

### RUSSIA'S DESIGNS ON TURKEY.

It is now twenty two years since the close of the last war between Russia and Turkey and many good judges are of the opinion that there will be another war between these two powers before the present year is ended. Four times during the present century have the Russians made war on the Turks and therefore it is easy to see that the policy of Russia towards Turkey is one that is likely to lead to future contests. That policy is one of aggression and steady pressure and the results aimed at are the aggrandizement of Russia and the possession of Constantinople by the Czar.

The British people have good reason to remember the wars between Russia and Turkey for Great Britain has been more or less mixed up in all of them. The worst blow that Turkey has received during the present century came from Great Britain when the Turkish fleet was destroyed at Navarino. Again during the Crimean war Great Britain was found fighting on the side of Turkey against Russia, while in 1878 a British threat of war was the means of tearing up the treaty of San Stefano by which Turkey was reduced to an abject condition. It has always been a feature of British policy that the Russians should not be allowed to obtain Constantinople, yet we doubt whether Great Britain would go to war with Russia even to prevent such a result.

The present difficulty arises from certain demands that Russia has made upon Turkey with reference to concessions in Asia Minor. The nature of these demands is of no consequence because they are merely a pretext for forward action. If they were all granted tomorrow Russia would not be satisfied but would make fresh demands with a view to fresh aggressions. Fortunately for Great Britain the eastern question and the relations between Turkey and Russia concern her far less than they did formerly. There was a time when England could get no other power but France to assist her in resisting Russian aggression; now Germany is to the front, and if Russia is stopped in her onward movement it will be because of Germany. The German Emperor during the past four or five years has been engaged in cultivating the friendship of Turkey and taking the place that Great Britain formerly held as the friend and adviser of that nation. It is a thing which is of no more value than Turkish promises, which are never meant to be fulfilled.

Germany, however, hopes to be rewarded for her friendship to Turkey by concessions in Syria, a part of the Turkish empire in which France once took a very deep interest. It seems highly probable that France would protest strongly against Germany acquiring any part of Syria and Russia would join her in resisting such a movement.

It is pretty well understood that one of the conditions of the recent understanding between Great Britain and Germany was that the latter should have a free hand in Syria. The British people have long ago come to the conclusion that in fighting the battles of Turkey and endeavoring to preserve the integrity of that nation they have been doing the work that ought have been done by Austria and Germany. These two powers would suffer far more than Great Britain from a Russian occupation of Constantinople, and while the latter might join in a remonstrance against such a destruction of the Turkish power we do not believe that any British government would receive popular support that went beyond a remonstrance. We shall never again see British blood and treasure poured out for the purpose of preserving an effect system.

The government like that of Turkey. The lessons of the Crimean war have not been forgotten, and it is well that they should be kept in mind for they will be the means of avoiding similar errors of policy in the future.

### SPITEFUL POLITICS.

It is to be regretted that the opposition should have brought about so grave a departure from decent political methods in their treatment of the government as has been witnessed during the past two years. It is impossible for anyone, even with the aid of a microscope, to discern any political principle in which they have proceeded, for their attacks have been general based upon individual ministers and have in most cases been plainly the outcome of political spite. Take the case of Mr. Tarte, for instance, as an example of the manner in which ministers have been treated, and we must come to the conclusion that Tory hatred and Tory attacks on him have been due to the fact that he left the Conservative party for good and sufficient reasons and that he has been a successful leader. So far has Tory spite against Mr. Tarte been carried that the severe illness from which he has been suffering has excited no sympathy, and words have been used in regard to him more worthy of a band of savages than of civilized men. Mr. Blair is another minister who has been attacked without reason by every Tory leader and camp-follower and by the whole Tory press of Canada. The only reason for this is Mr. Blair's political success and his strength as a leader. Mr. Blair, ever since 1883 has been a shining mark for Tory assaults, yet instead of being injured thereby he has steadily grown stronger and filled a larger space in the public eye. The only thing that seventeen years of Tory warfare against Mr. Blair has accomplished has been to mark him as the greatest political force in his own province and to place him at the head of one of the most important departments in the government. Mr. Sifton is another cabinet minister who has been most spitefully and unjustly attacked, yet he still

