

An Independent Liberal Newspaper, published every morning at five o'clock at No. 10 King Street East. Extra editions are published whenever there is news of sufficient moment to demand it.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICES: Twenty-five cents a month, or \$3 a year in advance, postage paid. Single copies, one cent. Sold on the streets and by newsdealers in every city and town in Ontario, Quebec, and Manitoba.

ADVERTISING RATES: All advertisements are measured as solid copy, and are charged for on a line basis. Five cents a line for each insertion. Reports of meetings and financial statements of public and railway companies, and of other companies, TEN CENTS a line. Paragraphs among news items, double the ordinary rate.

Special notices, twenty-five per cent. advance on the ordinary rate. Birth, marriage and death notices, TWENTY CENTS each. Contract rates for display advertisements, per line, set to change of matter, are as follows:

Table with columns for ad types (Display, Classified, etc.) and rates per line.

Condensed advertisements are charged at the following rates: Situations Wanted, \$1.00; Help Wanted, \$1.00; Real Estate, \$1.00; Lost and Found, \$1.00; Business Cards, \$1.00; Personal, \$1.00; Miscellaneous, \$1.00.

The Toronto World. The Only One-Cent Morning Paper in Canada, and the Only Exclusive Morning Paper in the City of Toronto.

POSTMASTER: GENERAL JAMES appears to have rather the best of the case in the matter of the mail bags. It is quite certain that the Canadians have been using United States bags very freely. But it is the first time ever we were ahead in any dealings with our neighbors.

IF IT IS ASERT that churches and charitable institutions should be subjected, then it is right that they should be supported entirely out of the public purse. Or, to put it another way, if it is wrong to tax them, then it is wrong to permit them to rely for existence in other respects upon voluntary contributions.

THE QUINCYNS say that two or three of the judges are not pleased with the new judiciary act, and therefore they will act the obstructionist. This is little talk. As is well known, our judges have always declared it to be their duty to interpret the law, and not to make it into a mere machinery.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

THE GRAND REASON against a railway monopoly in the Northwest is that the railway will exact such freight rates as will barely leave sufficient to the farmer out of the product of his land whereon to live. All above the living line will go to the road that monopolizes the carriage of the grain.

THE GRAND REASON against a railway monopoly in the Northwest is that the railway will exact such freight rates as will barely leave sufficient to the farmer out of the product of his land whereon to live. All above the living line will go to the road that monopolizes the carriage of the grain.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

MR. JUSTICE CAMERON is of opinion that the judge must first be convinced before they can sit in the high court of justice. Whether a valid objection or not, it is much better that it should be taken now than at some future time. It would be a serious matter to have all the labor and the decisions of the court upset and brought to naught a year or two hence, as possibly might be the case by a judgment of the supreme court at Ottawa.

OUR GODLESS UNIVERSITY.

The Christian Guardian, however much it may protest the opposite, is by its assertions and opinions taking a position of covert, if not open, hostility to our provincial university. If its article of this week has any meaning, it means that our provincial institution is a godless university, and that there are other colleges "as easily accessible, with quite as ample facilities for imparting superior education from which "all such persons (previously announced as "agnosticism and atheism) is carefully excluded, and which are pervaded by a "powerful religious influence."

To all of which we must enter our protest. The moral atmosphere in and about our provincial university is at least on a par with that of the Guardian's "other colleges," and they are—of the provincial college are on the whole superior to any other institution in the province. It is all very well to push the denominational colleges forward and crack up their wares—they have a wide field and a bright future before them—but there is no reason why an attempt should be made to do so at the expense of the non-sectarian university of the people. And that the people have confidence both in the moral tone that pervades and the teaching that characterizes our provincial institution is best evidenced in the annually increasing crowds that repair thereto.

IRELAND'S OPPORTUNITY. Ireland had flourishing industries at the beginning of the century. There were woollen, carpet, blanket and calico factories which then gave employment to thousands of men, but which now employ scarcely as many hundreds. The same thing is true of the manufacture of silk, linen, lace and worsted goods.

Two agencies have contributed to this result. Up to 1846 English competition, backed by hostile and discriminating English legislation, laid a blighting hand upon Irish industries. The concession of free and equal trade laws gave some promise of a revival, when the agitations of 1848 began. These have continued with varying intensity up to the present time, and capital and industry have fled from their presence.

The people have been striving to live upon the land, which they have over-crowded, and which at its best was handicapped by unjust laws. The reform now effected by the passage of the land act will doubtless improve the position of the tenant and the farm-laborer.

But there is a feeling abroad in the country that even under reformed laws the land cannot support all who are trying to make a living on it, and that an effort should be made to revive the ruined industries.

How is this to be accomplished? Farnell and those who act with him favor an elaborate system of boycotting English goods. Lord Dunraven, Mitchell Henry, Shaw and others advocate a development of the immense water-power of the country by government appropriation and exemption from municipal taxation. Mr. Bright has faith in the natural flow of English capital into the country with the guarantee of order and security.

