

The Semi-Weekly Telegraph is issued every Wednesday and Saturday by The Telegraph Publishing Company, St. John, a company incorporated by Act of the Legislature of New Brunswick.

B. W. McCREADY,
President and Manager.
Subscription Rates

Sent by mail to any address in Canada at One Dollar a year. Sent by mail to any address in the United States at Two Dollars a year. All subscriptions must be paid in advance.

Advertising Rates
Ordinary commercial advertisements taking the run of the paper, each insertion, \$1.00 per inch.
Advertisements of Wants, For Sale, etc., one cent a word for each insertion.
Notices of Births, Marriages and Deaths, 50 cents for each insertion.

Important Notice
All remittances must be sent by post office order or registered letter, and addressed to The Telegraph Publishing Company.

Correspondence must be addressed to the Editor of The Telegraph, St. John. All letters sent to The Semi-Weekly Telegraph and intended for publication should contain stamps if return of M.S. is desired in case it is not published. Otherwise, rejected letters are destroyed.

Authorized Agents
The following agents are authorized to canvass and collect for The Semi-Weekly Telegraph, viz:
H. CECIL KEIRSTEAD,
MISS V. E. GIBERSON.

THE DAILY TELEGRAPH THE SEMI-WEEKLY TELEGRAPH THE EVENING TIMES

New Brunswick's Independent Newspapers
These newspapers advocate British connection
Honesty in public life
Measures for the material progress and moral advancement of our great Dominion.
No graft!
No deals!
"The Yacht, Shamrock, & Centwine, The Maple Leaf forever."

Semi-Weekly Telegraph and The News

ST. JOHN, N. B., MAY 31, 1913.

A BIG ISSUE—A LOWER TARIFF.

When is the Borden government going to confer the British preference to goods entering Canada through its own ports? And when is the Borden government going to increase the British preference? Limiting the preference to goods coming direct would be a great stimulus for the ports of the country, but even more important is it to increase the preference, for this would not only serve the port cities, but would be of great service to the whole population.

Mr. Carvell and other Liberals are taken to task by the Conservative press for advocating a lower tariff, and for placing the British preference in the forefront of their arguments. Mr. Carvell is referred to in some quarters as practically a free trader, as if this were a term of reproach. Mr. Carvell can stand it, and there is an increasing army of electors who share his opinion that when Canada takes from its taxpayers a sufficient sum yearly to pay all its running expenses and leave many millions of a surplus it is time to consider giving the consumer relief.

One would suppose that a government like that of Mr. Borden, which rode into office under the protecting folds of the Union Jack, which denounced its opponents as traitors and separatists, and which professed from the rising until the going down of the sun its headline desire to do something for Imperial connection, would not hesitate to increase the British preference and to keep on increasing it until the tariff on goods from Great Britain would be wiped out altogether.

But while patriotism and imperialism are the stock-in-trade of the patriotic government of the day these sentiments are never permitted to interfere with the government's business arrangements with the "interests." No sooner was Mr. Borden safely in power than the Canadian Manufacturers' Association held a meeting, at which, by resolution, notice was served upon Mr. Borden that there must be no increase in the British preference. Mr. Borden heard, and Mr. Borden heeded. It is, therefore, to be expected that Liberals like Mr. Carvell, who recognize the same tariff tendencies of the day, and who speak out for tariff revision downward, will be denounced as fiscal anarchists. The tariff which pinches the Borden government—its western supporters want lower duties. The protection cause in Great Britain has gone by the board. The United States, whose protection was carried to extremes and worshipped as the product of fiscal alchemists, has turned its back squarely upon the doctrine of special privilege.

The Borden government has introduced its second budget without doing much for its manufacturing friends, but without doing anything of importance for the consumers. Mr. Borden and Mr. White believe that they can afford to wait, or they are afraid to take any other but a waiting course. But the country is of another mind. Presently the American free list will be in force, and Canada will have the benefit not only of a long free list, but of greatly reduced duties on many of its leading products. A trial of this instalment of reciprocity will lead undoubtedly to an irresistible demand for a lowering of

the Canadian tariff toward a revenue basis, beginning with an increase in our tariff favors toward Great Britain. Mr. Carvell has sounded the right note. His speech deals with the leading issue in Canadian politics, the only lasting issue marking the great difference between the two political parties.

