

of the Exhibition stood because of their mismanagement of it. We know that a couple of years ago they had induced the City Council to prepare a by-law to be voted on by the taxpayers, and that because they believed that it could not possibly be passed at that time, it was withdrawn; that later, finding their condition desperate, they induced the City to submit the by-law; that it was submitted and defeated by an overwhelming majority; that, after a pretence of correcting some of the objections so strenuously raised against them by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, they induced it to come to their assistance, and that finally, at the last municipal election they succeeded in inducing the taxpayers to give them \$133,500, to be used in the erection of needed buildings and the general improvement of the Fair Grounds. Among the so-called reforms which they promised at a conference with the Parks and Exhibition Committee of the City Council in November last, were that the representation of the City Council, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and the Toronto Board of Trade should be increased, and that the representation of the District Electoral Society should be decreased. Believing that these promises would be carried out in good faith, as indeed some of them were, the Manufacturers' Association began an active campaign in inducing the taxpayers of the city to vote the money wanted, nor did their efforts relax until the by-law was passed; and it is safe to say that had it not been for that assistance there would have been no more recurrences of the Toronto Fair under the mismanagement that had previously controlled it. The Exhibition directors had promised that the reforms desired should go into operation as soon as necessary legislation could be had; and under this agreement the City Council had a bill prepared, covering the understanding, to be presented to the Ontario Legislature for ratification. In the meantime occurred the annual meeting of the Association, at which was elected a Board of Directors of rather remarkable personality; and it is to be observed that while previously, the Manufacturers' Association was represented on the board by several members, after all the efforts that had been made by it to secure the passage of the money by-law, under the new organization, the Exhibition Association returned thanks by electing only one member on its directorate from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. And thus was the ladder kicked away. While the reorganization bill was pending in the Legislature this Board held a meeting at which a resolution was unanimously passed protesting against the reduction of representatives of the Electoral District Society and the increase of representatives from the City Council. Among those present at that meeting were Mr. W. K. McNaught, vice-president of the Exhibition Association, and the only representative from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and a large number representing the Electoral District Society. Mr. McNaught was unanimously elected president.

Some of the members of the board have expressed regret that the Exhibition directors had been misrepresented by the newspapers in saying that the board had consented to the reduction of the representation of the Electoral District Society, when in fact the directors had only assented to it. Discussing this quibble *The Star* is authority for the statement that Mr. McNaught says that his board in their conference with the city had not consented to the reduction, but had only assented. "They had not agreed—they had only acquiesced, all they had done was to promise that they would not oppose the reduction." "And the big blundering city," says *The Star*, "went away supposing that this was enough—went away, passed the by-law, voted the money, and now finds

out the difference in some men's minds between consenting and assenting to a proposition." The excuse offered by Mr. McNaught and his board for opposing what it was agreed should not be opposed, is that the city, in supporting the bill before the Legislature, represented the directors as consenting to that to which they had only assented.

Mr. J. O. Thorn, a representative of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in the Exhibition Association, and who undoubtedly correctly represents the views of a very large majority of those interested in the matter, in a letter to the Mayor of Toronto, says:

At the annual meeting of the Exhibition Association, held on the 5th inst., the power of the Electoral District Society was again made manifest, and we had the spectacle presented to us of the defeat of every representative of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, with the exception of one, whose occupation appeared on the ballot paper as that of a "merchant," while the representatives from the Toronto Board of Trade only succeeded in getting in at the foot of the list. The defeated representatives from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association were the Ontario vice-president, the treasurer and the chairman of the Toronto branch, all of whom were nominated with the unanimous approval of the Executive Council of their association.

If this is the kind of treatment the manufacturers are to receive, how can they be expected to take much interest in the future success of the Exhibition? And upon what grounds can they be expected to advocate the holding of the proposed "All-Canadian Exhibition" in this city?

Is it not time for the City Council to deal with this matter vigorously, and insist upon one-half the board being elected by the Council from amongst its own members, and the other half in equal numbers by the agriculturists and the manufacturers? Why should anyone except the owners and the exhibitors have any voice in the management of the Fair? The taxpayers of Toronto were good enough to vote money for a new building for the manufacturers, while the Exhibition Association has very plainly told them they are not wanted.

But Mr. McNaught is president.

FOOL FRIENDS.

The Toronto Evening Telegram publishes the following in its editorial columns:

Canadian manufacturers ought to aim at excellence in their products.

Protection ought not to encourage the directors of an industrial enterprise to sit down under the shelter of a favoring tariff, giving as little as possible to the consumer in value, taking as much as possible from the consumer in money.

The Canadian Manufacturers' Association should find out the lines in which English or American producers excel the Canadian producers of similar articles. The Canadian producer should then attempt to bring his product up to the English or United States standard instead of relying on the tariff to compel the Canadian consumer to buy an inferior article of Canadian origin in order to save the duty on a superior article of English or American origin.

For some reason which we do not now discuss the impression is gaining that many lines of Canadian manufactures are deteriorating in quality, presumably because they are to some degree benefitted by tariff protection, and therefore their standard of excellence is lowered in proportion to the protection they receive; and this idea is fairly well expressed by *The Telegram*, as above quoted. If these over-virtuous friends of Canadian manufacturers were in any degree conversant with facts, which they might verify without undue expenditure of time or expense, they would know that no deterioration whatever has occurred in the quality of Canadian-made goods; and that they embody as much excellence now as they ever did, and that they are the equal in every respect to similar goods made any where else in the world.