

strances of friends and the denouncements of enemies these incongruities are suffered to exist; and when it is seen that a few sugar refiners are becoming millionaires; that the production of binder twine is manipulated so as to squeeze enormous profits out of the farmers; that the capital stock of cotton mills is watered to the extent of a hundred per cent. so as to obscure the fact that more money is being made out of the business than is justifiable, and that even the oil in the household lamp is taxed a hundred per cent. more than it ought to be; it is not surprising that the adverse arguments of free traders, based on these facts, are likely to affect the judgment of the voters who have heretofore upheld protection, and to cause them to seriously consider the propriety of trying another policy. It is quite time, then, that manufacturers whose greed does not blind them to the situation should join hands with labor to correct the glaring evils to which we allude. In theory the interests of the two classes are identical—why not make them absolutely so by an equitable sharing of the profits in the creation of which they are both so essential? Under existing systems whatever sharing is now done is done on horizontal lines. In the cases of sugar, binding twine, cottons and coal oil the strata of divisions which are assigned to labor are very thin and very close to the bottom of the milk pan, while that which capital appropriates is the very thick, rich cream at the top. The division should be on perpendicular lines, where all interests involved obtain a fair proportion of the cream. If this is done; if labor and capital work together in this way, protection would be established upon a rock and could not be prevailed against by the most resolute assaults of the enemy.

Protection in Canada is rapidly approaching a crisis in which the best common sense of its friends should be exercised. A policy of inaction under a blind dependence in a two-thirds majority in the House of Commons, however, is not an indication of common sense.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

"We are well pleased with our advertisement in THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER. The paper should be patronized by every manufacturer in the Dominion." Messrs. Brown & Co., proprietors of Ontario Nut Works, Paris, Ont.

A HIGH tariff has just been condemned in the States, a tariff so extravagantly high that even strong protectionists like Mr. Blaine deemed it imprudent; and the Grit organs in Canada have raised a hue and cry against the moderate protection which exists in Canada.—*The Empire*.

THE McKinley tariff is said by recent official reports to be responsible for a diminution last year in Swiss exports to the United States of \$2,200,000.—*The Empire*.

"Extravagantly high tariff" in the United States, and "moderate protection" in Canada indeed. The "extravagant" Mr. McKinley put a duty of \$10 per ton on refined sugar, and put good brown sugar No. 16 D. S. on the poor man's breakfast table free. The "moderate" Mr. Foster put a duty of \$16 per ton on refined sugar—sixty per cent. higher than in the United States—and the poor man in Canada has no free sugar on his breakfast table, the No. 14 D. S. article being unfit for domestic consumption. The *Empire* should refrain from comparisons—they are frequently odious. And then as to the diminution of Swiss imports into the United

States; it is clear that the McKinley tariff caused the expenditure of \$2,200,000 in his own country that would otherwise have gone to strangers.

ACCORDING to the October returns, the United States owes our banks \$22,000,000. Pretty good for a country in a state of commercial atrophy.—*The Empire*.

If the *Empire* desires to investigate the matter it can be put upon the track where hundreds of thousands of dollars of Canadian wealth is lying absolutely idle and unproductive, simply because it is invested in industries which are strangled for the lack of a fair interpretation of the ethics of protection. In the instances alluded to the protection does not protect. We can mention industries where the duty on the raw material is from twenty to fifty per cent. higher than the duty on the finished product manufactured abroad. When the inquisitive capitalist discovers this situation, he does not rush into what would be disastrous manufacturing investments, but deposits his money in the bank, where he can realize a very small interest. The banks, unable to loan this money to good advantage in Canada, send it to the United States where it is in demand for investment in manufacturing and similar enterprises. Is it any wonder, then, that the Canadian owner very naturally gravitates towards where his treasure is? There is more truth than poetry in the *Empire's* sarcasm about the "commercial atrophy" of Canada. It does not see the point, perhaps, but the owners of that \$22,000,000 do.

THE *Toronto World* says: "The McKinley tariff raised the cost of living in the States." If the tariff raised the cost of living in the States, it surely operates the same way in Canada.—*Windsor Record*.

Well, no, not necessarily. If the McKinley tariff—remember that "if"—raised the cost of living in the States, it would be apt to do the same thing in Canada—if—remember that "if," too—we had the McKinley tariff in Canada. But the *Record* is herby assured, on our honor as a man, that we have not the McKinley tariff in Canada, nor anything like it. It does not follow that, because one tariff produces a certain effect, another, and a much lower tariff, will produce the same effect. If a man kills his wife after drinking a gallon of whiskey, it doesn't follow that the man who takes a single horn of whiskey must kill his wife.—*Hamilton Spectator*.

The *Spectator* assures us on its honor as a man that we have no McKinley tariff in Canada, nor anything like it. Let us see. The McKinley tariff does not impose a duty of more than a hundred per cent. on coal oil, but the Canadian tariff does. The McKinley tariff imposes a duty of only \$10 per ton on refined sugar, but the Canadian tariff imposes a duty of \$16 per ton. The raw sugar that the McKinley tariff admits free into the United States is a wholesome and cleanly article of food, while the raw sugar that the Canadian tariff admits free into this country is an unwholesome, dirty stuff that cannot be used for domestic purposes. The poor man in the United States has free sugar on his breakfast table, while the poor man in Canada finds his sugar heavily taxed. The *Spectator* had better save its honor as a man by retracting so wild an assertion.

THE value of the foreign commerce of the United States last year was \$28.58 per head of population, while the value of the foreign commerce of Canada in the same period was \$45.94 per head. The value of exports from the United States was