

produced in the Island. The Bermuda duty is, therefore strictly a duty for revenue only, and is consequently paid by the consumer.

"Is there no such thing as honesty," The Week asks, "between nations when questions of tariff and revenue are concerned? What has become of national pride, to say nothing of nobler impulses, when the great American nation can take advantage of circumstances or its own superior shrewdness to compel a neighbor with whom it has dealings to pay a part of its revenue, in addition to providing for its own? What should we think of such cleverness as between individual neighbours? Surely honesty, the genuine honesty which insists upon giving quid pro quo, must be in the long run the best policy for the nation as for the individual."

Our esteemed contemporary has evidently lost sight of the fact that nations, like individuals, in their business transactions are not usually influenced by sentiment. In the case alluded to we know that the United States is a large producer of onions, and that the farmers there are capable of producing enough to supply the home market. Bermuda, too, is a large producer of onions, and not only supplies its own market, but has onions to sell. Is it any part of the duty of the United States to assist Bermuda in finding a market for its onions? Is it any part of its duty to depreciate the value of the market for American onion growers, to the end that it may help find a market for Bermuda onion growers? Why is there an over production of onions in Bermuda? Why produce what cannot be sold? Is it possible that the chief product of the island of Bermuda is onions, and that the prosperity of the country depends upon selling its surplus of onions in the United States? Does The Week expect the United States to make its laws with an eye single to the interest of Bermuda and its onion growers? Other nations do not pursue that policy, neither do individuals. We were asked "What should we think of such cleverness as between individual neighbors?" Suppose The Week to be a farmer engaged in growing onions, and on the other side of the road was another farmer engaged in growing the same article; would it be considered a stroke of "cleverness" for The Week to refuse to buy onions from his neighbor? What does The Week mean by giving quid pro quo, which must be, in the long run, the best policy? We fail to see wherein a nation or an individual is derelict in duty to a neighbor merely because it or he declines to purchase abroad what is more conveniently produced at home.

#### EDITORIAL NOTES.

Does the iron schedule of the tariff need revising? We think so. Look at this. The general selling price of first class puddled bar iron in business centres in the United States is 1.70 cents per pound. The average cost of pig iron from which this rolled iron is made is about \$14 per ton. The price paid workmen for puddling the pig is \$4.50 per ton, and the price paid for re-rolling the puddled iron into refined iron is also \$4.50 per ton. This brings the cost up to \$23 per ton. The loss in working two times amounts to about 25 per cent., or \$5.25 per ton, which would make the cost of the finished iron about \$28.75; and this is the iron which is sold on the American market at \$34 per ton, leaving a margin of \$5.25 per ton to the rolling mill proprietor. The general selling

price of an inferior bar iron in business centres in Canada is 1.85 cents per pound, the iron being made from scrap. The average cost of wrought scrap of which this Canadian iron is made is about \$12 per ton. Having been already made from pig, and having been used for all sorts of purposes, it does not require to be puddled, and therefore the Canadian rolling mill proprietor is saved that charge of \$4.50 per ton. But he must pay for re-rolling the scrap into bar iron the same as his American competitor, say \$4.50 per ton, bringing his cost for finished iron up to \$16.50 per ton. Against this should be a further charge for loss in working one time, say 20 per cent - \$3.30—making the cost of his finished iron about \$19.80 per ton, which is sold on the Canadian market at \$37 per ton, leaving a margin of \$17.20 per ton to the Canadian rolling mill proprietor. The difference between the profit on American first quality puddled iron—\$5.25 per ton, and on Canadian inferior quality re-rolled scrap iron—\$17.20—is \$11.95 per ton. The National Policy does not contemplate such an incongruity, neither does the theory of protection. The duty on pig iron is all right, the duty on rolled iron is all right, the duty on scrap iron is all wrong. It should be made prohibitory. Canada should have a scientifically arranged iron tariff.

IN another part of this journal will be found an exceedingly interesting and instructive paper entitled "Steam Boiler Tests as a Means of Determining the Calorific Value of Fuels," by D W Robb, C.E., of Amherst, N.S. This paper was printed in the transactions of the Nova Scotia Institute of Science, Session of 1890-1891, and has for some time been out of print. Our readers will therefore appreciate its reproduction in these pages at this time.

THERE are persons in this world who entertain such exalted opinions of their own perfection and immaculateness as to feel offended if any human being should happen to differ with them, and to become exceedingly indignant if a doubt be expressed regarding their perspicacity into any of the transpiring affairs of life. There are journals also that are affected in the same manner, and which, although always ready to express opinions upon subjects, whether they are familiar with them or not, incline to the idea that they are not treated with true journalistic courtesy if a contemporary happens to point out inconsistencies in some of their expressions and positions. Such sensitiveness is not a good qualification for the battle of life which goes on in this rugged Canadian climate.

A RECENT issue of the Empire contained a letter by Mr. W. H. Merritt in which were evidences that the ink with which he wrote was strongly impregnated with caustic, and that sarcasm guided his hand. Mr. Merritt discussed the absence of a comprehensive steel industry in Canada, and the policy of the Government that had so effectually repressed it. His arguments embodied many painful facts, and his suggestions were along lines which if followed out would certainly make Canada a producer of all the steel rails and all the forms of Bessemer and mild steel for which we have necessity. It gives us great joy, too, to learn that the Empire, though not agreeing with all that Mr. Merritt said, admits that there is great force in the argument that Canada should go to work in