holds his ground and apparently he has received no injury from the malice of his enemies. Surely it is time for the Tories to return to better methods and a more reasonable system of politics. They ought to be able to discern for themselves the futility of the personal attacks which have recently become their only resource, and which are so inconsistent with good morals to say nothing of good manners.

### CROOKED REPORTING AND FALSE COMMENTS.

In order that our readers may be in a position to judge for themselves how utterly unreliable the Sun newspaper has become we desire to make a few extracts from its columns. On Monday last it said editorially:

"Mr. Winslow testified under oath that neither the auditor general nor the public accounts committee of the legislature had been permitted by Mr. Emmerson to examine the bills and vouchers of the payment on permanent bridges accounted for by the auditor general."

Our Fredericton correspondent called attention to the fact that the Sun had misrepresented the statements made by Mr. Winslow, and showed conclusively that he did not and could not have made the statement that public accounts had not been thoroughly examined by the public accounts committee.

The Sun yesterday morning said editorially:

"It will be seen that the official report fully verifies the independent report published a few days ago by the Sun and forms a most complete answer to the subsidized organs of the local government, which, too cowardly to print the facts of the case, endeavored to distract public attention by slandering the Sun."

The portion of the official report of the proceedings before the investigation committee upon which the Sun relies to prove its statement that Mr. Winslow had testified under oath that neither the auditor nor the public accounts committee of the legislature had been permitted by Mr. Emmerson to examine the bills and vouchers of the payments on permanent bridge is, as follows:

"Dr. Stockton—My experience in the legislature as far as the public accounts are concerned is that ordinarily the auditor general has the cheque or warrant or the receipt for payment of certain amounts of money; not the bill of items or voucher upon which the payment was made. The chief commissioner has stated that these accounts were kept by him in the department of public works for his own purpose."

"Mr. Winslow—Yes."

It will be seen from the above that there was no justification whatever for the Sun's statement that Mr. Winslow had sworn that the accounts were not examined by the public accounts committee. The only part of Dr. Stockton's statement which Mr. Winslow was called upon to answer was that contained in the last sentence of his remarks: "It is the receipt for the payment of money which goes to the auditor general." The fact that the auditor general is the custodian of the receipts for the payment of money in our interest with the thorough examination of the public accounts of the province by the public accounts committee, and on the attempt on the part of the Sun to torture Mr. Winslow's answer into a justification for its dishonesty in trying to make it appear that the public accounts committee had not been permitted by Mr. Emmerson to examine all the accounts in connection with the construction of public bridges will be additional evidence to the public of the dishonesty of the Sun's methods.

Mr. Hazen and his party are dying hard over these bridge charges, but they are dying all the same, and it is no wonder that they and their press have become so very angry and entirely unscrupulous.

### SHOULD ENGLAND DO IT?

Having regard to the Tory proposition respecting preferential trade, there are two questions which suggest themselves at the threshold of the matter: First, should England grant a preference to Canada in her market? Second, Would she do so? Our friends on the opposition side have always proceeded upon the assumption, as we pointed out lately, that nothing should be done for England in our market unless the mother country granted us a relatively important concession in her market. This view must be measured in the full light of England's position as a manufacturing country, her relations to other countries, and the effect which a change from free trade to a protective policy would have on her industrial status. In other words, even though she were disposed to impose a duty against the world, her colonies excepted, would it be advisable for her to do so?