THE WEAKNESS OF HUMAN KIND.

Mr. Gaynor, the Mayor of New York, recently replied to an inquiry from an out-of-town manufacturer who is short of labor, as follows:

"The entire population of this earth, if brought into the city of New York, could be given two feet square each, which would enable them each to stand up here. And if they were brought to Texas they could be given three acres each. And yet as small as the population of the world is compared to the area of the earth, we have congestion of population in some places with all the evils thereof. The question is a great one but very few are thinking of it. It does not excite as much attention here as the case of one policeman who takes graft."

The New York Post offers the following comment on the reflections of the Mayor: "Such is the weakness of human kind. It will go on reading about graft without giving a moment's thought to the fact that the Irrawaddy River rises in the highlands of Assam and flows into the Bay of Bengal. It will grow excited about the exploits of a handful of East India gunmen, and show no interest in the fact that light travels at the rate of 120,000 miles a second. It will display vulgar curiosity in the doings of grand juries, while all the time about us any two sides in a triangle are persistently longer than a third side."

It is an easy and familiar way of reminding Mr. Gaynor that human interests will always have the first claim with people and that thinking about things remote and difficult is a most unusual proceeding which will never become so popular with the people in any city as the desire to see a corrupt crew brought to order, so that they may learn to live either without power or without vice. Even when men have given themselves over to the abstract ideas that Mr. Gaynor recommends, they have produced no results in comparison with the energy consumed. Estimating how many men can stand on the soil of New York or how many angels can dance on the point of a needle may produce intellectual culture, but it leaves the man's conscience, his social ideas, and the question of his relation to his neighbor untouched. Mayor Gaynor of late has been frequently urged to think more about graft in his administration and less about distant issues. And the point of the critics is well taken.

THE MOVEMENT FOR LOWER TARIFFS.

In the way of rapid political development it is difficult to surpass the record of the movement for lower tariffs in all countries within the last few years. When Mr. Taft was elected with a popular plurality of a million and a quarter, the opposition party was quite lukewarm on the subject, and it seemed as if the United States would be content for a long time to leave things as they were. To be sure, Taft had promised a revision of the tariff, but few expected a downward revision, and so certain was his party of the desire of the country for a truce on tariff matters that they attempted a strong upward revision. It looked as if tariff reform, in the way desired by those who oppose privilege in all its forms, was as dead as a door nail.

But the Aldrich bill changed all that. From the time Mr. Taft went over of his way to declare it the best tariff ever devised, the atmosphere was different for the protectionists. Yesterday they could stand against the world; now none as weak as to seek even for the repeal of the wool schedule. A few years ago Schedule K was sacred. No one dreamed of such a proposal as free wool. It was not thought of even last year when Mr. Taft vetoed a proposal to reduce it by fifty per cent. Now many things besides wool are to be placed on the free list, and the cause of privilege is deserted by its oldest friends.

It may be said that the treachery of the Payne-Aldrich act was the cause of the resentment against protection, but that is only one of the causes. The high price of the necessities of life has contributed powerfully to making the tariff the most prominent issue. The high tariff may not be responsible for the whole of that increase, but yet no one questions that its effect is to make prices higher. But the present resentment against the system is chiefly due to the fact that about every claim made for it has proved false. It claimed to increase wages and to direct a larger proportion of the product of labor into the hands of those who have the best right to enjoy it. The fact that the advocates of protection are not wage-earners but employers; that the tariff schedules are fixed, not upon any investigation of wages paid or desirable, or even upon evidence as to the profits to be secured, but upon the suggestion of each kind of manufacturers engaged in any particular branch of industry, should have given pause to the laborers who listened to this cry. It was claimed again that it would diversify industry; that it would defend the country from foreign monopoly; that it would prepare a nation for self-defense, and a thousand other things which time has demonstrated to be absurd.

