

It is claimed that Russian foreign trade has declined rapidly under the influence of a protective tariff, the decrease being over 20 per cent., both of exports and imports, in three years, but this year while the imports decrease the exports have increased.—*Hamilton Times*.

THE protective tariff is all right, and the "influence" of it is all right, too. What's the use of exporting large quantities of merchandise that can be used at home: and what's the use of importing large quantities of merchandise that can be manufactured at home? The imports decrease in volume not because such goods are not consumed at home, but because the home factories meet the home demand in large measure; and the exports increase in volume because the improvement in the condition of the people enables them to more than supply the home market.

THE *Hamilton Times*, speaking of the United States system of pensioning Union soldiers of the war of the rebellion, and the exceedingly large number of pensioners now being carried upon the rolls, says that, "whatever charge can be laid against the Cleveland administration, it cannot be said that it is neglecting the interests of those who participated in the civil war." The density of the ignorance which prompts such a statement is phenomenal. Probably the most conspicuous act of Mr. Cleveland's official life was the vetoing of several hundred pension bills in one batch, a greater number of vetoes than all his predecessors from Washington to Arthur had ever signed. His Bourbon proclivities, and sympathies with the element that precipitated the war has kept Mr. Cleveland's face set steadily against granting pensions to Union soldiers, and such pensions as have been granted during his administration were granted in spite of him.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH, in a recently published letter, speaking of the set-back his Commercial Union party has received, says:—"Mr. Butterworth's sickness at the moment when he was bringing on his motion in Congress, is, it must be owned, a heavy blow to us." So? Mr. Butterworth may recover from his sickness, but it is not at all likely that Professor Smith's Commercial Union party will ever recover from the "heavy blow" under which it is now staggering. The cause must be frail and weak if its success depends upon favorable consideration in the United States Congress. Mr. Butterworth introduced his little bill there at the last session—about a year ago—but it received no consideration whatever, and there is no reason to suppose that it would meet with any better fate now. Perhaps Mr. Butterworth is glad for his own sake that he is too sick now to "bring on his motion." Probably when he recovers he will have changed his mind and not bring it at all. If there was anything in the scheme the illness or even the death of one man would not stand in the way of its introduction and discussion.

MENTION is made in our "Manufacturing" department of a concern doing business in Richmond, Va., who manufacture some 200,000 paper boxes a day, used mostly by druggists and physicians. They give employment to over 400 hands, mostly women and girls, who earn from \$3 to \$10 a week: and most of the paper boxes of this description consumed in Canada are

manufactured in this establishment. We do not think that there is any such concern doing business in this country. Dextrousness and nimbleness of fingers rather than technical skill are required in the manufacture of this class of goods, and there is abundance of such labor to be had in Canada. There can never be any monopoly in conducting such a business, for no patented machinery or process is required, and there is no country where the raw material—paper—is cheaper. The finer and more expensive grades of ornamental and decorated papers used in the Richmond factory are imported from Germany, and similar goods could be laid down in Canada quite as cheaply as in the United States. The establishment of such a factory in this country would be a remunerative investment no doubt.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH weeps bitter tears over the fact that Mr. Benjamin Butterworth was taken down sick just at the moment when he was bringing on his Commercial Union with Canada motion in the United States Congress, and admits that the incident "is a heavy blow to us." "Having met him in the campaign I have been deeply impressed by his ability and power as a speaker," says the professor; who also remarks that Mr. Butterworth expressed to him "kindly feelings towards Old England, and strong reprobation at the insulting language held about her by certain members of Congress." Mr. Smith seems to have been badly "mashed" on the Cincinnati statesman; and no doubt Old England and all the sons of Old England, wherever they may be dispersed, will be duly and truly thankful that Mr. Butterworth not only entertains "kindly feelings" towards her, but actually "strongly reprobates the insulting language held about her" by certain other illustrious American statesman. Surely now the lion and the eagle shall lie down together, and Mr. Benny Butterworth shall lead them. The fact is, the professor has become a monomaniac on the fad. His mind is affected by it and his antics are unnatural. He is inclined to slobber and gush over his new-found acquaintances. For his sake we sincerely wish speedy recovery to health of his friend whom he "met in the campaign," Congressman Butterworth, of Cincinnati.

The United States surplus is a mighty argument against protection.—*Toronto Globe*.

It was under their protective tariff that the United States raised surpluses, and a surplus surely is a sign of prosperity. Most sensible people will therefore be inclined to think that the surplus is an argument in favor of protection.—*Brockville Times*.

And as the surplus has got to be something of a curse instead of a blessing, and a source of financial danger to the business interests of the country, our neighbors propose to get rid of it by getting rid of some of the protection, thus lightening the taxation borne by the people. From the American standpoint, therefore, the surplus is an argument against protection.—*Montreal Herald*.

As we before remarked, "The United States surplus is a mighty argument against the United States Internal Revenue system. Protection is all right." The trouble with our Grit contemporaries is that they seek to make it appear that the white elephant surplus in the United States treasury arises from the operations of the tariff alone, and then arguing that the only way to get rid of the surplus is only by getting rid of the tariff. The fact is, the Internal Revenue system