It is the judgment of those most competent to form an intelligent and correct opinion that England's ability to keep herself in the first place among manufacturing nations is due entirely to the cheapness with which she can feed her operatives. All that they consume enters the country free. There is no tax on breadstuffs nor articles of clothing. Yet this cheapness is a relative thing. It has a direct connection with the wages paid. Germany, for example, feeds her operatives at no higher cost than does England, and pays them less wages. As a result some English products have been displaced in parts of the world, and as respects others, they are barely able to hold their own. The struggle is growing more intense every year. There is no prospect of England being able to lower the general scale of wages, either for skilled or ordinary labor. The tendency is rather

upward. Her raw materials, including coal and iron, will never cost her less than now. What then would be her position if, in answer to the demand of Canada, she should impose even a small tax on breadstuffs? The tax, as well as the incident thereof, would fall directly on her operatives. Wages would have to be raised correspondingly, and this would mean the increased cost of everything produced. She would suffer in the keen rivalry with other nations. She would lose ground. She might sacrifice her supremacy in the field of manufactures. That she would. Ought we, under such circumstances, to ask her to do a thing so manifestly contrary to her interests?

Is there the slightest probability that England would, no matter how strenuously one might urge it, consent to radically alter her trade policy? We fancy not. She is too thoroughly convinced that her safety and continued prosperity depend on the maintenance of free trade. This is quite clear from newspaper criticisms appropos of the recent action of the Canadian government. The London Times, for instance, writes:

"Canada's further tariff preference, announced today, is gratefully received, but is not the remotest chance of such reciprocity in the way of British tariff discrimination against the United States and other countries as the Canadian ministry seem to hope for. England knows too well the strength which free trade and the policy of the 'open door' give to her Empire."

The Westminster Gazette also gives this advice to us:

"Canada would do well to base her calculations on the supposition that we shall stick to the free trade system."

While the Outlook, an influential political weekly, observes:

"The seal of the tariff imperialists in Canada commands British sympathy and admiration all the more because a British tariff discrimination in favor of the products is as impossible to us as ever. The pillar of the Empire's strength is its free trade; it must remain the Empire of the open door as far as home products are concerned."

There is a further view which ought to weigh with those who are disposed to approach this matter with an open mind. Would a preference to Canadian products improve our status in the English market to the degree pictured by optimistic Tories? It is possible it would not. We are doing so well now that it would seem to be imprudent to tamper with the conditions which are at work in our favor. See how our exports the past ten years:

|      |       |              |
|------|-------|--------------|
| 1890 | ..... | \$48,333,044 |
| 1891 | ..... | 49,280,828   |
| 1892 | ..... | 64,906,549   |
| 1893 | ..... | 64,981,493   |
| 1894 | ..... | 68,538,850   |
| 1895 | ..... | 61,856,990   |
| 1896 | ..... | 69,690,280   |
| 1897 | ..... | 72,247,992   |
| 1898 | ..... | 104,998,818  |
| 1899 | ..... | 99,091,855   |

A trade which has more than doubled within ten years would not seem to be in need of special stimulation. It is worthy of note, too, that the period of greater expansion was after the introduction of the preferential tariff in 1897. There can be no doubt that the action of Canada towards the British Empire, and the response in favor of our products was both natural and decided. The dictates of prudence are all on the side of letting our present position alone. As Shakespeare has put it: "Striving to better off we mar what's well."

### NOTES AND COMMENTS.

There were 2,425,850 tons more of freight carried by the railways of Canada in 1899 than in 1898. Where did all this additional traffic come from if Mr. Foster is correct in assuming that our large trade is due rather to an increase of values than of volume? It begins to look as though our ingenious friend will have to find some theory that accords better with the facts.

The Tories have always followed a narrow course. The tariff of 1878 was an appeal to selfishness; their present policy is an appeal to racial prejudice; and they want Canada in a miserable spirit to try and drive a bargain with England, whereby she would put a tax on her consumers for all time to come for the sake of hurrying on a trade that cannot very well grow faster than it is growing. The genuine article of loyalty does not partake of such huckstering.

