

of this city, who, like THE COMMERCIAL, has recently fallen heir to a dose of abuse from our morning luminary. (1). That THE COMMERCIAL should criticise the telegrams in the *Free Press* on railway matters because of a desire to please Mr. J. H. Ashdown, and specially on account of that gentleman being President of the *Sun Printing Co.*, is a slight of logic worthy of the late and now departed quadruped which Dick Burden drove through Winnipeg streets. A few links more, making connections with "The Jesuit Controversy," "The Cronin Case," or a few other matters now stirring the public mind, would have added variety to the *Free Press* tirade, and have been quite as relevant as the rubbish to be found there.

Of course there is good reason for the *Free Press* thus trying to link all it can to its relations with Mr. Ashdown. It recently published an uncalled for, unprovoked and venomous collection of abuse on that gentleman, such as could only come from the pen of a moral assassin of the most cowardly and treacherous type; and now that the opinion of a judge and jury is to be asked as to whether or not such a publication is libelous, the policy of the *Free Press* is to add all it can to the wanton abuse it has already heaped upon that gentleman, in hopes that some of its mud may stick, and furnish to a few of its supporters, if it cannot to a judge and jury, an apparent justification of its scurrility and blackguardism.

It is but a short time since the *Free Press* rated all who differed with its opinions as to the present Local Government as fools or knaves. But that is nothing surprising, as crazy people usually imagine everybody's mind but their own unhinged. It would not take a very close study of the open letter literature of the past two years in Winnipeg to throw a strong taint of knave and fool combined around one prominent individual connected with the *Free Press*. But to do so would be an infringement upon the "personal journalism" which by its cowardly attack on Mr. Ashdown, the *Press* has made peculiarly its own.

MIPPED.

The rehash man of the *Northwestern Miller*, of Minneapolis, while pursuing his monotonous work for the issue of June 21st, happened to light upon the following which he took from THE COMMERCIAL of June 3rd:—

"It is almost impossible for a farmer in that country to borrow money at less than twenty five per cent per annum, and often double that rate is paid, and the borrower mortgaged body, soul and boots for security. If these are the advantages our farmers are to secure, then they will be much better without them."

A violent fit of patriotic indignation seems to have overtaken him upon reading this quotation, and he accordingly launched out with the following effusion:—

"This sort of statements and those of a character even more exaggerated are so frequently made by the newspapers of Manitoba that they have come to be taken as a matter of course and a thing to be expected. But they are none the less futile and short-sighted. Will THE COMMERCIAL tell us why it is that the farmers of Dakota are so much a more unfortunate and deluded class than those of Manitoba? Is it because they are less intelligent, or because they are less favored in the matter of a free and enlightened Government? The former point we think hardly requires discussion and as to the latter, if we accept the testimony of the newspapers of Western Canada, a worse Government than that of the Dominion hardly exists under the sun. We do not take any risk in saying that the journals of Manitoba which furnish this sort of editorial statements to their readers do it for the sole purpose of stemming the tide of emigration from Manitoba across the line. There is not an intelligent editor in Canada who does not know that the free government of the United States is in itself an incentive to emigration. There is not an intelligent editor in Canada who does not know that the soil of Dakota is equally as fertile as that of Manitoba and less subject to early frosts. Apparently the journals of Canada are edited on the presumption that their readers do not know what is good for them. A more mistaken standpoint for a newspaper could hardly be assumed."

Where the *Miller* man found any comparison of Manitoba and Dakota farmers in the article from which he quoted, is a mystery to any one who will read the same, and he will only take the trouble of reading the whole article, instead of picking a fragment from the stomach of it, he will find himself mixed in a mystery over his effusion. Even the mutilated quotation he uses does not state or infer any comparison. It is simply a statement as to the interest paid by Dakota farmers on small loans not secured by real estate mortgage, which statement is within the limit of fact. Nor does this journal attempt to show, that Manitoba farmers can borrow at lower rates, or in fact, borrow at all. The article so far as it refers to farmers, treats only of the advantages they would possess when borrowing money upon graded grain represented by a warehouse receipt, compared with borrowing on ungraded grain similarly represented. Such comparisons as

the *Miller* man launches out in condemnation of, are not common in THE COMMERCIAL columns, and it would puzzle him to find one such in the four hundred or so issues of the journal that have been published since its establishment. It has carefully avoided the foolish policy of breaking the pump handle to prevent a neighbor from getting water, and going without itself in consequence.

But to come to the question of comparative rates of interest in Manitoba and Dakota, rates are decidedly lower and money and credit more easily obtained by either farmer or trader in the former. But THE COMMERCIAL does not claim that to be any advantage, but in many cases an evil. The whole credit system of this province, and every other province of Canada is inflated to a most unhealthy state, and a little importation of the spotcash, or short credit system in force in Dakota and other northwestern states, THE COMMERCIAL would deem quite an advantage to Manitoba.

Had the writer in the *Miller* read the whole of the article from which he quoted, he would have saved himself a good deal of annoyance and some space in the columns of the journal he writes for. It is only upon the assumption that he has not done so, that his action can be comprehended. There is only one other ground on which we can comprehend it, and that is that dishonest mutilation and garbling was the aim, and such a charge we are not prepared to make against a journal for which we have always had a very high esteem, as we always have had for the *Northwestern Miller*.

While thus disclaiming the charge of misrepresenting a neighboring country, which has interests in common with our own, we take the liberty of reminding the *Miller* that it has not always been blameless in that respect. It has on quite a few occasions strained a point to get a blow at Manitoba's interests; and it does not require any great stretch of memory, to remember when that journal sneeringly said, that up to that time Red Fyfe wheat had been produced here only in quart samples, and that the possibility of a milling supply was very doubtful. If the fact that Manitoba within three years thereafter exported from one crop some ten millions of bushels of that wheat, has not changed the *Miller's* opinion, the evidence of Mr. Pillsbury before the Senate Committee doubtless has. The *Miller* is usually prepared to back up the statements of a dignitary of the Minneapolis Millers' Association.