to the participations of the defendants, either in the purpose to commit the offence or the act of selling the policies, if made after the sale, would have been clearly inadmissible (State vs. Beam, 13 Ired. 63), the State was not precluded, after laying the foundation, by showing the declarations of the defendants that he was their agent for that purpose, from proving his naked confession of the act of selling certain policies, as according to the testimony of Parker he had agreed to do, for the benefit of the defendants, and had subsequently attempted in his presence to do. . . For the reasons given the judgment of the court below is affirmed.

It is satisfactory to find that so important a prosecution, one in which the deepest interest was taken all over the United States and in Canada, has ended with the punishment of the scoundrelly culprits. The prosecution was conducted with great ability by J. W. Hinsdale, an insurance lawyer, who represented the Massachusetts Benefit Life Association, the Mutual Reserve Fund Life Association, the National Life Association and the Life Insurance Clearing Company. These four companies bore the expense of the prosecution. Judge Graham, in sentencing the men in December, 1895, said of this gang: "There has never been, within my knowledge, in the criminal annals of our whole country, a more gigantic conspiracy than this."

## "NOT A BOYCOTT."

A very ill-advised proceeding was taken when a number of fire nsurance agents asked by circular that a meeting of the Toronto Board of Fire Underwriters be called to consider, condemn and punish the conduct of the Agricultural Insurance Company agents in accepting less than tariff rates on non-hazardous risks in outlying parts of the city. Such meeting has been called for this afternoon, and we trust the full board will show better discretion than consent to attack, specifically and alone, a non-tariff company in the way indicated. "It is not a boycott," says one of the signers of the circular letter, "but is simply to meet the rates of the Agricultural." But what does the circular say?

It says that for six months from 1st proximo " . . all members of this Board be permitted to take up and cancel any policies of that company on dwellings or the contents thereof, and mercantile buildings, which shall have been in force not less than three months, and replace them with Board policies at such rates as may be necessary to secure the business." Such policies to be marked by the stamping officer, "competitive rate."

If this is not a boycott, it is as bad, or worse, for it means saying to the company: "How dare you? You shall not do any more business; we will do it for you, and by the same token will do it at *less rates* than you." It is noticeable that more than one of the agents most concerned belittle the Agricultural. One man says, "we don't recognize it at all"; another says, "it does not do business enough down town for us to notice." If this be true, where is the sense of making such a parade of threats and coercive machinery to force out of the field a trivial competitor? The Toronto underwriters may as well take warning that the present impolitic step will be very likely to cause the public to reason thus: "This American company has been doing fire underwriting in Canada for thirty odd years, and it ought to know what adequate rates are. But if it was writing risks at a loss, and is found fault with therefor, how can the Toronto board justify the issuance by tariff companies of policies at lower rates, and at a still greater loss, with the avowed purpose of 'securing the business'? This sort of squeezing process reminds us very much of combine methods in other directions."

We are aware that some companies declined to sign the circular in question, thinking it a petty piece of business to make a vicious set at one company. If the Agricultural is so foolish as to cut its own throat by doing business at a loss, some other method should have been found of correcting it The course proposed is childishly undignified, and we are astonished that it should have emanated from a dozen of men supposed to be level-headed. Let the Toronto Board sit upon it—and squelch it.

## CATTLE EXPORT.

People in Canada have been known to ask why, if the export cattle trade were a losing one, as those pursuing it say, do shippers stick to it season after season. The answer probably is that the trade is not always a losing one, indeed has been at one time very profitable, but owing to peculiar conditions on the other side the Atlantic was perhaps a losing one this year. Prices ruled low, 9½c. in London in June, only 8c. in July, coming up to 11½c. in August, and going down to 8 or 9c. again. The condition of the animals sent over was often poor and quite a number of shipments realized a loss. The extent of the trade was very considerable, 100,360 head having been shipped in 1896, as compared with 96,582 in 1895, which at an average of $60 each, represents a total of $6,021,600. The freight amounted to $1,003,600, while the railway charges were $301,080. The amount of hay used is estimated at 15,000 tons, which at $11 per ton, makes $165,000 The insurance is put at $100,360; keep of cattle at yards, $54,661; loading fees, $54,661, and attendants for the ocean voyages amounted to $90,000, making a total of over $8,000,000. This, therefore, is no inconsiderable industry. Exports of sheep were 80,671 head, a decided decline from the 136,728 head of 1895, and caused, no doubt, by the embargo placed upon them in January last. In their case, too, low prices were the rule, for where in 1895 they realized 14½c. for top price, in the present season the top price was 12½c. The value of these 80,671 at $5 the head is put at $403,355; ocean freight $100,000, and insurance $20,000. Horses went abroad to the number of 12,755 from the St. Lawrence in 1895: this year the number was only 10,087, of which one-half were landed in London.