No country has ever entered upon an era of protection without regarding it as a temporary experiment, that is, without looking forward to the time when tariff favors to these industries would be no longer necessary. Industries secure protection at first chiefly on the ground that they desire it and need it through

the years of their tender infancy. But after being nursed through these years there is no industry on record that has voluntarily surrendered the privilege of taxing the country. Those that have been the most clamorous and persistent in appeals for aid during late years, are those which were infants one, or two, or three generations ago. The very fact that an industry is forced to depend upon lobbying for its success and that the enterprise and ingenuity which would otherwise go into securing legitimate progress are turned into graft and politics, is the reason why so many have become more and more dependent upon government aid. As a matter of fact the industry which has been best protected under the whole system, and which has grown to the greatest strength is the oldest industry of all—human greed.

The old time arguments for high protection being broken, and the fact that as quickly as governments interfere to prevent foreign competition, monopoly steps in to stifle domestic competition, make it evident that it is not possible that the system can ever have the vigor again that it has had in the past. Today nations eagerly join in opening facilities for mutual intercourse, and each uses the arts and the products of all. The system cannot, in the United States, survive the proposed tariff bill which is now before the Senate. With the removal of protection it will be seen that many industries were being obstructed rather than protected by the tariff; the removal of restrictions will throw a world-wide field open to industry, and the unparalleled abundance and natural cheapness of the raw materials, the energy, ingenuity and effectiveness of labor and business leadership will open a new era of progress. Canada will be forced to follow in the direction of downward tariffs to the great advantage of the whole country and of every legitimate industry within its borders. It is time. And, first of all, we should increase the British preference.

MIXED METAPHORS.

Lord Curzon was a pupil of Jowett, and one of Jowett's maxims for politicians was: "Never explain." Lord Curzon, however, has been compelled to explain, because, as a speaker of force and precision, he is unwilling that the country should believe that he described "the ship of state" as "approaching the brink of a precipice and in danger of falling over into the pit of fratricidal strife." Lord Curzon explains that he was misrepresented by a condensed report, and that the figure of speech he did employ pictured the ship of state as being like a boat drifting the broad current of Niagara toward the falls. While he was at it, he also denied using another mixed metaphor which had been very generally attributed to him. He had been made to say: "Though we are not yet out of the wood, yet we have a good ship." The noble lord says he never used any sentence remotely resembling the one quoted.

Lord Curzon's explanation has reminded a London publicist that Lord Cromer once criticized a woman's suffrage bill as "not the thin edge of the wedge, but the whole wedge—lock, stock and barrel."

Mr. Asquith is generally regarded as easily excelling the other public men of our day in precise and direct statements of a case, yet even he is credited with having described a proposed reform as "a thorny subject which required delicate handling or it would tread on somebody's toes." One suspects that condensation or some other evil spirit has done the Prime Minister an injustice, for no man of this day is less likely to fall into slovenly English. Mr. Chamberlain's lieutenant, Mr. Chaplin, is the author of one of the most famous of the mixed metaphors of modern debate. He said that "if back to the lands is the right horse, then it will blow a very terrible hole in your unearned-increment balloon." Lord Middleton once illuminated a House of Commons discussion on army matters by expressing his satisfaction that, "among the many jarring notes heard in the House, this subject at least might be regarded as an oasis." Mr. Alfred Lyttelton once charged Mr. Lloyd George with "throwing dirty water on his opponents in order to inflame people against them" an expedient of doubtful utility, surely. Mr. Austen Chamberlain, on a well-remembered occasion, sought to give comfort to his backers by remarking solemnly that the harvest which the government had sown was already coming home to roost. All of which recalls the figure of speech used by a famous English clergyman who, calling proudly on, although the waves of sin were striving to overwhelm him: "And why, my friends? Because he is founded on a rock." This is on a par with the utterance of a member of the Australian Federal Parliament, who declared recently that the ship of state "was not moving fast enough" and that it was absolutely necessary "to change horses in order to lift it out of the mire."