No one pretends that the marvellous progress which Canada has enjoyed during the past year is due entirely to the Liberal trade policy. Many circumstances have combined to bring about this happy result. But during the eighteen years of Tory rule everything on the right side was credited to the national policy, and it is not improper under the new conditions to draw comparisons. The Tories have themselves to blame if the contrast is to their prejudice.

Dr. Montague must regard the good Samaritan as an imprudent and shortsighted philanthropist. On the "business is business" policy, the Samaritan should have arranged with the poor fellow whom he befriended to pay him an annual tax during the remainder of his life. That is the way the Tories want us to deal with England since sending our soldiers to South Africa.

Our morning contemporary grows very weary over Mr. Perrault's bill of expenses which was read in the House of Commons as though it were a thing of yesterday, or last year, or even ten years ago. The thing is 25 years old. We have always maintained that from Sir Charles Tupper down the Tories deal too much in ancient history. More than half of the men who

were in parliament when Mr. Perrault incurred his expenses at Philadelphia are dead.

The amount collected by the present government in taxes during the first three years they were in power was \$63,183,150, or at the rate of \$31,091,575 a year. The amount collected by the late Conservative government for the years 1896-97, inclusive, was \$92,514,744, or an average of \$30,838,248 a year. The difference is just \$222,802 a year. As the population of Canada has increased by 15 per cent., or 750,000 in the meantime, the taxation per head is lower now than it was during the years named, under the late government.

Witness the hypocrisy of the thing! The Tories blamed the government for allowing England to pay our soldiers while in South Africa, but are most anxious that, in return for what we have done, England should put a tax on her consuming population for all time to come. This is what they call "business." Sentiment, they say, is all right enough in its place; but it is good policy to squeeze England while we have the chance.

"In 1891 the senate investigated the Baie des Chaleurs steal. It traced \$100,000 from the provincial treasury of Quebec to the pockets of certain public men. Some of them were ministers of the crown at the time. One of them is a member of the Laurier cabinet."—The Sun.

The senate took up the Baie des Chaleurs case simply because the common law was investigating the McGreevy, the Rykert and the Curran bridge scandals. The work was passed over to the senate, and not originated by that house. But who is the member of the Laurier cabinet into whose pocket any Baie des Chaleurs money found its way? Name him!

The death of Alfred Perry of Montreal at the advanced age of eighty years recalls the Tory riot of 1840 when the parliament buildings at Montreal were burnt down by the mob because the legislature had passed the rebellion losses bill. It was always asserted and never denied by Perry that he was the man that actually fired the building, but although arrested he was never tried and was soon released. Perry lived to reap his share in the transaction and to mark his change of heart he abandoned the disloyal Tory party and became a good Liberal.

In reckoning the expenditure of the country, account is not taken by opposition critics of the fact that several millions of additional outlay is met by an equally large income. For example, we spend say \$1,200,000 in the Yukon country; but we get back \$1,300,000. One hand more than washes the other. The same thing is true of the Intercolonial. The government railway is costing us more; but it is also earning more. Both these items appear as charges against the revenue. The so-called controllable expenditure is not growing.

One would think to hear Sir Charles Tupper talk, and to read the Tory journals, that all Canada had to do was to ask it, and England would toss overboard her trade policy of sixty years standing and start out on a new course. The present government does not believe in anything so absurd. Canada cannot reasonably ask Great Britain to put a permanent tax on her consumers for the sake of stimulating a trade which is now advancing by jumps of tens of millions a year. It would be an economic crime to impose such a tax, and Canada would suffer in the long run.

During the three years that the present government has been in power up to the 30th June last, the net surplus of revenue over expenditure was \$6,040,480. During the last three years the Conservatives were in power the net deficit was \$5,704,758. Here we have a difference of nearly \$12,000,000 in the financial operations of the two periods of three years. The Conservatives took all the credit of the good times when Canada was prosperous under their rule. What have they now got to say in regard to the far more prosperous years under Liberal rule?