The second and third plans have much to commend them to sensible men. The first is only the mad scheme of an agitator, who has never considered what a shy and sensitive creature capital is.

Without the guarantee of order and security every device for reviving Irish industries must fail. But given these, there is no reason why Irish industries should not prosper, or why in a very few years Ireland should not be one of the most flourishing countries under the sun.

Irishmen in Canada and the United States can do something to this great end. They can disband their land leagues, break up their home-rule committees, and dissolve their dynamic councils, leaving the brotherhood at home to their row in a fair race with Scot and Saxon.

ATTACKED BY A BEAR. The Wonderful Escape of a North Bruce Farmer from Bruin's Clutches. (Toronto Echo, Aug. 13.)

On Saturday last a man named Thomas Smith of Hope Bay, had a narrow escape from being killed by a bear. He was out in the bush after sunset in search of his cattle, and while following a cattle path about a mile from home, he came suddenly upon a large bear. It was not more than seven or eight yards from him when he first saw it, and the bear was coming at him like an angry man.

In three bounds it was upon him, and he raised his rifle and fired. The bear was as quick as a child in the hug of the bear. When it took hold of him, he put up his right arm to defend himself, but the bear seized it, and bit him severely on the wrist. The bear then held him by the left paw, and struck him two violent blows with his right paw, and the other on the side of his head, and the other on the side of his neck. These inflicted severe wounds, and the work of a few seconds, he was lying on his back, and as he lay there, he was his only chance, he acted upon it by sinking down to the ground. As he did this, his weight partly pulled the bear down with him, and in falling it loosened the paw that was round him, and he fell, and at once rolled over on his back, and he was again on his feet, and did not touch him after he fell. When he recovered consciousness, he heard nothing of the bear, he ventured to look around, and as the animal was not in sight, he got up and hurried home as well as he could. Bleeding and terribly lacerated it was a painful journey, and when in sight of his own clearing he heard the bear in pursuit, he was rushing through the bushes and rapidly gaining on him. By a desperate effort he managed to get across a brush fence and ran up the hill to his house, which he had barely reached when he heard the bear crashing over the brush fence. He had just opened the door and fled on the floor, and the bear had reached the house. He had brought the neighbors to the rescue. Dr. Wigle, of this village, went out early on the following Sunday morning and examined Smith. He was badly cut and

PERSONAL CHIT CHAT.

Gen. George S. Dodge of California is dead.

And S. has sprained her ankle. Also poor Maud!

J. D. Edgar has returned from the Muskoka lakes.

M. C. Cameron and Judge Toms of Godolphin are both confined by sickness.

George W. Rogers, the Washington banker, died yesterday morning.

Rev. Joshua Donovan was returned to the city after four weeks' holidays in the north country.

Rev. Wm. McKee, who fourteen years ago preached in the Baptist church, Parkhill, died in Cleveland recently.

The remains of Senator Brouse were interred in the historic cemetery of the north country, three miles from Prescott yesterday.

Mr. Kincaid was elected to the Ontario legislature by the north country yesterday for West Peterborough. He is the representative of both parties.

The Canadian Baptist has received the following subscription to the memorial fund: Hon. Wm. McMaster, \$100; Wm. Elliot, Toronto, \$40; John Kennedy, Montreal, \$10.

Bishop Cimmon has returned to Hamilton from Rockaway, R. I., where he has been sojourning for the last month, greatly improved in health. He has the corner stone of the R. C. church at Drayton, today.

"QUERIST" TO MR. PHIPPS. To the Editor of the Toronto World. Sir,—In the reply which Mr. Phipps made to my last letter, he intimates that he hopes I will trouble him no more, and refers me to "the licensed expounder in the Mall, the Spectator or the Free Press."

I know very well that I have been enquiring very much on the time and relations of Mr. Phipps, but in an enquiry of this kind I prefer going to one whom I know to be a sincere and honest adherent in the doctrine of the free trade, and whose researches have been extensive in this subject, rather than look for information to those who are merely "licensed expounders," which would simply be resorting to the counsel of the ignorant. If Mr. Phipps' answer had been exercised by Cleveland, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, I should certainly not have troubled him any more, but as it is not I will take the liberty of pointing out to him the difficulties in his conclusions that prevent me accepting his conclusions.

By the term protection I understand the interference to prevent the free importation of foreign goods, which I choose if unrequited, by free trade I understand the absence of such restriction, and it is in this sense that I have used these terms. For example, pig-iron costs in England about \$12 per ton and in the United States about \$23. Now, if the American were to restrict his free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh, he would undoubtedly choose the cheaper, and the government adds \$7 duty to each ton of iron imported from England, so as to restrain the people from buying from the latter country. Now Sir, if I am to restrict my free choice between Birmingham and Pittsburgh