Public speaking in Great Britain, both in the House of Commons and on the hustings, has reached a level far higher than has yet been attained in Canada or the United States. Many of the leading public men there combine admirable clearness, dignity and force of utterance with a happy facility of getting the right word. Mr. Asquith, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Churchill, Lord Haldane, Mr. Birrell, Lord Morley, Lord Curzon and many another, take up any subject like men born to public discussion and debate.

THE COST OF THE WAR.

The official figures of Bulgarian losses during the war have been published and the total is terribly high: 380 officers and 29,711 men were killed, and 950 officers and 82,350 men wounded. Besides this, more than 3,000 are reported

missing. One in ten of all those engaged in the war is an exceedingly large proportion of killed. That is the proportion according to these figures. It was an end with horrors to put a stop to the horrors without an end. There is a Macedonian epigram which the outlaws of the Bulgarian bands would repeat to the persecuted peasants of the villages: "Better an end with horrors than horrors without an end." Bulgaria has chosen this better part and she has paid the price. The number of killed compared with the wounded indicates that a high proportion of the wounded died for want of care. The terrible sufferings of the wounded, as indicated from the time of the despatches, and the lack of medicine and treatment explain this great total of killed. The tale of the casualties among the other allies taken together is about one-half that of Bulgaria.

The formation of the Balkan league probably will not survive the war. There have been several reports that Greece and Serbia are uniting to dispute the claims Bulgaria is making to the conquered territory. While the Bulgarian army was still occupied at Techataldia the Greeks and Serbians were massing their own forces in Macedonia, with a view to conflict over the ownership of much of its area. Reports have been received from many skirmishes between Greeks and Bulgarians in the disputed regions east and northeast of Salonika, and many have been killed in these skirmishes, so it is possible that before the end comes the Allies will be fighting seriously among themselves. The war with Turkey has been bloody and cruel, and its regular operations have been aggravated by every variety of outrage and massacre, but the cruelty would be eclipsed by a war among the Balkan peoples and such a war would be almost certain to break Serbia and Greece.

Much has been written of the ethical aspect of the war against Turkey, but taken all together it is probably the most justifiable war that has been waged in recent years. The war in Tripoli had inclined many to think of every war as an immoral invention of financiers and politicians, but this sharp violence to end a long oppression comes under a different category. Manhood has always judged violence and carnage as not only excusable but laudable when they are used to end another violence as gross and more permanent. Turkish rule in the Balkans has been a continued state of war. Indeed this state which is now closed was made at the treaty of Berlin. When Disraeli tore up the treaty of San Stefano and handed back Macedonia to the Turks after it had been liberated by Russia, he imposed on the future a war of liberation or else effective reform. The reform did not come and the other alternative was chosen.

But wherever the responsibility is for Macedonian misrule, the fearful cost of lives snuffed out, of energies overtaxed and broken, cannot be counted. On the people the dead weight and burden of it all has fallen throughout the years. They should have a rest now to recover from poverty and oppression, instead of being made again the victims of unjustifiable strife.

UNITING FOR WORK.

There are many indications in the United States of a drawing together of the progressive and Republican parties. Practical politicians are uniting to bring it about and there are many practical politicians in both parties. It is possible that "insurgency" has done its work. The vigorous protest of the Progressives, and it is likely to remain broken for some time to come. The system of government by party has threatened to become what Lord Rosebery called one of "alternating treason"—first one party then the other, and although his own idea of plunging a lone furrow could never lead to any results, it is quite possible to find a mean between the extreme of individualism on the one hand and tyranny on the other. When party becomes despotism it is subject to revolution like any other, and it is a fact that before the organization of the new party in the United States, party control had become too rigid. Independent minded men were eliminated and a fairly smooth-running machine controlled the pooled consciences of the leaders.