"Sir Wilfrid Laurier's sentimental despatch has had no more effect on John Bull than water on a duck's back. Mr. Fielding may go on, and make the reduction 50, 75, 100 per cent, and John Bull will take it without winking. It will simply strengthen his belief in free trade. The Canadian premier told him it is intended to have that effect?"—Montreal Gazette.

Who wants England to change her free trade policy? Isn't she doing well under it? And is not England buying twice as large a volume of Canadian products as she did ten years ago? We are giving the trade policy preference to help England, and England will continue to give us the preference as she has been doing since the first concession was made by the present government in 1897.

Our Fredericton correspondence makes very interesting reading. The latest tactics of the Sun newspaper to make a point against the government, no matter at what cost, are so thoroughly exposed that we need scarcely do more than direct attention to what our correspondent says. Tory party journalism has surely reached a very low level when the Sun finds it necessary to represent witnesses as stating the very opposite of what their sworn testimony proved. Will the Sun apologize for its misrepresentation of the statements of Messrs. Winslow and Brown, or will it look to Dr. Stockton and Mr. Hazen to come to its assistance in its present plight?

Mr. Fielding is coming in for a good deal of coarse abuse at the hands of Tory papers, which is the penalty he must pay for presenting such a magnificent and unprecedented financial statement on Friday last. He is described as a "small man,"

who descended to "tricks with figures." Jealousy is accounted for this view; but we may be excused for saying that it is not an easy thing to get the people of New Brunswick to believe that Mr. Fielding suffers by comparison with Mr. Foster. The view that Mr. Foster is a broad-minded and dignified man, rising above partisan emotions, will only find acceptance where he is not known.

The editor of the Chatham World is able to see that Dr. Pugsley stands head and shoulders above the laymen who are appearing for the opposition in the investigation into the bridge charges at Fredericton. In a recent issue of his paper he says: "The other lawyers in the case have talent, but Dr. Pugsley has genius, intuition, inspiration, that give him an X-ray facility of knowing the contents of papers that have not been produced and guessing the facts that witnesses have not given. He courteously and sympathetically gets his witnesses into explaining things to which they have been testifying, and then he turns on them suddenly and asks for circumstantial explanations of their explanations, with the result of making it appear that they do not know very much after all and are not sure of what little they think they do know."

### An Evil Minded Father Wields An Axe

St. Stephen, March 29.—(Special).—One of the most diabolical murders ever enacted in the vicinity, took place this morning at Red Beach, near the site of Calais. When Fred Reynolds, of that place killed his wife and two boys, aged five and eight. The older boy was sent for his father to come to breakfast, he being at work cutting wood for a neighbor some distance from home. The boy, who was dressed in his nightgown, ran out to find him covered with blood, his brains out from a blow on the head, and the murderer had already turned toward home with the axe in his hand. The monster on arriving in his own yard met his wife and at once split her head open with the sharp edge of the axe striking her twice to make sure of her death. He then dragged her into a shed attached to the house and there, with a younger child coming out, he also struck him at once ending his life. By this time the crowd of angry neighbors surrounded the house when the murderer had barricaded the door, raised a window, brandished his bloody axe and threatened death to anyone who came near him. He then set fire to the house and the mob quickly broke open the door when the man ran out a back way firing the axe at one of the men who fortunately escaped by dodging the blow. The murderer was quickly overtaken and captured, when he was manacled and held until Deputy Marshal Robinson, and his assistants, drove to Calais proper, when Reynolds was placed in the lockup. After the inquest tomorrow he will be given a hearing before Judge Fowler. Dr. Holland, the city physician, went to the scene of the murder and dressed the wounds of the older boy but was unable to save his life. The child died about seven hours after receiving the blow.

