

BREAD has never been so cheap in England within the memory of man as it is at the present time, when the wheaten loaf of four pounds is supplied by contractors to great institutions at two pence half penny, that is a little over a cent a pound. That is a great deal cheaper than in Canada, whence people export both wheat and flour to Great Britain. It is said that Minneapolis flour can be obtained in the ports of Great Britain at as low a price as Manitoba flour can be obtained in Montreal. That is probably partly because Minneapolis flour in the British markets finds a competitor in the Manitoba flour, which has a monopoly of this market, or, at least, is protected by a duty. The farmer gets little, or none, of the benefit of the duty, for the price of wheat is governed by the price paid in the British market for the surplus which is sold there. No. 2 Chicago wheat for delivery in July was quoted yesterday as low as 69 cents. There is no one bold enough now to set a limit to the possible minimum price of wheat. All predictions of that kind have been utterly belied.—Montreal Witness.

Bread has never been so cheap in England as at the present, under free trade, and bread was never so difficult to obtain. What matters it to the British workmen if bread is but a little over a cent a pound, if he is out of work and therefore has no money with which to buy it. Bread may be cheaper in Great Britain than in Canada, but if it is, the Canadian workman, thanks to the National Policy, has the wherewithal to buy. If the Manitoba flour is worth more in Canada than Minneapolis flour is worth in Great Britain, the Manitoba farmer reaps the difference, thanks to the National Policy, and the duty of fifteen cents per bushel on wheat imposed by the tariff. The Witness has intelligence sufficient to comprehend that the Manitoba farmer pockets the difference in price in Canada as between American and Canadian flour, and its effort to cloud this fact is not creditable to its honesty.

THE American Economist has asked a large number of workmen engaged in manufacturing establishments to give their opinions of the effect of changes in the tariff such as are proposed by the so-called "tariff-reformers." A great many letters have been received in response to this invitation, and in every case the writer declares that reduction of duties will result in reduction of wages in his particular industry. One man, born an Englishman, shows how he brought over to the country, and found situations for in the mill in which he works, two of his relatives, both of whom at once obtained from twenty-five to forty per cent. better wages than had been earned in England. All of these men perceive clearly that their better wages are secured to them by the tariff, and that when the duties go down, wages must also go down. Not one of them holds the opinion, urged by the free traders, that the employers are engaged in robbing the workmen. Not one of them agrees with Mr. Cleveland that the larger wages are wholly absorbed by the larger cost of living. There can be no doubt that the men who have written to the Economist accurately represent the convictions of the mass of the workmen in the manufacturing industries. We doubt if five per cent. of such laborers favor changes in the tariff, and some who voted with the "reformers" in November last, now regret their folly.

Cold storage for farm produce is gradually developing an entirely new feature in the marketing of farm supplies. Heretofore it was always compulsory upon the farmer to market his perishable stuff just as soon as he possibly could.

Milk, butter and eggs if not sold would spoil, and their forced sale always tended to depress the market unduly, such sales sometimes resulting actually in a loss to the farmer. But now that the idea of cold storage is being entered into more largely on lines that have several times been suggested by The Homestead, the prospects are better for good prices. By checking an oversupply at any one season, perishable goods can be held till the market is more bare, and although the cold storage produce does not bring as high a price as strictly fresh goods, still the average returns are better through the maintenance of a more steady market. The same idea can be equally applied to fruits, and there is no reason, except that of lack of proper cold storage, why consumers in large cities such as Boston and New York, should not be able to purchase good fresh peaches, plums, early apples and pears, cherries and such things at Christmas time, which would command good prices during the holidays, and would be bought at such a season by those who could afford to pay for them. What is more to the purpose is that while placing his goods in cold storage the farmer is not compelled to wait till they are sold before receiving any returns, because money can be borrowed on butter, cheese, chickens and other stuff that will keep, from the banks, which are always willing to advance on warehouse receipts. The best plan would be for farmers to co-operate in their own localities and erect their own cold storage warehouse. They might even co-operate in the work of building it just as easy as they can co-operate in storing the ice. The farmers can thus secure their advances at home, watch the market closely and sell on a rise, instead of almost giving away their products to commission merchants who would do the storing and reap the benefit of the higher prices. The cost of storage, if the idea were carried out by farmers on the co-operative plan, need be next to nothing, sufficient only to cover interest on the building, with very little more in the way of other charges because the farmers themselves would cut, haul and store the ice, also deliver and receive their own goods.

FARM AND HOME, an American agricultural paper, draws this strong picture of one phase of the sixty million market to which Canadian farmers are invited:

The national association of retail implement dealers is the meanest kind of a trust. One of its ironclad rules is to buy no goods of a manufacturer who retails any of his wares direct to the farmer. This is nothing more nor less than a trust and conspiracy in restraint of trade, which is a direct violation of the federal anti-trust law. We invite those who know anything about this matter to submit full particulars to Farm and Home, that we may prepare a case to be submitted to the United States attorney-general. If the real facts are proved beyond doubt, we shall have no difficulty in securing a verdict from the United States courts annulling this infamous trust. Every manufacturer of implements and every farmer is equally interested in suppressing this conspiracy. The national association of implement dealers is composed of a gang of middlemen who are leeches on both the producer and consumer of farm implements. They demand large commissions, which of course take the form of a heavy addition to the retail price of an implement, that the farmer has to pay, while on the other hand many of them are very slow to remit to the manufacturers of whom they buy their goods. This is why such a large number of manufacturers are yearly finding it more and more to their advantage to sell direct to customers by advertising in the agricultural journals. Evidently the time has come for the