In the art of the statesman it is a constant policy to overlook lesser antagonism in order to work together for great interests. If either party refused to do this it would be marking itself down as a faction and not a great party. The difference between a faction and a party is important; this difference consists in the fact that parties can suppress minor differences, and combine for what they think essential for public welfare, while factions divide and subdivide on petty differences. Mr. Roosevelt will be the first to recognize the need of this high exercise of reason in overlooking minor antagonisms and in seeking differences that are not of the first importance. The revolt which he led against the crushing out of independent opinion and against the control of the machine has been completely successful. The man who followed him sacrificed ancient political ties and personal friendships, but they rescued the party from the grip of the reactionaries, and the price paid for that was not too great. The place of the dissembler and critic has been established, and the methods of repression, penalty and tyranny effectively rebuked.

Repression and tyranny with the growth of plutocratic power, have been the prolific sources of discontent, of class antagonism and of anarchistic and socialist agitation. These serious dangers have been fought by a sturdy citizenship under the inspiration of strong and aggressive leaders. With a union of both parties again it will be long before the tendencies which were

checked by this revolt will again be in control.

THE SENATE AND NAVY.

The Imperialist Liberal, Sir George Ross, has summed up, strikingly and succinctly, the Liberal position with respect to Mr. Borden's emergency tribute legislation. Liberals who read with care the closely reasoned address of the Liberal leader of the Senate will not fear that even persistent Conservative misrepresentation will hereafter be able to place the Liberal party in the wrong.

Sir George Ross has set forth in plain and convincing English the true path to be followed by Canada in the matter of Imperial naval contribution—a contribution not of empty ships alone, not of money alone, but a contribution of manned ships, thus placing the blood and bone of Canada, as well as its money, at the disposal of the Empire. Sir George describes Mr. Borden's emergency plan as an attempt to substitute money—and borrowed money at that—for service. The Borden bill, he says, "calls for money, not men; for models of steel and iron, not for models of courage and daring; it appeals to no man's flesh and blood, it offers no Victoria Crosses for lives risked on the battle field. Empty as an exploded cartridge and soulless as its plated sides, it arouses no sympathy, no sentiment, no emotion of joy or glory. Should a bill like this be submitted for assent of a royal seion whose ancestors for many generations honored the British constitution, as the palladium of liberty and self-government? Our feelings, our judgment, our sense of duty to our country, all combined to ask for further delay in the hope that even at this late hour we may decide to show to the world that the disrupting forces of party warfare have been submerged by the loyalty of a united nation acting for the naval defense of Canada and of the empire."

Sir George proposes that Mr. Borden shall go to the people and take their judgment upon the projected legislation. He proposes that this country shall not send three empty shells of ships to Great Britain and ask the Motherland to man them and maintain them, but that we shall build, maintain and man ships of our own to be added to the common naval strength of the Empire. Sir George proudly proclaims himself an Imperialist, and he sees weakness and danger in Mr. Borden's proposed contribution. He opposes the bill, because it is unnecessary and of no possible use, because it establishes a cleavage in defence of Canada directly, because it might lead to friction with Great Britain, because we have no evidence that it meets with public approval, because it introduces a new practice in legislation not sanctioned by the usages of this constitution, and because it removes from the free control of Canada one of its effective elements of national defence—the three battleships proposed.

The Senate, Sir George says, stands for the defence of the Empire from Australia to the Pole, for as many battleships of the most modern type as are required, at any rate to the limit of our resources, for a permanent Canadian navy to guard our coasts and trade routes to Great Britain and to all other nations that are at peace with the Empire, for the construction of a navy and of shipyards, using for these purposes the products of our own industry and building the ships by the hands of our own people. And, says Sir George Ross:

"We stand for the training of our own seamen in our own naval schools and colleges, and on training ships, so that when our ships go out to sea they will represent Canadian blood and bone and flesh and sentiment. We stand for ships to be placed at the disposal of the king in case of emergency, or at any time at the expense of Canada and not at the expense of the British taxpayer."

"We stand for co-operation with his majesty's dominions beyond the seas in the world's phalanx, if need be, with all the power they represent in defence of Britain for the peace of the world."

"We stand for unity and defence if emergency arises and we do not propose to question the wisdom of the admiralty as to how or where that emergency has arisen, or with whom or where we are called upon to fight for the empire."

