

tical impropriety in national capital, you would multiply letters in little capitals who, would scarcely raise theington; and when they got ent figures in either honest

the Bryanite go their way shipments of older-fashioned to the number of their own able to endorse the asser- orge at the Toronto Labor between capital and labor Let the laborist delight raving his hard lot to-day, immeasurably better off compared with them, he portation, his fine clothes, everything, a Sybarite, com- only a few short decades ing on, in spite of ogreish rumbler. That is because progress; and because it elp the human worker to natural capacities will per- metal machinery. Where en amazingly extended in is is increasingly so, see- ble intellect must be em- the best advantage. That s the most efficient staff. ceives the best remunera- n to fear the enlargement ies than there was to be- the steam threshing and going to throw men out days.

## THE FIGURES.

cy in public business being exemplified and en- ide of Canada. Knowl- man can thrive under imate knowledge of his a dozen different, per- its place, much less ad- along the nations, unless th the conditions and chanism which goes to lled national commerce. usly the most backward and businesslike pro- and Spain, are also dis- considerable lack of re- their industries. The oples are distinguished h they collect, for their t trade which, though t. provide a valuable anges in international ly changed within the hich were adequate to- are woefully incomplete ue of co-ordination of nderstood than it was. f public affairs is just co-ordination as the gricultural machinery, standardization to the purchaser alike. tion has been a large n the manufacturers of e Australian market: the home domain of most as many British

local customs in machinery as there are dialects. Much machinery is in use for which it is either impossible to obtain ready-made duplicate parts, or which, if parts have to be replaced, can only be repaired at high expense because those parts are very rare, and have been kept in stock for ten, twenty, or thirty years.

There are just as many disadvantages in diversities of governmental methods as there are in the region of manufactures. In any unnecessary diversity, there is unnecessary expense and unnecessary ineffectiveness. In a federal system, such as ours, these diversities are liable to become worse and worse unless some strong current towards simplicity and efficiency sets in, and accomplishes a beneficent work.

There is a Union of Canadian municipalities, which is good. If there is a case for it, there is a case for frequent interchange of departmental ideas between the different Provinces, and for enlarged sympathy between departmentalists of the Provinces and those of the wide Dominion. Only by encouraging a trend in that direction shall we escape the unhappy apotheosis of sectional interests—that kind of sectionalism which, in the United States, has reduced the holy estate of matrimony to so deplorable a condition.

Take a concrete illustration of costly comparisons. According to the census returns issued by the Federal Government for the year 1901, there were in that year in Ontario some 372,477 acres under spring wheat, and 1,115,156 acres under fall wheat; the yield of spring wheat is given as 6,540,000 bushels, and of fall wheat 21,879,000 bushels. According to the Provincial report of Ontario there were only 358,000 acres of spring wheat and 920,000 acres of fall wheat; the yield being 5,499,000 bushels and 16,017,000 bushels, respectively. For the year 1901, therefore, the Federal returns show a total of 209,000 acres and 6,900,000 bushels of wheat in excess of the Provincial returns. The Federal returns show for Ontario an average yield per acre of 19.6 bushels and 17.6 bushels in the case of fall and spring wheat respectively, the corresponding figures in the Provincial Report are 17.4 and 15.4 bushels. A comparison of the two sets of returns in respect to stock shows the same discrepancies as have been shown in the case of crops.

The Bill for procuring a census of production in the United Kingdom is a sign of gradual readjustment of statistical perspective in the United Kingdom. It will approximate more to the thoroughness with which Washington expects the captains of industry in the republic to illuminate the returns of their trade. But while the United Kingdom is approximating to the United States, the United States is improving on itself. Thirty-six years ago, the United States classified its exports into the products of, (1) Agriculture; (2) Manufactures; (3) Mines; (4) Forests; (5) Fisheries. Since then manufactures have multiplied tenfold. The Bureau of Statistics of the Department of Commerce and Labor has changed this method of classification. The classification of imports, which was adopted twenty years ago, when the classes of articles forming the bulk of imports, differed considerably from that of to-day, is also to be changed, partly because it was intrinsically inadequate for the purpose of the Bureau and partly because it afforded no reliable means of comparing exports and imports, and the effect upon them of tariff legislation.

The new classification is to be applied to the whole of the United States foreign trade, imports and exports alike. It is:—

- (A). Foodstuffs in a natural state, and food animals.
- (B). Foodstuffs, partly or wholly prepared.
- (C). Crude materials for use in manufacturing.
- (D). Manufactures for further use in manufacturing.
- (E). Manufactures ready for consumption.
- (F). Miscellaneous.

This classification is being criticised as not being

simple enough, and the English method is said to be better. Here it is.

- (I). Food, drink and tobacco.
- (II). Raw materials and articles mainly unmanufactured.
- (III). Articles wholly or mainly manufactured.
- (IV). Miscellaneous and unclassified (including parcels post).

The Canadian classification is the same for imports and exports:—

- |                 |                     |
|-----------------|---------------------|
| (A). The mine.  | (E). Agriculture.   |
| (B). Fisheries. | (F). Manufactures.  |
| (C). Forest.    | (G). Miscellaneous. |
| (D). Animals.   |                     |

This is very similar to that discarded by Washington. The point is not whether the Canadian, the British, or the American system is the best. It is that revision of official trade statistics is in process in the two great manufacturing sections of the English-speaking peoples, as a natural sequence of the passing of rule-of-thumb methods in ascertaining profit and loss, and increase of worldly goods.

## SAFEGUARD OF PUBLICITY.

A highly competent correspondent summarises on another page the work of the House of Lords Committee on life insurance. Among the things which an old and old-fashioned country can teach a young and more active community, is the rapid dispatch of public business.

Perhaps the comparative solitude in which many of our parents lived, had something to do with the garrulity which is too often associated with public functions, and which, may be, is a long rebound from a state of liberal silence. The British House of Commons is probably the only legislative assembly in the English-speaking world, where the possibility of limiting speeches has a chance of being translated into fact. A House of Lords Committee is proverbially an efficient body. It went into the question of security which foreign companies, doing business in Great Britain, should provide in that country. It was presided over by Lord Beauchamp, a young fellow of thirty-five years of age, who is a far abler man than the average of his class, and in six sittings examined eighteen expert witnesses, and arrived at the seven leading conclusions, which are noticed elsewhere.

As a Canadian, who was present at a sitting, said, "They got more evidence in a quarter of an hour than the Canadian Commission is getting in a whole day, for they got the facts, and nothing but the facts, and did not allow any witness to wander off into eulogies of his own company's way of doing things." The Committee's recommendations will surprise those who, on insufficient information, have been led to suppose that if Canadian methods were to approximate to British methods, there would have to be much more cribbing and confining of companies with regard to investments and securities. Conditions there and here are very dissimilar.

The Lords are not anxious about making an elaborate, east-iron mechanism for security's sake. They rely upon plentiful publication of all the facts relating to a company, and so providing the best possible check upon possible evil doers. The standard of commercial honor is admittedly high in great British corporations—an imperial asset which might well be turned to better account in this country, by the grace of imitation. Individually, we are a righteous, sometimes a self-righteous people, but what may be called our collective sense of pecuniary propriety, is not as highly developed as it will be presently. This is perhaps a rather dangerous theme to touch. But it is as obvious as it is true no such recommendations as those made by the House of Lords Committee are possible