed. Insurance associations in New York and the Eastern States have taken counsel together as to how best to proceed in these curious circumstances. Lawyers have been engaged to contend in a test case to come up this week or next. Meanwhile no insurance companies but one are attempting to do business in Arkansas.

SOME CASUALTY YARNS.

A betting man was in the habit of regularly purchasing a railway insurance ticket whenever he went on his travels. Once he failed to do so, and his train was in imminent danger. His disgust knew no bounds. "Here have I been betting on this coming off all my life," he said, "and now that it has, — if I've got a bit on!"

There is one sadly dramatic history associated with an insurance ticket. A gentleman purchased one prior to starting on a journey, and, as is frequently done, posted it home to his wife from the departure station. The ticket was delivered simultaneously with an intimation from the railway company announcing that he had lost his life in a railway accident.

In the case of the Tay Bridge disaster, an insurance ticket was discovered upon the body of one of the victims. The ticket had been reduced to absolute pulp by the action of the sea water, but under a microscope the printing could still be traced. The company thereupon admitted the claim and duly paid over the amount of the insurance money.

After the death of one victim of a railway accident his estate was proved at £1,000 7s. 1d. An insurance ticket represented the "pounds" column of the above figures, while his "personal estate" accounted for the remaining 7s. 1d.

One man, in passing under a low archway, slightly forced his hat down over his eyes, and straightway died from a fracture of the skull. It was found afterward that his headpiece was of such abnormal thinness that the lightest blow thereon at any period of his life must infallibly have proven fatal. And yet he reached middle age!

Another gentleman, also a policyholder, exhibited totally opposite qualities. He fractured his skull by a fall, but walked about in complete ignorance of the fact for six weeks. At the end of that time he became ill and died.—*Railway Magazine.*

AN ENGLISH CHARACTERISTIC.

A case recently heard before a London stipendiary gives an example of an English characteristic which we in Canada are apt to regard as merely amusing, but which is often of notable benefit to the public, namely, the determination of the individual to insist on having his full rights in little things, at whatever cost and inconvenience to himself. The hero of the story is Mr. Handford, a civil servant, residing at Streatham Common. He got into an omnibus at Brixton marked "Streatham Common," and his indignation may be imagined when the bus turned round at Streatham Library, which is a mile from the advertised destination. When he remonstrated, the conductor remarked that there was another omnibus coming along, which would take him to the Common for a penny. The average Canadian would have paid the penny and thought no more about it. But not so the English civil servant. He took the conductor's name and address, and had him brought

before the magistrate on the accusation of "wilful deception with respect to the destination of an omnibus of which he had charge." Mr. Handford appeared at the court and gave evidence against the conductor, who was fined five shillings and costs. The magistrate remarked that the complaint "had done a public service in bringing the case before the court, as it was intolerable that a conductor should thus deceive a passenger." There is no doubt that the magistrate was right. Occasionally we get a freshly-imported Englishman who retains his native pertinacity in securing his rights; but people are too apt to regard him as a crank. There is a feeling that it is a waste of time to trouble about such small matters, and it pays better to let them go. But it is by insisting on their rights in small matters that the English people have had large ones rectified. Their admirable system of municipal government, which we all envy, owes its excellence to the determination of every citizen not to submit to injustice or inefficiency, even in little things. If we have people in our midst who are willing to sacrifice time and money in drawing attention to petty abuses, by all means let them be encouraged. It is only by the general body of citizens following their example that we can secure efficient administration. Eternal vigilance, in small things, as in great, is the price to be paid for good government.—*Gazette.*

INCREASED TRADE.

The trade returns for March, as found in the *Canada Gazette*, show that exports of goods, the produce of Canada, were much increased, and imports show a small increase over same month last year. The figures for the month are: Exports, \$8,179,427; imports, \$12,412,264; a total of \$20,591,711. In March last year the exports were \$7,696,738; imports, \$12,370,144; a total of \$30,066,882. This shows an increase in the exports of \$481,709 and in the imports of \$42,120.

The total trade for the nine months of the fiscal year was \$235,662,353, as compared with \$223,497,083, for the corresponding period last year. The exports were \$122,872,347, compared with \$127,341,202 for 1898, a decrease of \$4,468,856. The imports were \$112,790,000, as against \$96,155,881, an increase of \$16,634,125. The duty collected was \$18,751,708, compared with \$16,585,938 for the nine months in 1898, an increase of \$2,165,770.

The details of the exports are as follows:

	EXPORTS.	
	1898.	1899.
Produce of mine	\$11,715,341	\$10,219,153
Produce of fisheries	8,574,449	7,551,159
Produce of forest.	21,240,869	20,988,907
Animals and their produce	38,557,869	39,972,056
Agricultural products	34,368,779	31,294,637
Manufactures	8,377,643	8,905,901
Miscellaneous	261,168	420,838
Coin and bullion	4,245,124	3,519,696

\$127,341,202 \$122,872,347
Decrease, \$4,468,855.

	IMPORTS.	
	1898.	1899.
Dutiable	\$56,534,679	\$64,772,597
Free	36,505,121	44,939,716
Coin and bullion.	3,116,081	4,077,693

\$96,155,881 \$112,790,006
Increase, \$16,644,125.
Duty collected ... \$16,585,938 \$18,751,708
Increase, \$2,165,770.