Sir George, it may be assumed, has spoken for a large majority of the members of the Senate, and it will now be accepted as settled that the Upper Chamber will reject the Borden legislation, and that the government must either go to the country or postpone its naval policy pending an attempt to alter the constitution of Canada by appealing to the Imperial Parliament—a long and troublesome process of more than doubtful utility.

Let Mr. Borden take the issue to the country. That may not cure the disease from which he is suffering, but if it does not, it will at least put him out of his misery.

PICTURE OF A STATESMAN.

Of all men who have had to do with European affairs since the inception of the Balkan trouble, Sir Edward Grey, Britain's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, has increased most in reputation. The Spectator said recently, in speaking of the improved outlook for peace:

"Such results as these could hardly have come about without a guiding hand or a miraculous run of good luck. For ourselves we are certain that the guiding hand was there and was the sole cause of the happy issue; and we believe that all Europe is of the same opinion. The hand was Sir Edward Grey's. We cannot praise too highly his patience, the tenacity, the coolness, and the wisdom with which Sir Edward

Grey has managed the negotiations. The peace will be his peace. Probably no other Foreign Minister could have done what he has done. It need not be forgotten that there were natural conditions in his favor, such as the freedom of London from prejudice, intrigue, and passion, and the fatal disadvantages of premature publicity. But when this is remembered the sum of Sir Edward Grey's achievement remains enormous. His patience and quiet resolution would have won the admiration of the late Lord Salisbury, who was himself a master of similar methods, and one of the best friends of peace that modern times have known."

A fine picture of Sir Edward Grey was recently drawn by Signor Guglielmo Emanuel, for a newspaper of Milan. This observer finds it strange that so conservative a statesman should be a leading figure in a Radical administration. He describes the British Foreign Minister as admittedly the guardian angel of the peace of Europe. He asserts that Sir Edward ignores the opinions of many supporters of his party and sturdily declines to read the party journals. He gives us this picture of Sir Edward's parliamentary manner:

"Now and again the dull humor of the Radicals finds expression in an impatient, insistent request for 'explanations' upon the most important questions of foreign politics. Naturally, Sir Edward Grey treats with severity those indiscreet persons who attempt to penetrate the fastidious reserve with which he surrounds the negotiations of foreign politics. He distrusts the public, and will not allow it to share in the negotiations until a positive result has been achieved. Therefore he speaks rarely. But when his tall, pale, refined figure rises in the House of Commons, and with clean-shaven impetuous face and calm voice, devoid of impetuosity or excitement, Sir Edward begins a speech, the sitting is immediately transformed. The Chamber is crowded, the attention becomes solemn; one feels that one is truly in the presence of the greatest Empire in the world. He is the most authoritative orator in the House of Commons. When he speaks he is no longer a Minister defending his own policy, but the very voice of the nation proclaiming the unavoidable necessity of a given collective attitude."

Sir Edward has been spoken of as Gladstone's favorite pupil. While the Italian observer finds him in strange company in Mr. Asquith's ministry, many hold another view. Sir Edward Grey's manner and training are conservative and aristocratic in a sense, in that he has no popular methods or manners, he speaks infrequently, and he holds himself aloof from the world. On the other hand, no member of the ministry is a more convinced progressive Liberal than Sir Edward Grey. Indeed, it has been said often of late that in the event of Mr. Asquith's retirement the front rank men of the Liberal party would demand Sir Edward as their leader not only because of his intellectual power and poise, but also because of his tenacious and daring determination to advance the social legislation which will be the monument of the British Liberal party of our time.

Sir Edward affords a fine subject for the study of personality. Mr. Asquith is not a man with whom the average parliamentary reader readily takes liberties, but it is a fact that many a member of the House of Commons will address hostile questions or comments to the Prime Minister who would think twice about doing so in the case of the Foreign Secretary. No imaginative writer can long observe Sir Edward Grey without thinking of him as an inviting figure about whom to weave a great story. Cold, a trifle gloomy, detached, of fine presence, with an eye of prescience, he is as one might say, a man of a book.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

Probably the most interesting thing about the Canadian naval-political situation at present is the Prime Minister's anxiety to avoid a general election.