Many think the man insane, but Dr. Holland said that he did not think so at the time of his interview with the prisoner this afternoon. Reynolds has the reputation of being a hard character, but a shiftless disposition. He has the appearance of one not very well balanced mentally. He is about thirty years old. His wife and children were popular neighbors. The affair has greatly shocked all the people.

### The Telegraphers in Session at Moncton.

Moncton, March 29.—The executive committee of the I. C. R. station masters' and telegraphers met here this afternoon and evening, with Mr. M. Dolphin, vice president of the Order Railway Telegraphers, presiding. The members of the executive committee were: R. A. Blais, Causapscal; J. H. Currier, Lewis; T. F. Ward, Chatham Junction; Geo. Forbes, Steveston; J. McMahon, Charlottetown; S. C. Charters, Point du Chene; B. G. Barnett, Dorchester; H. H. Bray, Campbellton.

C. A. Wilson, vice grand chief of the

### It is Incontrovertible!

The Editor of the "Christian Million," under the heading of General Notes, on August 20, 1899, wrote:

"A good article will stand upon its own merits, and we may rely upon it that nothing will continue long which does not, in a more or less degree, harmonize with the statements which are published concerning it."

Mr. Hall Caine, Author of "The Deemster," "The Manxman," "The Christian," etc., when speaking on "Criticism," recently, said:

"When a thing that is advertised greatly is good it goes and goes permanently; if it is bad, it only goes for a while; the public finds it out."

The Proprietor of

BEECHAM'S PILLS

has said over and over again: "It is a fallacy to imagine that anything will sell just because it is advertised. How many medicines have been advertised and snuffed out in gloom? The fact is, a man may advertise a good medicine, and every dissatisfied purchaser does ten times more harm than one satisfied purchaser does. Assuredly the sale of more than 6,000,000 boxes of BEECHAM'S PILLS per annum, after a public trial of half-a-century, is conclusive testimony of their popularity, superiority and proverbial worth."

Beecham's Pills have for many years been the popular family medicine wherever the English language is spoken, and they now stand without a rival. In boxes.

### Great Bargain Opportunities for Money-Saving People.

### LADIES' JACKETS

At Half Price, and many less than Half Price to Clear.

- 15 BLACK CHEVIOT JACKETS, sizes 32, 34 and 36 at \$1.00 each. Some in the lot were as high as \$6.00.
- 12 MIXED TWEED JACKETS, unlined, sizes 32, 34 and 36, at \$2.00 each. Some in the lot were as high as \$8.00.
- 10 MIXED TWEED JACKETS, satin lining, at \$3.00 each. Some in the lot were as high as \$9.00.
- 15 NAVY BEAVER CLOTH JACKETS, unlined, at \$3.50 each. Some in the lot were as high as \$9.00.
- 10 BLACK BEAVER CLOTH JACKETS, same price.
- 10 NAVY CURL CLOTH JACKETS, silk lined, at \$4.00 each. Some in the lot were as high as \$8.00.
- 6 DARK GREEN BEAVER CLOTH JACKETS, unlined, at \$4.00 each. Some in the lot were as high as \$8.00.
- 2 BLACK BEAVER CLOTH JACKETS, last year's, very long, size 32, \$2.00 each.

If parcel to be sent by mail add 50c. for each jacket.

### DOWLING BROS., 95 KING ST., ST. JOHN, N. B.

### MR. GEO. E. FOSTER WORKED

### THE OLD PERCENTAGE GAME.

His Reply to Hon. Mr. Fielding was a Masterly Effort, Showing How Truths Can be Used to Prove a Falsehood.

