

warmness towards free trade which Mr. Courtney notices." At the Greenwich dinner of the Cobden Club, he said: "They might confess that a country might be prosperous although it had adopted a protective regime. It was prosperous, not because of protection, but in spite of it." This is a very untenable position for the Cobdenite party to assume:—On the one hand, that all the prosperity of England is due to the fiscal policy prevailing there, but the prosperity of protectionist countries is produced in spite of its policy. Mr. Low proceeds to say:—Free trade England stands worse than she did twenty-three years ago. No wonder Englishmen are puzzled and angry, and look curiously at the protected foreign countries which are reducing the lead we still hold so fast. If that is what is happening under protection, says the man of business, may not there after all be "something in it?"

He winds up his long and interesting paper by saying:—It is possible that if Cobden were alive to-day, and face to face with the conditions of latter-day industrialism and international competition, he might be a Cobdenite no longer. It is certain that so acute an explorer of the currents of public opinion would have perceived that such projects as that of an Imperial Customs Union would have to be dealt with on their merits, political and social, as well as financial. And he would have understood that they could not be disposed of by being called "veiled protectionism, or by an appeal to an economic pontificate that has lost its sanctity."

THE IRON INDUSTRY.

One of the most remarkable exhibitions of tergiversation that has ever been seen in Canada, is that of the Toronto Globe regarding the protection afforded by the duties on agricultural implements. It will be remembered that for a number of years, and up to 1894, the duty on such implements was thirty five per cent. ad valorem, but in that year it was reduced to twenty per cent. At a recent tariff hearing at Ottawa, representative manufacturers waited upon the Ministers and requested that the previous thirty-five per cent. duty be reimposed, or that a very great reduction of duties be made upon all materials entering into the manufacture of agricultural implements.

At this point The Globe appears as the special champion of these manufacturers, making the occasion one in which to decry and run down all the other manufacturers, who produce what to the agricultural implement men are raw materials, its special venom and misrepresentation being directed towards the makers of pig and other forms of iron. We say misrepresentation, inasmuch as about every argument it advances is a distortion of the facts surrounding the subject. Thus it tells us that in 1894 the Government, when proposing to do something for the farmer, reduced the duty on mowers, binders, etc., to twenty per cent., but left the taxes on raw materials ranging all the way from twenty-five to seventy per cent., the difference between the raw material and that in the finished article being tantamount to a bounty to the foreign maker of implements; that the foreign maker instead of being placed at a disadvantage in the Canadian market, for the benefit of native industry, is given a pull over it to that extent by the so called National Policy.

If the facts set forth by The Globe were correct, the National Policy would be a curse to Canada rather than a bless-

ing, but the animus is entirely too palpable, and the facts so entirely at variance with the truth that any unprejudiced mind can grasp the situation at a glance. If the working of the tariff is to discourage the Canadian industry, and to encourage the American industry, why is it that the Canadian implement manufacturer holds virtual—almost absolute possession of the home market, to the exclusion of the American manufacturer? If it was an injustice to the Canadian manufacturer to reduce the duty from thirty-five per cent. to twenty, as The Globe and these manufacturers assert, why is it that the imports of American implements did not increase, and the production of home made implements decrease when the duty was lowered? The fact is, a duty of twenty per cent. was quite sufficient to keep American implements out of the Canadian market, and the reduction of duty did not in any way prove prejudicial to the interests of the Canadian manufacturers.

The Globe tries to create the impression that the duties upon the materials entering into the construction of agricultural implements is even greater than the protection afforded by the twenty per cent. tariff. We are advised by those who know that even if every dollar's worth of materials employed in the construction of implements was imported, and full duty paid thereon, the amount of duty thus paid would not amount to more than six or seven dollars, while the protection afforded on a mower or reaper that cost \$115 would be, at twenty per cent. of that amount, some \$23. In other words, if it cost the American manufacturer \$115 to produce a machine, and it cost the Canadian manufacturer just the same, his materials being to him duty free, to lay his machine down in Canada it would cost the American manufacturer \$115 plus the duty, \$23, or \$138, while to the Canadian manufacturer his cost would be \$115 plus the duty on his raw materials, \$7, a total of \$122. Then why should he complain, and why should The Globe weep such bitter tears on his account? As is shown in a letter published in The Globe written by Mr. Hobson, of the Hamilton Blast Furnace Company, only about two hundred pounds of iron are consumed in the construction of a mowing machine, and as that quantity is only a tenth of a ton; and the duty upon pig iron is only \$4 per ton, even if imported iron be used the manufacturer would be taxed only forty cents upon the iron used in making his machine, which, considering that he controls the home market, to the exclusion of foreign machines, is not as burdensome a load to bear as The Globe would lead its readers to believe.

AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENTS AND IRON.

Discussing the fearful handicap burden the manufacturers of agricultural implements have to bear when they have to pay a duty of \$4 per ton upon pig iron consumed in their industry, The Toronto Globe says:—