Fancy how indignant Messrs. Pollister, Nantel, Blondin et al. are over the delay in "going to the rescue" of the British they condemned so savagely in Quebec not long ago!

The Senate thinks it ought not to take Canada twenty-five or fifty years to build ships of war if Australia can do it in a few years. The country is of that opinion, too.

Although it is the most law-abiding of the nine provinces, Prince Edward Island occasionally resorts to shocking and senseless crimes of violence, due generally to insanity or whisky.

If Mr. Borden has lost or mislaid the "emergency" he used to talk so much about, perhaps he could find one in the Senate about now. The Conservative Dreadnoughts are facing heavy weather there.

The Senate, evidently, is going to send Mr. Borden to the country or make him drop the bill. This action by the Senate will be endorsed by the country at large when Mr. Borden asks for a verdict. The country desires to see the ships built at home.

Colonel Roosevelt is using a publisher who said he was a drunkard. The slander was rung broadcast during the last presidential campaign. If all Americans were as temperate as the Rough Rider—as regards alcohol, not speech—there would be no drink problem in the big republic.

Lieutenant-Governor Wood in his address at Mount Allison yesterday reminded his audience that he and Rev. Dr. Howard Sprague constituted the first class graduated by Mount Allison, in 1861. It is a far cry from the institution of that time to the Mount Allison of to-day; and there is a greater Mount Allison to come.

Once more it begins to look as though the principal European powers would have "to fight in order to keep the peace" in the Balkans. At the moment the outlook is troublesome, but it is

probable that steady pressure from the greater nations will result in a reasonably fair division of the spoils taken from Turkey, and that the world will settle down to a period of tranquility.

A Prince Edward Island ecoroner, J. W. found that an unfortunate resident of that province who recently was attacked by a neighbor, "came to his death as the result of rough usage and excitement from assault" on the part of the prisoner in the case. Somehow or other this verdict recalls the customary and melancholy bulletin to the effect that the operation was successful but that the patient died of shock.

Now or next month—rather than next November—St. John ought to know how many mail steamers, if any, are coming to St. John. Also, it is about time this city had definite word from Mr. Chamberlain of the Grand Trunk Pacific, with respect to his company's plans for St. John. The G. T. P. will require grain elevators, a passenger station, immigration sheds and other facilities in addition to those already arranged for. Where and when are they to be built?

Mr. Sydney Brooks, in the London Daily Mail, says that about £90,000,000 of property is annually burnt up in the United States. That is anywhere from eight to thirteen times the per capita loss sustained throughout the year by the people of Western Europe, and the statistics show that while the population of the United States has increased by only twenty-one per cent. in the past decade, her fire loss has increased by eighty-four per cent., exactly four times as fast. "And this in spite of the fact that America boasts the most efficient and daring fire departments to be found anywhere, and that in the central and most crowded areas of several of the largest cities the law compels the erection of 'fireproof' buildings of steel, concrete, and hollow tile. Yet New York alone has more fires every year than all the capitals of Europe put together. One American in every 250 has a fire each year, and the actual value of the property destroyed represents probably less than half the amount extracted from the people to pay for additional safeguards and the increased cost of insurance. Not less than \$100,000,000 is the full tribute thus annually paid by Americans, directly and indirectly, to the fire fiend."

WESTMORLAND CHANCERY COURT

Dorchester, N. B., May 27—(Special) The May sitting of the chancery court opened here today, the chief justice presiding. Two suits were opened for trial, Hon. Pierre A. Landry, judge of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, vs. the New Brunswick Alberta Land Co., M. & C. Teed, of St. John, solicitors for the plaintiff, vs. Emerson, Friel & Clark, solicitors for the defendant.

Lucy Binney, executrix, vs. Hector D. LeBlanc and others. A. A. Allen, for plaintiff, Emerson, Friel & Clark for the defendant. Delphine LeBlanc widow of mortgagee. This is a suit for foreclosure and will come up tomorrow.

