

doing battle for the conservation of a policy which has now been thrice endorsed by a large majority of the people of this country.

The part taken by this organization in the late contest is now a matter of history and its plan of campaign was the publication of tariff literature for free distribution, the dissemination of cartoons and lithographs exemplifying in a telling manner the benefits of Protection to the community at large, and by holding, under the auspices of the League, a series of public meetings at which the National Policy was, in each case, the principal theme for discussion.

That the efforts of the League were not ineffectual, is just cause for congratulation, and the election returns, from the cities in particular, have shown that the arguments submitted for the consideration of those whose votes were to decide the question "shall the National Policy be maintained," were not without weight. Regarding the influence of the League in this city and elsewhere we quote the *Toronto Daily News*, which says:—

"The Conservative party was wise in choosing the National Policy as their chief issue. No doubt this cry, artfully separated from politics by 'Industrial League meetings and cartoons, carried the Torontos.' * * * The same methods in other constituencies had the same effect."

To the president of the League, Mr. W. H. Storey, the treasurer, Mr. Charles Knees, and to Messrs. George Booth, John F. Ellis, Edward Gurney, Samuel May and W. K. McNaught, the executive committee, the thanks of manufacturers generally are due. These gentlemen devoted a great deal of time to the cause in which their energies were enlisted, a cause which has once again been vindicated at the polls, and a cause which was presented to the public in the fairest possible manner, and without either equivocation, suppression of facts, or misrepresentation.

Their labors are now concluded, and it is to be hoped that the question at issue has, once for all, been definitely settled. The producing interests of Canada have shown such wonderful development since 1878 that the credit and prestige of the country would seriously suffer were they tampered with by so-called modifications of the tariff.

In defence of their interests the manufacturers were forced to fight; the fight is now over, the hatchet is buried and will remain buried unless the gauntlet be again thrown down.

PRISON COMPETITION WITH FREE LABOR.

A FEW weeks ago the editor of this paper had occasion to contradict a statement freely circulated in the Grit press, charging that the Dominion Government were still allowing convicts in the Kingston Penitentiary to manufacture goods which came into competition with like goods, the product of free labor. Our contradiction was unchallenged until the Saturday previous to polling day, when the *Toronto Globe*, with dishonest intent, manufactured and published the following "roorbach" which we reproduce in full as a fair sample of the *Globe's* editorial talent:—

"Mr. Frederic Nicholls, the delightfully non-partisan secretary of the so-called Canadian Industrial Association, has issued a circular designed to show that the Tory Government have not allowed prison labor to come into competition with

free labor. Young Mr. Nicholls appears to grow more rash as the campaign progresses. He has displayed a recklessness in elevating this subject into prominence which his political friends must deplore. As an invitation to the workmen to return to their allegiance to Sir John Macdonald it will not entice.

"Young Mr. Nicholls first quotes Mr. James G. Moylan, Inspector of Dominion Penitentiaries, to this effect:—

"The only boots and shoes made at the Kingston Penitentiary are those made for the use of the institution. None whatever are made for the outside market."

"To this statement Mr. Nicholls adds the following:—

"The public are reminded that * * * the Dominion Government have done away with prison labor in such institutions as come under their control."

"But, unfortunately for young Mr. Nicholls, the report for 1885 of Hon. J. L. D. Thompson, Minister of Justice, convicts him of gross misrepresentation of the facts. On page 10 of this blue book there is a statement of the number of convicts at Kingston and the work at which they are employed. Here are some of the items:—

WORK.	NO. EMPLOYED.
Carpenter shops.....	40
Blacksmith and machine shops.....	33
Stonecutters.....	36
Masons.....	36
Tailor and shoe shops.....	71
Foundry.....	82

"Does young Mr. Nicholls contend that 71 tradesmen are required to produce boots, shoes and clothing for less than 500 convicts?

"Then on page 13 of Mr. Thompson's report appears a tabulated statement of the value of the goods produced, exclusive of the cost of material for the year. In the tailor and shoe shops the value of the labor alone was \$5,119.60. At the low price at which the convict labor is rated, it is estimated that this represents a complete product of \$20,000. Mr. Moylan officially reports that the cost of clothing in all was but \$5,488.09.

"On page 7 of this same blue book, under the heading, 'The Dominion of Canada in account with the Kingston Penitentiary for the year ending 30th June, 1885,' the first item is, 'By convict labor, \$9,862.36.' On the opposite side of the page appears a statement of the various monthly drafts sent to the Minister of Finance, showing that the Dominion derived in revenue from the penitentiary no less than \$10,929.67. So it was at St. Vincent de Paul, Dorchester, Manitoba and British Columbia.

"The total value of labor, exclusive of material, on work done in the Kingston Penitentiary for the year ending June 30, 1885, was \$51,837.52.

"The value of the product of the convicts engaged in the trades above quoted, after deducting the cost of material, was \$41,446.42.

"And young Mr. Nicholls states that the Dominion Government does not permit prison competition with free labor."

In reply to the above charge of gross misrepresentation we wrote a short but concise defence, but the *Globe*, in order to sustain its well earned reputation for unfairness, refused to give it insertion, although the mere fact of being convicted of one extra campaign lie more or less, could not possibly have drawn upon itself much greater discredit than by common consent it is now awarded.

It will be observed that in order to refute our statement, which was made on the authority of the Inspector of Penitentiaries, the *Globe* quotes from the blue book of 1885, but which in reality deals with the year 1884. We did not claim that the Government never employed convicts or allowed them to be employed in making goods for general sale, but simply refuted the statement which appeared in the *London Advertiser*,