Ottawa, March 28.—Mr. Foster's great speech on the budget which had been in a state of incubation for four days was delivered last evening and the verdict of all disinterested parties was that it was a dead failure. The followers of Mr. Foster gathered in large numbers in the house behind him forming an able coterie of about fifty persons who were one and all prepared to applaud whatever Mr. Foster might say. They were very liberal in their applause for the first hour, but as hour after hour passed away and Foster still continued reading columns of figures and percentages they got tired of banging their desks and listened in silence or pretended to listen. To what extent they did listen is a matter of doubt. One member from Nova Scotia who declared to the writer that it was the finest speech ever delivered in the House of Commons had to admit later that while it was being delivered he was engaged in writing business letters. As the member in question could not see a double set of brains the chances are that he did not listen very attentively to Foster's speech, and that he judged of its merits rather by the noise that Foster made than by the thoughts that he expressed. And it cannot be denied that he made a great deal of noise, and he belabored until he became hoarse. He filled the chamber with sound, but he did not convince any person who had not been convinced before, and the only persons who gave any praise for his speech were those who were bound to praise it whether it was good or bad.

### Dishonesty and Irrelevancy.

The faults of Mr. Foster's speech were manifold but the principal ones were dishonesty, dishonesty and irrelevancy. Nineteen of what he said had no bearing whatever on the matter in hand. It was nothing to the purpose that he should be able to quote speeches made by Liberal members ten years ago in which economy in expenditures was advocated. Different years and different circumstances demand different treatment. A policy that might be proper and necessary ten years ago might be wholly out of date and absurd at the present time. A man who has an income of \$2,000 a year does not practice the same little economies that were necessary when he had only \$1,000. All his expenditures are on a more liberal scale than before, because he can well afford to spend more money. That has been the case with Canada. Mr. Foster spent a good hour and a half in denouncing the Liberals for alleged inconsistency with respect to expenditures, but Sir Richard Cartwright, in three sentences, toppled over the whole fabric that he had so elaborately raised. It was delightful to see how quickly the statesman put the special pleader out of court.

### Foster and Percentage.

One great feature of Foster's speech was the manner in which he tried to prove by percentages that the preference given Great Britain by the Liberal tariff had not increased our trade with her as much different treatment. A policy that might be proper and necessary ten years ago might be wholly out of date and absurd at the present time. A man who has an income of \$2,000 a year does not practice the same little economies that were necessary when he had only \$1,000. All his expenditures are on a more liberal scale than before, because he can well afford to spend more money. That has been the case with Canada. Mr. Foster spent a good hour and a half in denouncing the Liberals for alleged inconsistency with respect to expenditures, but Sir Richard Cartwright, in three sentences, toppled over the whole fabric that he had so elaborately raised. It was delightful to see how quickly the statesman put the special pleader out of court.

### The Figures and the Statement.

Now let us see whether it is true, as Foster states, that "the increase in the exports to Great Britain was not nearly so large as with nearly all the principal countries, with which Canada traded." Here are the actual figures of the increase in the exports of Canada in 1898-99 to the countries named as compared with 1895-96:

|               |       |              |
|---------------|-------|--------------|
| Great Britain | ..... | \$32,401,567 |
| United States | ..... | 665,111      |
| France        | ..... | 576,182      |
| Germany       | ..... | 1,462,038    |
| Italy         | ..... | 68,596       |
| Belgium       | ..... | 751,382      |

Do these figures bear out Mr. Foster's statement? The increase in the exports to Great Britain in actual volume is eight times as great as to nearly all the other countries that he named, yet he actually tries to prove by percentages that it is less. Such a prevaricator may well be left to the contempt of his fellow men.

J. H.

cent from the United States. The percentage of increase from Great Britain was about the last on the list, and it was much lower than that of all the other great countries with which Canada traded."

