

as the fates may determine. But it is from these unsuccessful and unnecessary professionals the *Globe* hopes to muster recruits in its quixotic forays against protection.

RECIPROCITY.

Now that the elections are over and that the country has decided that Sir John's Government must look after Canada's interests in any negotiations that may be had with the United States looking to reciprocity in trade between the two countries, public interest is keenly alive to learn what may be the probable outcome in that direction. It is more than likely that whatever negotiations may be had, Sir Charles Tupper will be one of the Canadian commissioners, and any expressions from him at this time on that subject are interesting. A few days ago, having been questioned on the subject, Sir Charles said:

"I am very sanguine that reciprocal trade arrangements on a broad and liberal basis between Canada and the United States will very soon be made, embracing all such articles, whether the product of the forest or the farm, as can be arranged to the mutual advantage of both countries. My confidence in that arises from the fact that Mr. Blaine was known to be strongly opposed to the McKinley Tariff Act, and he has sought to relieve that measure of the natural consequences which must flow from it by proposals for reciprocal arrangements with other countries. So far from refusing to make anything but treaties of Unrestricted Reciprocity, the treaty he has made with Brazil simply embraces the articles that both countries agreed upon could be exchanged to the mutual benefit of each, either free or at a reduced rate of duty, leaving many other articles at the existing rates of duty. The treaty that Mr. Blaine has made with Newfoundland is precisely of the same character, and embraces the same principles exactly as would be included in a treaty that Canada would be prepared to make with the United States. As Canada affords an infinitely better basis of supplies for the fishermen of the United States than Newfoundland, there is no reason why Mr. Blaine should not embrace the opportunity of ridding the McKinley bill of its worst features by a broad and liberal trade arrangement with Canada. He is undoubtedly a very eminent and able statesman, and following, as he no doubt has, the discussion of the issues between the two parties in this country, has learned that the statement that the Liberal Conservative Government and party had been unfriendly to the United States is not only entirely devoid of foundation, but the very reverse of the truth. Mr. Blaine has only to consult the Canadian *Hansard* to see that, so far from the Liberal party being more friendly to the United States than the Conservative party, the discussions in the Canadian House of Commons and an examination of the files of the newspapers of the Reform party will prove that when Sir John Macdonald, in connection with Her Majesty's other plenipotentiary, in 1871 made a treaty between Canada and the United States, he was violently denounced by the Liberal party on the floor of the House of Commons, and by the press of the Liberal party, for having basely surrounded, as they said, the most important and valuable rights of Canadians, in his desire to obtain the friendship of the United States. Again, when Lord Sackville, Mr. Chamberlain and myself negotiated the treaty of Washington in 1888, I was subjected to the same treatment by the Liberal party and press, who denounced me as having been guilty of surrendering enormous rights, privileges and advantages that belonged to the people of Canada for the purpose of promoting a feeling of friendly intercourse with the United States. Under these circumstances Mr. Blaine, finding how entirely he has been misled as to the real

position of the two parties in this country, will, I have no doubt, be prepared to give the most friendly consideration to the wishes of the Government of Canada to have freer and more friendly trade relations between the Dominion and the United States. I shall be greatly surprised if Mr. Blaine does not crown his best efforts as a public man by accomplishing a settlement of all the questions of friction between the United States and Canada on terms that will be mutually beneficial and honorable to both countries."

MUGWUMPERY.

THE National Policy has given rise to abuses which must be abolished if it is to be continued. The pledges made to the people at the time of its introduction must be fulfilled and those manufacturers who have been sufficiently protected must be made to feel that they are not to look for Government protection beyond what the people consider a reasonable degree. The time has come when protection must not shut out English manufactures merely because about half a score or less of workmen may possibly be employed in some particular manufacture, as is the case in many manufactures now taxed with high duties.—*The Shareholder*.

These reflections are very vague. It is quite easy to charge abuses to the N.P. and then insist that they must be abolished, while the abuses are not specified nor the way in which they are to be remedied pointed out. It is also easy to speak of unfulfilled pledges made to the people, but what those pledges were is not mentioned. Why not specify? And why a covert threat to "those manufacturers who have been sufficiently protected," and who "must be made to feel that they are not to look for Government protection beyond what the people consider a reasonable degree?" The manufacturers who have been "sufficiently protected" are not asking for more protection—they do not desire any more—and that which they have been given to them by the representatives of the people to what they considered a "reasonable degree." Under the present regime protection is the fixed policy of the Government, and why does *The Shareholder* threaten the manufacturers that it will be withdrawn from them? Under protection the manufacturing industries of Canada have grown to such proportions that almost all articles of imperative necessity are now made in Canada, and under the fierce fires of competition are sold at as cheap or cheaper prices than before protection brought the industries into being: and an inspection of the returns will show that much the larger portion of imports of English manufactures into Canada are of an expensive character intended chiefly for the use of the wealthy who can afford to pay the duties imposed upon them. The vaguest sort of vagueness in the reflection that there are now many English manufactures taxed with high duties merely because a half score or less of workmen in Canada are employed in the production of similar goods. Why not specify? It is mean to stab in the dark. If *The Shareholder* has knowledge of any such incongruity existing it should mention the facts. Mugwumperry is an excrescence of American politics that we would dislike to see introduced into Canada.

THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER,
\$1.00 PER YEAR.