

need cause no alarm to the advocates of Protection, for most assuredly there is not the most remote probability that England will abandon her Free-trade policy.

We confess that we think that Sir Alexander Galt might have stated more clearly than he did, the effect of a great reduction in the price of goods on a revenue raised by *ad valorem* duties, and the difficulty of increasing such duties beyond a certain point. It is sufficiently obvious that there is much greater danger of fraud when duties are levied according to value than according to weight or quantity. The principle of combined specific and *ad valorem* duties has long since been adopted, with the concurrence of all parties, in our tariff, as it has been also in that of the United States. Sir Alexander Galt did not shrink from admitting and defending the protective character of the tariff. It cannot be denied that the chief cause of the national sentiment in favor of Protection, which was manifested at the last general election for the Dominion, was the refusal of the United States to concur in any measure of reciprocity. To the earlier portion of Sir Alexander Galt's paper we should not imagine that any exception could be taken. A revision of the tariff was indispensably necessary, in order to obtain a larger revenue, and it was quite pertinent to the question at issue to point out the heavy expenditure that Canada has been called on to incur, not only from the withdrawal of the Imperial troops, but from the accession of a large territory uninhabited, except by Indian tribes, whose supervision is very costly.

The account given of the various negotiations with the United States for reciprocal trade requires no lengthened notice here, although it could not have been omitted with propriety in a paper intended for English readers. What is chiefly objected to by the Opposition journals, and especially by the *Globe*, is the passage in which Sir Alexander Galt argues that the tariff was specially aimed at the manufactures of the United States and that "it was intended to make it apply in this sense as little as possible to Great Britain, and it is hoped that, instead of diminishing, it will increase our imports from home by replacing certain classes of goods by British." Immediately preceding our quotation Sir Alexander Galt had specially referred to the duties on cereals, coal, lumber and sugar, all of which, it must be admitted were aimed chiefly at the United States although coal and sugar are likewise imported from the United Kingdom. The coal imports from Great Britain have been

insignificant as compared with those from the United States, and, as there is no bounty on sugar exported from Great Britain, the effect of charging the duty on the long price is inoperative. We confess that we fail to comprehend how the effect of the tariff can be to replace certain classes of goods by British. As the duties are not discriminatory it would seem to follow that if England could not compete with the United States under the old tariff she cannot do so under the new. The *Globe* maintains that the tariff will operate much more against the importation of British than of United States manufactures, and refers specially to fabrics of wool. We find some difficulty in dealing with the *Globe's* figures, owing to the unsatisfactory character of the returns given in the *Official Gazette*, in which all cottons and woollens are classed under one head, although subject to various rates of duty. The returns are practically useless, unless there is a classification of the goods according to their respective rates of duty. There is, however, sufficient information given to prove that the *Globe's* statement is wholly incorrect. After selecting a number of articles, such as carpets, blankets, flannels, tweeds, woollen clothes, and worsted, which he states are charged with duties ranging from 30 to 50 per cent., and the value of which, in the aggregate in 1878 was under three millions of dollars, he gives "other woollens" value \$5,137,773 as liable under the tariff to 40 to 50 per cent. Now the unenumerated woollens in the tariff are only 20 per cent. *ad valorem*, and the articles specified above are all that are specially protected. There is, however, an obvious mode of testing the correctness of the *Globe's* statement. The woollens imported in the month of July according to the *Official Gazette* were of the value of \$514,365, the average duty on which was \$141,293, or a trifle under 27½ per cent. *ad valorem* on the whole. For the month of August the value of woollen imports was \$899,850, and the duty \$234,637, or about 26 per cent. The *Globe's* average is 43½ per cent. It would, of course, be more satisfactory if we were informed what amount came in at 20 per cent., and what the combined specific and *ad valorem* duties really amount to as the *Globe's* figures are mere estimates. The *Globe* is, however, correct in its statement that the low-priced English woollens are what the Canadian manufacturer feared, and it is clear that the duties were arranged so as to leave the market for the higher priced goods open to the English manufacturer and to close it for the inferior descriptions. Sir Alexander Galt did not enter into details,

and we think that, if he had confined his remarks to cotton goods, he would have been tolerably accurate. On the whole we venture to submit that, if Sir Alexander Galt has endeavored to minimize the effect of the tariff on British goods, his critics have exaggerated it in a much greater degree.

BUTTER ON THE CONTINENT.

At the Irish international dairy show at Kilburn this season the various continental butter-making methods were exhibited, and the description of the Danish and French methods is apt to convey to our own butter makers a hint or two which may be for their advantage. We see no reason why our best butter should not be fully equal to the best foreign make, and we believe that a little more care or attention would bring it to the same excellence. With one exception, the practical making of the butter at the German, Danish and Swedish dairies seemed to be quite perfect. The churning is done in the upright Holstein churn. Directly the butter comes, when it is still in small grains, like fine seed, slightly sticking together, the churning is stopped, so that the butter does not gather in lumps at all. The top of the churn is then taken off, the dasher taken out, and the butter milk drawn off through a sieve to catch any grains of butter. The butter is lifted out in a sieve, still in fine grains, and after a few rollings and tossings in the sieve forms in a lump, the grains having run together. It is next thrown out on the table; thence lifted with wooden trowels on the butter-working machine, and a few turns of the roller over it, with one or two more liftings with the trowels, and the work is done. The exception to this method is that the butter is not washed with water at all. The butter working machine is relied upon entirely to squeeze out the butter milk.

The French system of butter making, as exemplified at the international dairy, does not differ materially from the practice of the best English and Irish dairies. The chief advantages which the French method appears to have are the perfect sweetness of the cream and the novel and careful mode of washing. The churn used on the occasion bears a strong resemblance to the tinkler, so extensively employed in the United Kingdom. Unlike the latter, however, the French has two main openings instead of one, at directly opposite sides of the center. There are also two small openings, the smaller of which is the medium through which the water and buttermilk escape in the earlier washings.