### The Explanation.

The utter dishonesty of such a system of reasoning as the above needs hardly any illustration. The percentage of increase in the imports into Canada from France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Holland and Belgium was greater than from Great Britain, but what about the annual amount of the increase; here are the figures of the increase of imports from the countries named into Canada in the year 1898-99, as compared with 1895-96:

|               |       |             |
|---------------|-------|-------------|
| Great Britain | ..... | \$4,680,381 |
| France        | ..... | 979,363     |
| Germany       | ..... | 1,461,997   |
| Spain         | ..... | 172,704     |
| Portugal      | ..... | 16,700      |
| Italy         | ..... | 164,582     |
| Holland       | ..... | 200,831     |
| Belgium       | ..... | 1,307,965   |

It will be seen from the above statement that the actual increase of imports from Great Britain, although only 12 1/2 per cent, is larger than that of all the other European countries named combined in volume. So much for the value of percentages. The same remarks are applicable to the figures of our export trade as dealt with by Mr. Foster. He said:

"What was to be said of the argument that the preference given to British imports had resulted in a preference to Canadian exports in the English market?"

One could see some reason for supposing that a preference to goods entering Canada would lead to some increase in the volume of our exports. But it was difficult to see the figures of our export trade as dealt with by Mr. Foster. He said: "What was to be said of the argument that the preference given to British imports had resulted in a preference to Canadian exports in the English market?" One could see some reason for supposing that a preference to goods entering Canada would lead to some increase in the volume of our exports. But it was difficult to see the figures of our export trade as dealt with by Mr. Foster. He said: "What was to be said of the argument that the preference given to British imports had resulted in a preference to Canadian exports in the English market?" One could see some reason for supposing that a preference to goods entering Canada would lead to some increase in the volume of our exports. But it was difficult to see the figures of our export trade as dealt with by Mr. Foster. He said: "What was to be said of the argument that the preference given to British imports had resulted in a preference to Canadian exports in the English market?" One could see some reason for supposing that a preference to goods entering Canada would lead to some increase in the volume of our exports. But it was difficult to see the figures of our export trade as dealt with by Mr. Foster. He said: "What was to be said of the argument that the preference given to British imports had resulted in a preference to Canadian exports in the English market?" One could see some reason for supposing that a preference to goods entering Canada would lead to some increase in the volume of our exports. But it was difficult to see the figures of our export trade as dealt with by Mr. Foster. He said: "What was to be said of the argument that the preference given to British imports had resulted in a preference to Canadian exports in the English market?" One could see some reason for supposing that a preference to goods entering Canada would lead to some increase in the volume of our exports. But it was difficult to see the figures of our export trade as dealt with by Mr. Foster. He said: "What was to be said of the argument that the preference given to British imports had resulted in a preference to Canadian exports in the English market?" One could see some reason for supposing that a preference to goods entering Canada would lead to some increase in the volume of our exports. But it was difficult to see the figures of our export trade as dealt with by Mr. Foster. He said: "What was to be said of the argument that the preference given to British imports had resulted in a preference to Canadian exports in the English market?" One could see some reason for supposing that a preference to goods entering Canada would lead to some increase in the volume of our exports. But it was difficult to see the figures of our export trade as dealt with by Mr. Foster. He said: "What was to be said of the argument that the preference given to British imports had resulted in a preference to Canadian exports in the English market?" One could see some reason for supposing that a preference to goods entering Canada would lead to some increase in the volume of our exports. But it was difficult to see the figures of our export trade as dealt with by Mr. Foster. He said: "What was to be said of the argument that the preference given to British imports had resulted in a preference to Canadian exports in the English market?" One could see some reason for supposing that a preference to goods entering Canada would lead to some increase in the volume of our exports. But it was difficult to see the figures of our export trade as dealt with by Mr. Foster. He said: "What was to be said of the argument that the preference given to British imports had resulted in a preference to Canadian exports in the English market?" One could see some reason for supposing that a preference to goods entering Canada would lead to some increase in the volume of our exports. But it was difficult to see the figures of our export trade as dealt with by Mr. Foster. He said: "What was to be said of the argument that the preference given to British imports had resulted in a preference to Canadian exports in the English market?" One could see some reason for supposing that a preference to goods entering Canada would lead to some increase in the volume of our exports. But it was difficult to see the figures of our export