The land company case is now before the court. The plaintiff claims the company in 1910, to Hon. A. R. McClellan, of Miramichi, Albert county, and ex-governor of New Brunswick, John T. Hawke, editor of Moncton: Albert J. Chapman, barrister, of Dorchester, and Judge Landry, for \$25,000. The defence is that no option, as claimed by the plaintiff, was given. That if there was any option it was that the mortgagee might take stock at par in payment of cash for the amount of the loan, in which event they waived interest, and having accepted interest each year since the mortgage was issued the plaintiff has no right to stock at par. The other mortgages do not join in the suit. M. G. Teed is counsel for the plaintiff, and A. J. Gregory, of Fredericton, appears for the land company. The case will be finished tomorrow and argument will be heard in St. John. Mrs. Smith is the official court stenographer in attendance.

Dorchester, May 28—(Special) The taking of evidence in the case of Judge Landry against the N. B. & Alberta Land Company ended today. Argument will be heard by the chief justice at Fredericton June 10.

In the case of Binney vs. LeBlanc, a decree was made for sale of the mortgaged property. There was no further business before the court and the chief justice and Messrs. Teed and Gregory returned to St. John by the evening train.

The Inference.

Adolphus: "It's an awful shame. My little nephew got hold of that poem I wrote to you and tore it to shreds." Mr. Teed: "The little fellow can read already!"—London Opinion.

ABE MARTIN



The new tariff bill may not suit the captains of industry, but it ticks the boys in the trenches. "Lafayette has quit fighting" with his wife cause it costs too much to make up.

AGRICULTURE How the Demons Sweet Corn—P Plant—The Ne —What the Op

In a former issue we of the farm demonstration is being carried on in the first time. The seedling to the demonstrators followed in growing interest the readers of the New Brunswick.

The following outline growing potatoes and sweet corn shall give method for other crops:

Sweet Corn
Preparation of Land—At the rate of 20 tons per acre. By such implements able get soil in a very friable condition.

Variety—If you have your own seed, have it and give it a good trial. The demand on the Port for Crosby's; but if you can't get the Cory try plant Early Malakoff. It is an early variety and a little early, while the others are late.

Planting—Make rows of plants in hills three feet apart and cover about one inch from five to seven grains in to four plants in the hill. The best way to test is to plant in a shallow box the number of grains you wish to grow. If you have a few grains and only 25 grains, you will overcome the difficulty twice as many as you get. Seed as low as you can get it planted if better so.

Time to Plant—Corn 41 degrees of soil heat to temperature equal to that obtained before the frost, however, corn may be safe before that time.

Fertilizers—At time of the rate of 1,000 pounds of fertilizer, home mixed, as follows:

Nitrate of soda
Dried blood
Acid phosphate
Muriate of potash
Cultivation—Cultivation must be done early, should be shallow. Cultivate every week and as soon after rain as possible. Further instructions given from time to time.

Preparation of Land—S of barnyard manure to the plough under. By such you have available, get it under before the frost. Variety—Green Mountain. Treatment of Seed—Add of commercial formalin to water. Stir thoroughly and tubers in this solution for 24 hours. Expose tubers to the light night after treating with formalin. Green Mountain should be cut in pieces to 1 1/2 inches apart. Sets should be 14 inches apart in the row four inches deep.

Cultivation—Cultivation must be done before potatoes are planted, when some plants in no case should be less than two-week pieces. Time to Plant—It has been repeated experiments that for yield decrease very much planting is done later in the season. Planting should be done between the 15th and 20th of May. The manner of planting—Green Mountain should be cut in pieces to 1 1/2 inches apart. Sets should be 14 inches apart in the row four inches deep.

Spraying—Potatoes should be sprayed with Paris green as soon as attacks by beet beetles are observed. Spraying should be done with mixture and Paris green should be of the strength: 1 lb. lime (best) to 40 gallons. To this should be added 1 lb. of Paris green which mixed to a paste with a little water is very important that the mixture should be correctly mixed. The writer will help you with the fertilizers. At planting the rate of 1,000 lbs. per acre, home mixed, as follows:

Nitrate of soda