A table will show the number of animals shipped from Montreal and Quebec during the season and the steamer lines by which they went:

| Steamers. | Cattle. | Sheep. | Horses. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Allan Line | 27,100 | 27,085 | 4,066 |
| Reford & Co. | 22,744 | 13,482 | 2,077 |
| Elder, Dempter & Co. | 15,656 | 17,632 | 1,851 |
| Dominion Line | 13,470 | 8,392 | 876 |
| Johnston " | 8,931 | 3,272 | 332 |
| Beaver " | 8,486 | 5,345 | 642 |
| From Quebec | 2,270 | 533 | .... |
| " " | 1,481 | 3,223 | 88 |
| Munderloh & Co. | 961 | 1,493 | .... |
| McLean, Kennedy & Co. | 171 | 214 | 155 |
| Total | 100,360 | 80,671 | 10,087 |

Thirty thousand cattle went to Liverpool; twenty-two thousand to Glasgow; eighteen thousand to London, the remainder to Bristol, Newcastle, Manchester and France. Among exporters of sheep John Dunn was at the head, with shipments of 12,165; A. McIntosh, P. R. Duff, and Swift & Co. being other large shippers. Gordon & Ironside, who shipped 33,907 head of cattle in 1895, despatched only 27,057 this year. James Eakins stands next, with 9,571. There seems a fascination about the trade, for we have counted ninety names in the list of shippers of Canadian cattle during the present season.

## NOVA SCOTIA AND ST. LAWRENCE COAL TRADE.

Some features of interest appear in connection with the coal trade of Nova Scotia, according to the figures now made public describing its growth and extent. The growth of her exports to the St. Lawrence has been very great. The Province produces, as most of our readers know, only bituminous coal, which is mostly shipped to Canadian ports on the River St. Lawrence and to the United States. The total quantity of Nova Scotia coal shipped to the St. Lawrence, in the last two years, was 706,477 tons in the present season, against 636,519 tons in 1895, an increase this year of almost 70,000 tons. The following are the respective shipments:

| Shipped by | 1895. | 1896. |
|---|---|---|
| General Mining Association | 115,435 tons. | 119,035 tons. |
| Dominion Coal Co. | 454,513 " | 547,773 " |
| Cape Breton Coal Co. | ...... " | 6,080 " |
| From Pictou | 66,571 " | 33,589 " |
| Total | 636,519 " | 706,477 " |

The ports to which this great quantity of coal was sent were Montreal, Sorel, Three Rivers and Quebec. Of course, the great bulk of this went to Montreal. 598,000 tons, or 84 per cent. of the whole, having been received at that city. This was 43,000 tons more than last year.

Of course, these figures do not represent all the coal that comes to St. Lawrence ports. Besides the Nova Scotian, Montreal and Quebec import Scotch, English, Welsh and American coal. The aggregate of these foreign fuels imported in 1895 was 88,429 tons, whereas this year it was only 86,367 tons, a slight falling off. The relative share of Quebec city in this import was increased by 10,000 tons in 1896, because of the large quantities stored there for the convenience of the Allan mail steamers. The duty imposed has much hindered the importation of American soft coal into Canada.

## INGENIOUS RASCALITY.

One of the oddest schemes of plunder—perhaps we might call it one of the most romantically delusive plans of robbing Peter to pay Paul, and afterwards to line the pocket of the robber and the robber's chums—is furnished by the career of Clark & Bradley, storekeepers, in Caledon East, and would-be proprietors of a theatrical troupe. For some days last week, Francis Clark and his wife, of Toronto, and John A. Bradley, of Caledon, have been on trial at Brampton, charged with trying to defraud creditors. The latter was a farmer at Campbell's Corners, and last summer bought out Clark's store, the latter agreeing to remain with him as manager. A few weeks ago there was a fire in the store, and this was followed by an assignment. The liabilities were $7,000, the assets only $800. Bradley attempted to explain the discrepancy