

facture of which is protected against injurious foreign competition. Those who make this assertion ignore the benefits of protection, and they ignore price lists and market quotations. Previous to the recent war of the rebellion in the United States—from 1846 to 1857—when that country had a tariff for revenue only, the average price of No. 1 anthracite foundry pig iron at Philadelphia was \$26.25 per ton, and bar iron \$71.52 per ton. Omitting the period when there was an inflation of values caused by the expansion of the currency incident to the war, and taking the period from 1871 to 1885, when the country was under a protective tariff, and the average prices of the above alluded to articles at the same city were for pig iron \$23 per ton and bar iron \$53.09 per ton. These figures show that these articles—pig iron and bar iron—have been and are much cheaper in the United States under a protective than a revenue tariff.

A CERTAIN steel manufacturer in Sheffield, England, according to the *New York Star*, has a standard price in that country for his grade of manufacture. He will make no reduction to any one. He has desk room in a store in New York, where he is represented by a young man who solicits orders, and imports for that purpose only, not carrying stock at all. His expense for rent is \$12 per month only. The steel is invoiced to the young man, who divides it up to fill the various orders he has taken. It is found that the invoice value is less than one-half the price the manufacturer will sell for in Sheffield. Consequently the duty is reduced in the same ratio and amounts to next to nothing. Regarding this matter of defrauding the Government by undervaluation, the *American Manufacturer* says: "There are now very few bona fide importers in the United States. Much the largest part of the business of importing foreign goods into this country is in the hands of foreign agents of foreign houses, these agents not even pretending to be American citizens."

SPEAKING of the new Canadian tariff, the *Cleveland, Ohio, Iron Trade Review* says: "The best possible tribute to the wisdom and efficiency of the present American tariff is the fact that Canada has adopted a system modeled very closely upon it and differing chiefly in the fact that it levies about two-thirds of our duties upon articles entering that country. The readjustment of rates has proceeded upon the theory that Canada has iron ore and coal in close proximity to each other and special facilities for the production of charcoal iron, and that the exclusion of foreign products would be more than compensated by the resulting growth of the Canadian iron and steel industry. The annual Canadian consumption of pig iron is 250,000 tons, not inclusive of steel rails. To make this quantity in Canada, 750,000 tons of iron ore, 120,000 tons of limestone and 750,000 tons of coal would be required, and considering the benefit which would accrue to the country by the development of the iron industry the Government felt that it was justified in losing the coal duty of half a million. The United States has little to lose by the new arrangement, and it certainly would be in bad grace to characterize the present policy otherwise than as pre-eminently politic on the part of our neighbor. May she reap great national and material results from the new system."

RECENTLY while addressing the Canadian Club in New York, Mr. Erastus Wiman, speaking of the advantages to be derived by the United States from Commercial Union with Canada, said: "Canadians would no doubt gladly submit to taxation in a different form to make up for the loss of revenue upon imports from the United States." Mr. Butterworth, in addressing the same club, speaking on the same subject said: "Our (American) farmers would in no wise suffer from it (Commercial Union), and our (American) manufacturers would be benefited. There would be better prices for Canadians, and no injury to American farmers." If Mr. Wiman's remark means anything it means that as a matter of course with Commercial Union Canada would necessarily have to forego and give up her "revenue upon imports," and "submit to taxation in a different form" to make up for that loss, the "different form" of taxation being a direct tax upon all real and personal property and interests in the Dominion. In thus raising revenue by direct taxation farmers would find that not only would they have to respond to the call of the tax gatherer, and pay specific taxes upon every acre of their lands, but they would also have to account for and pay taxes on every horse, cow, sheep, hog and even the chickens in the barnyard. Are Canadian farmers ready and willing to have taxes collected in that way?

Our bashfulness prevents us making any comment on the following letter except to remark that it is our desire at all times to forward the interests of our friends, and that when they avail themselves of our advertising space they find that they are well dressed, in exceeding good company, and well taken care of:—

OFFICE OF THE CHATHAM MANUFACTURING COMPANY (LIMITED),
CHATHAM, ONT., May 23, 1887.

PUBLISHERS CANADIAN MANUFACTURER, TORONTO.

GENTLEMEN,—As you are aware, we are and for many years have been subscribers for the *MANUFACTURER*, but we desire in addition thereto to mark our appreciation of your effective warfare against Free Trade and the Butterworth proposals, and in favor of the Canadian National Policy, by placing our advertisement in your pages. Enclosed, please find copy—we desire it inserted in every issue. Yours truly,

CHATHAM MANUFACTURING COMPANY (LIM.),

D. R. VAN ALLEN,

President and Manager.

Would Illinois do well to secede from the American Commercial Union? If not, why would Canada be unwise to enter it?—*Toronto Globe*. There is no such thing in existence as the "American Commercial Union," as every school boy knows. The tie that binds the several States into what is known as "the United States" is not a commercial but a political tie, and Illinois is as much a part and parcel of that political body as Wales, Scotland, Ireland or England are of that political body known as Great Britain. Some of the States of the American Union tried secession and failed. "Would a man's arm do well to secede from his body? If not, why would it be unwise for him to allow any foreign thing to enter it. The parallel is similar. Perhaps it might be as impossible for Canada to force herself into the American Union as it was for some of the States to secede therefrom when they tried it. The *Globe's* comparison is very silly and nonsensical.