

UNAUTHORIZED INSURANCE.—James V. Batty, Michigan; George W. Marshall, Delaware; Reau E. Folk, Tennessee; James R. Young, North Carolina; J. A. Nedderson, Wisconsin; W. A. Wright, Georgia.

PLACE OF MEETING AND OFFICERS, 1904.—E. E. Yates, Missouri; John C. Linehan, New Hampshire; Francis Hendricks, New York; Thomas E. Drake, District of Columbia; Geo. W. Marshall, Delaware.

COMMITTEE ON RESERVE OTHER THAN LIFE.—Henry D. Appleton, New York; Nelson B. Hadley, Michigan; S. W. McColloch, Pennsylvania; Frederick L. Cutting, Massachusetts; Theron Upson, Connecticut; J. J. Brinkerhoff, Illinois; S. E. Stilwell, Ohio.

ASSETS OF INSURANCE COMPANIES.—Theron Upson, Connecticut; Frank F. Merriam, Iowa; Emil Giljohann, Wisconsin; Stephen W. Carr, Maine; Charles Weston, Nebraska.

CREDENTIALS.—Thomas E. Drake, District of Columbia; Charles C. Gray, Rhode Island; H. C. Shober, South Dakota; John L. Bacon, Vermont; R. T. Hazelwood, Wisconsin.

FRATERNAL INSURANCE.—C. W. Fletcher, Maine; Frank H. Hardison, Massachusetts; Reau E. Folk, Tennessee; H. D. Green, Arkansas; J. B. Reynolds, Missouri; Robert P. McDavid, Alabama; Theron Upson, Connecticut.

PROMINENT TOPICS.

The theme of the day is the resignation of the Honourable J. Israel Tarte, Minister of Public Works, who no longer is a member of the Laurier cabinet. The course pursued by Mr. Tarte for some months past in advocating a more protective fiscal policy, "without any previous understanding with his colleagues," was regarded by the Premier as "a self-evident violation of duty towards the Government" of which Mr. Tarte was a member. In Mr. Laurier's letter to his late colleague he says: "I was obliged to demand the resignation of your portfolio." At the conclusion of it the Premier thus expresses himself:—

"To remain a member of the Government and at the same time to advocate a policy which had not yet been adopted by the Government was an impediment to the proper working of our constitutional system, and implies a disregard for that loyalty which all those who are members of the same administration owe to each other and have a right to expect from each other."

The incident has created a sensation in political circles, where feeling is running high in regard to the removal from office of so influential a member of the administration.

Those who condemn the apparently severe terms of Sir Wilfred's letter to one with whom he was on such friendly terms, do not sufficiently consider that it was written as Premier of Canada to a

colleague, not as the letter of one friend to another. It recalls the dismissal, in 1867, of Sir George Grey in terms of harshness by the Duke of Buckingham, who, on meeting that distinguished official, was most profuse in assurances of his friendship, and even apologized for the severity of the language he had used in his letter of recall. Official relations involve duties which are, at times, out of harmony with those of a personal nature and ought not to be allowed to interfere with each other.

The conference of miners called to consider the proposal to submit the dispute between them and the mine owners to arbitration, resulted in an agreement being reached that the men resume work, and in all probability, the great body of the late strikers are now busy getting out coal. The appeal of Mr. Mitchell to the miners to let bygones be bygones and to forgive and forget, was a very notable deliverance, one highly honourable to him and the cordiality of its reception by the men was most creditable. President Mitchell in addressing the delegates said: "For our opponents we entertain no feeling of malice. Between the combination of capital on the one hand and the organization of labour on the other, there should be and need be no irreconcilable conflict." It is to be hoped that the arbitration will result in some legally responsible tribunal being established, for the arbitration of such disputes, the very existence of which tribunal would tend to their amicable adjustment by the two parties directly concerned and tend also to the avoidance of any action by either of them calculated to ripen into an open breach of their normal relations.

One of our citizens applied this week to the Industrial House of Refuge, where men out of work are sheltered and found employment, as he desired the services of a laborer for a day. He was informed that not a man was to be had, but, probably, one would be available in a week. The incident affords striking evidence of the prosperity enjoyed in this city where it appears the entire local supply of labour is only just sufficient to meet the local demand.

The U. S. cereal crops are estimated by the "New York Produce Exchange" to yield as follows compared with those of 1901:—

	Wheat.	Corn.	Oats.	Barley.	Rye, etc.
1902, bushels....	620,896,000	2,352,776,000	988,632,000	135,168,000	47,555,000
1901 ".....	748,400,000	1,522,519,000	726,208,000	109,932,000	45,569,000

The total number of bushels in the yield of 1902 is estimated at 4,145,427,000, against 3,163,288,000 bushels in 1901.