

enco. This difference consisted in this, that the McKinley tariff removed the duty from all raw sugars up to number sixteen Dutch standard, and imposed a duty of \$10 per ton upon all sugars above that standard, while the Canadian tariff removed the duty only up to number fourteen Dutch standard, and imposed a duty of \$16 per ton on all above that standard. Raw sugar no higher in quality than number fourteen, is absolutely unfit for food in that condition, while number sixteen sugar is of a character which is quite acceptable for many domestic uses. Therefore, in our opinion the Government erred in not placing number sixteen sugar on the free list. If this was a mistake it could readily have been corrected, by an Order in Council, and if this had been done one great cause of complaint would have ceased to exist. If it was desirable to follow the example of the American Government, it was certainly desirable to follow the best features of it, and not to have subjected the people to a condition which deprived them in large measure of the benefit which they were told would follow the removal of the sugar duty. They should have been allowed to use cheap, light, wholesome unrefined sugars if they desired to do so; and they should not have been forced to use refined sugars if they did not desire to do so. If Mr. Foster had followed the McKinley example closely, probably twenty-five per cent. of the sugar consumed in Canada, would be of number sixteen standard, and this means that the consumers would have saved at least a cent per pound, or about 20 per cent. of the present cost of their sugar. Further, we are constantly informed that the McKinley tariff represents the acme of protection. We accept the assertion. If the American tariff is high enough, why should the Canadian tariff on sugar be sixty per cent higher? Considering the average consumption of sugar in Canada, this difference represents more than \$700,000 taken from the people unnecessarily each year. Mr. Stairs, M.P., stated from his place in the House of Commons last Session, that Canadian refiners could manufacture granulated sugar as cheaply as it could be done in the United States, and he ought to know, for he is largely interested in the Canadian industry. Then why should Mr. Stairs and the others of the sugar syndicate, be empowered to squeeze \$6 per ton more out of Canadian consumers than necessary? It is to these things this journal objects. There is no stronger advocate of protection in Canada than the CANADIAN MANUFACTURER, but in the advocacy of protection we draw a line when the protection is excessive and unnecessary, as we believe it is in this instance. The ethics of protection is that the duty should be only the measure of the difference of the cost of production in Canada and any other country. Mr. Stairs, who is a sugar refiner, states that sugar can be refined at no greater cost in Canada than in the United States, then why should he have greater protection than the American refiners have? We do not wish to see the Government of Canada turned over to the opposition for the sake of correcting the incongruities of the tariff. The friends of the N.P. should do that, not its enemies, and it is as a friend of the N.P. and of the Government, that we take the stand we have assumed in this question.

ADVERTISE in the "CANADIAN MANUFACTURER."

IN FREE TRADE BRITAIN.

AN account of a year's working of General Booth's plan for helping the English poor is given by a writer in *The Forum*. The £100,000 which the General asked for was speedily raised. Factories have been established in which the rescued are set to work—at match making, bookbinding, knitting, laundry, etc. At the shelters and food depots night lodging and board are furnished for the merest trifle. Parts of the farm are used for dairy, parts for market gardens, and parts for poultry. Brickyards are soon to be put in operation. Shops for carpentry, painting, brush-making, mattress-making, etc., have commenced work, all the work being done by men and women, boys and girls, who had previously been degraded denizens of the slums and gutters of the great city. More than 2,900,000 meals have been supplied by the cheap food depots. Nearly 100,000 breakfasts, at a farthing each, have been served to poor children. Half penny meals have been sold to the number of perhaps 1,200,000, and meals at one penny or more, up to four pence, have aggregated nearly a million and a half. About 4,000 persons can be sheltered every night. The factories employ about 4,000 men and women. Employment has been found for 5,000 men by the labor bureau. Two hundred ex-convicts have been received in the first of the prisoners' homes, with a view to protecting them and giving them work till permanent places are found for them.—*Toronto Globe*.

The *Globe* is constantly advising Canada to abandon its policy of protection to home industries and adopt the free trade policy of Great Britain, a staple argument being that by doing so the cost of production would be lowered at home, and that we would have the full advantage of the cheaper production of other countries. Britain represents the acme of the free trade idea—let us see how it operates there.

"The English poor" spoken of by the *Globe*, who were rescued by General Booth and set to work at various occupations were not paupers because they desired to be such, but because they couldn't help it. They were able to work and willing too, else they would not have been put at the employment appointed to them by General Booth. The occupations at which General Booth employed these people were neither new nor novel. They exist in all directions in Britain, and thousands of people there find their employment in them. In fact they are overcrowded with employes, else these paupers would not have been paupers—they would have been employees in these establishments, obtaining some small remuneration for their services. General Booth's plan may be a good one—for the paupers—but beyond question it is not a good one for the poor people who are not paupers. His proteges were put at work in a great variety of occupations, but it is not recorded that they received any money remuneration for their services. "At the shelter and food depots night lodgings and board were furnished for the merest trifle," and nearly 3,000,000 meals were supplied by the cheap food depots. Think of the meals which were supplied at one cent and two cents each. Of course the products of this pauper labor—this labor employed at making matches, bookbinding, knitting, laundry work, brush making, painting, carpentry, mattress making, etc., must be sold, and that, too, in the open market in competition with the products of the other poor people who were not yet paupers. Consider what this means. Depriving honest, self-supporting labor of its means of livelihood to the end that General Booth's army of paupers might be given employment.