

tons of iron ore, if it could be found to load them with, and that never before had such a concourse of steamers been seen anchored in the Bilbao river. The exports of Spanish iron ore to Great Britain last year were close upon 3,620,000 tons, compared with 3,230,000 tons in 1888. Its market value was more than £2,607,000, and was paid chiefly to English companies owning Spanish iron mines. Besides this the cost of freight for bringing the ore to English ports amounted to probably £450,000 or £500,000, and was earned principally by English ship-owners trading to the Biscayan ports with coal, and taking iron ore as a return cargo.

THE action of the Marine Section of the Toronto Board of Trade in sending a deputation to Ottawa to petition the Government to remove the duties on metal materials entering into the construction and equipment of ships constructed in Canada is paralleled in its selfishness by the petition of 122 New England manufacturers who asked Congress to remove the duty on coal, coke and iron ore, and reduce it on pig iron. These New England manufacturers are consumers of the articles mentioned; and they seem to care nothing for the interests of the manufacturers and producers of these articles, whether they sink or swim. A close inspection of the New England petition fails to discover that the petitioners asked any reduction or removal of duties from any classes of manufactures produced by them—in fact, they would like to see such duties increased. How do Canadian ship-builders expect ever to see flourishing works in Canada producing boiler plates, boiler tubes, corrugated furnaces, steam steering gear, steam windlasses, etc., if all such articles are admitted duty free? Canada would probably be quite as well off without any so-called ship-building industry whatever as to be obliged to import all the different parts of ships from abroad, only the mere fastening together of them being left to be done in Canada. "Live and let live" is a good maxim.

THE Farmers' Institute of Canada met at Toronto last month, and passed a resolution to the effect that it would advocate a measure that would allow the free importation of corn from the United States, inasmuch as corn cannot be raised at a profit in the Dominion. This may be accepted as the beginning of a movement that will not stop until American machinery can be imported into Canada without the payment of import taxes.—*St. Louis Miller*.

This is where "Eli" makes a bad guess. In fact a very bad guess. We can confidently state for the benefit of manufacturers of American farm machinery that Canada's National Policy is in the enjoyment of strong and lusty health, and that Canadian farmers are numbered among its most staunch supporters. Therefore, if the aforesaid American manufacturers are anticipating any large returns from sales of their machinery in Canada "without the payment of import taxes" they are barking up the wrong tree. Furthermore, if Kansas farmers want to sell their ten cent a bushel corn in Canada they will have to pay duty on that also. Another bad error that "Eli" has fallen into is in supposing that "the Farmers' Institute of Canada" is composed of Canadian farmers. This is not the case. Those who passed the resolution alluded to were broken-down political hacks, consisting chiefly of lawyers, horse doctors, livery-stablemen and jawsmiths. The farmers were not there.

SPEAKING of the qualified approval of the views of the Australian Federationists as made in the Queen's speech, *Fair Trade*, of London, expresses the hope that the British Government will make a new departure in its treatment of the colonies. It says: "Up to now Free Trade has refused any further industrial recognition or Reciprocity to our colonies than it accords to all the rest of the world. This may be very fine cosmopolitanism, but it bids fair to run our Imperialism. Without her colonies where would England be? The United States, a one time English colony, stands to-day as a warning and also a portent. With nothing to draw us closer together, why should not Canada follow suit, and guard her own internal industry and prosperity by Protective Tariffs against the Mother Country? We make no effort to conciliate Canada and it were a pity to lose Canada." Under a judiciously arranged Confederation of Britain and her colonies, the Empire would be within itself somewhat as the United States is within itself—an intirety: a complete nation enjoying within itself all that could possibly be obtained from such a union invulnerable against the rest of the world: invincible in any conflict that might arise. If England wantssuch invincibility and invulnerability she can have it by such a union. But it will never come to her under her existing system of Free Trade.

THAT abject poverty in the Old World is by no means confined to the cities is illustrated by a letter written by the wife of a rural laborer in England to *The Essex County Chronicle*. This man supports a family of eight on wages ranging from seven to nine shillings a week. Nine shillings, the humble letter writer points out, "comes to a half-penny each a meal and barely two shillings over," leaving two shillings for coal and all the other things that are wanted even in the poorest man's home.—*Toronto Globe*.

What's this; What's this! The *Globe* telling about a farmer in Free Trade Britain supporting a family of eight souls on two dollars a week, when not a day passes when that inconsistent journal does not do all it can to induce Canadian farmers to become Free Traders. What difference does it make to this British farmer how cheap the necessities of life may be in that country if he has not got but two dollars a week with which to buy his supplies. Two dollars a week to support eight persons! Think of it. Twenty-five cents a week each, and this to supply shelter, food, clothing and all the other comforts necessary in a family. The abject poverty prevalent in Britain among the laboring classes, both in cities and the country, does not speak encouragingly for the Free Trade system that prevails there. It may be a good thing for non-resident landlords, for merchant princes and wealthy manufacturers, but for the working classes it is a deadly upas tree.

WHY is it that ignorance resorts to strikes, and intelligence never does? The employes in woolen mills are rarely led to use force. The intelligent employes in the cotton mills never join strikes. Cotton operatives who have never had the advantages of an education always make this mistake and pay the penalty without learning the reason why failure followed their efforts. Strikes by cotton operatives originated in Lancashire, and there are many readers of *Fibre and Fabric* that could trace back to this cause. Woolen operatives were spread over the country until a later day, hence a different code governed