BE CONSISTENT.

A JOBBER who was reading some of The Review's knocks at the big city stores in last issue said: "The complaint of the country merchant because his customer pays cash to the department store in the city while asking credit from the store at home seems a hard case. Yet does he not sometimes pay cash to the European house and when he wants renewal come upon the home house for it?" There is probably some truth in this; how much we do not know. But in any case, the country merchant who is waging what we believe to be a reasonable fight against department store price-cutting must come into court with clean hands. No use in kicking at methods that are only a few degrees worse than our own. We must conduct our own business on square lines before attacking other people for their methods.

FOREIGN GOODS CAN'T DO IT.

A number of Montreal merchants were badly disappointed a few days ago. They had consignments of German and other foreign goods in bond, which had been purchased through an English agent, and they expected to be able to clear them as British goods and by this means obtain the benefit of the one-eighth reduction provided by the new tariff. The Customs Department had, however, prepared for this, and their disgust may be imagined when they found it was necessary to take an affidavit to the effect that the goods were the actual "growth, produce or manufacture of Great Britain or Ireland." This, of course, upset their little scheme and prevented them making the profit they had anticipated.

U.S. DRY GOODS IN CANADA.

A subscriber of The Review writes from Nova Scotia:

"Your article in April issue re new American tariff strikes me as rather strong. Are our neighbors not entitled to legislate for themselves, just as we are doing? I cannot see that they are singling out Canada for specially bad treatment, and nothing is to be gained by complaining if we are framing our own tariff to suit ourselves."

Our esteemed correspondent is a merchant who expresses a businesslike opinion and we have no quarrel with it. What The Review said was that the sensible business men in the States were probably opposed to shutting off trade with Canada; were not unfriendly to us when we wanted to deal with them, and that the portion of the tariff relating to Canada was framed, not by the commercial interests, but by tail-twisting politicians.

And The Review went a step further. It charged that the tariff, in certain of its clauses, was directly aimed at Canada. We adhere to that opinion and are prepared to prove its truth. Take the lumber schedules. The Dingley bill raises the duty on Canadian rough lumber to $2 per thousand feet, and provides, further, that if Canada protects its industry thus attacked by any export duties on logs or pulp wood, then the U. S. duties on our manufactured lumber go up an additional 25 per cent. In the same spirit, the articles coal oil, binder twine, etc., are made free to all countries except Canada, unless we make them free also. Then the duties on nearly all Canadian products are much increased. We do not dispute the right of Congress to prohibit trade with Canada altogether if it sees fit. But we must say it does not seem wise, or friendly, or good business. That is our point, and it simply forces Canada to go elsewhere for trade, and for that reason it is impossible to suppose that the manufacturers of the States really want to put an embargo against Canadian purchasers.

It should not be forgotten that Canada is a good market for United States goods. They sell us far more than we sell to them, and we ought naturally to be cultivated rather than invited to go elsewhere. The probability is that American commercial men are not posted on the amount of business they do with us. The total exports of the United States to Canada during the past five years have been:

1892	$53,000,000
1893	58,000,000
1894	53,000,000
1895	54,000,000
1896	58,000,000

The reciprocity countries with which Congress is seeking to do an extended trade—the republics of Central and South America—are not as good customers as Canada. Is it not reasonable to argue, then, that from an intelligent business point of view the Dingley bill is a mistake? Take lines of United States manufacture which interest dry goods men, and see what the result is. Last year Canada imported from the United States the following, amongst others:

Cottons, printed and dyed	$501,000
Hats, beaver, felt and straw	325,000
Cotton clothing	164,000
Silk goods	113,000
Rubber goods	169,000
Carpets, all kinds	92,000
Cottons, grey unbleached	76,000
Cottons, white or bleached	54,000
Curtains	59,000
Braids, fringes, tassels, etc	71,000
Cotton thread on spools	52,000
Jeans, sateens, etc	75,000
Buttons	48,000
Woolen clothing	38,000

This is less than two millions of the whole fifty eight millions purchased by this country from the States. We have only selected a few items from a long list, and in all the cases cited the States could sell us far more if they went the right way about it. That is their business, of course, but it does seem strange that a people living right beside such a shrewd commercial nation as they profess to be, and already buying $10 per head worth from them in a year, should not be deemed worth cultivating for more trade.

AN INTERESTING ARTICLE.

IN the foregoing pages will be found the special article on the development of the dry goods trade in Canada during the last generation, written by Mr. Burton. It will be found very instructive and entertaining. The British journal in which it originally appeared wrote to Mr. Burton requesting him to furnish the article, which he accordingly found time to do. One gets a glimpse of the conditions which once prevailed here in the importing business in the earlier years of the Queen's reign, and altogether a sketch worth reading and preserving has been got together.

A SPECIAL LINE.

In wash fabrics, Wyld, Grasett & Darling draw attention to a 32-inch printed organdy, dark and light grounds, to retail at 12½ cents. The firm have some attractive goods in silk and linen effects, zephyrs, French organdies and printed Dresden effects in light cotton fabrics.