packages had on them the names of United States makers, and the labels showed that they were made in the United States. The same goods are sold in Canada, manufactured in Canada, by the same company. A very slight duty would cause this manufacturer to establish factories in England. The goods would be sold in England as cheap as they are to-day, but a large number of hands would be employed in the manufacture, wrapping and handling of the goods.

A Canadian asked in a shop in a city in England for a particular make of razer made in that town and could not find it. The shop keeper had only razors made in Germany. Why should English money be sent to Germany for razors when they could be manufactured by English labor?

One paper manufacturer who sells his paper to newspapers informed me that if he had only 10% duty on his goods he would double his mills and sell his paper cheaper than he now sells it at. He wishes to increase the capacity of his works but is afraid to do so because at any moment an excess of goods from foreign manufacturers may be sent into his market and his mills kept idle for two or three months. Why should not Englishmen have this work to buy food with? It would not increase the price of the food. Our Canadian experience has been on these lines.

I had a brief some time ago in a law suit in Canada in which the question of cost of watch cases was raised. The senior counsel was a Liberal member of Parliament, subsequently a judge. It was proved to him that under a tariff of 35% the watch cases were made and sold to