

manufacturing concern, and the earnest way with which he writes, entitles his views to all due consideration.

He says that the protection which we now have in Canada, is like housing children from wild beasts and then leaving them to starve. It may be said that industries which cannot thrive under protection deserve to die, but that this idea does not hold in countries where the theory of protection is more fully understood than it is here. The United States Government, he says, gives a bounty of two cents per pound on sugar made in the States and exported; that it gives a bounty of ten cents per yard on woolen carpets made there and exported; that a bounty was paid to encourage the manufacture of steel rails, and that experiments are now being made partly at the expense of the Government to discover the utility of nickel steel. "The United States, therefore, not only erects a tariff wall which absolutely prevents outsiders from getting in, but also gives help to American manufacturers to enable them to compete with foreign manufacturers in their own markets. 'This is ideal protection.'" The question is then asked, How is it in Canada? A tariff duty, he says, is put on a certain line of manufacture to foster it, but to manufacture it certain materials must be imported, and these should be admitted duty free. But duty is levied upon these materials because, perhaps, some small concerns may be engaged in their production in Canada, although this home production may not be sufficient to meet the demand, or it may be of inferior quality. Window shade cloth is cited in illustration of the writer's contention. He says that window shades are made to quite a large extent in Canada, and therefore the chief materials used in the industry, such as cambrie, benzine, paints, etc., should be admitted duty free. Take woolen carpets also: British and foreign warp must be imported for this business, because Canadian makers cannot supply the demand, and therefore the duty on warps should be rebated when manufactured into carpet in Canada. But to this the N.P. says no, because carpet warp is made here. He says that the United States Government, to kill the Canadian industry, gives a bounty of ten cents per yard on all woolen carpet sent into Canada. Attention is directed to the fact that the United States has done more than any other country to protect and foster her manufacturing industries, and that this was done in such a way as to strengthen her commercial hand to the extent of being able to dictate the terms upon which she will do business with other countries, besides making it worth while for many large European manufacturing concerns to establish factories there.

It is quite surprising that a person who has invested large capital in a manufacturing enterprise in Canada, and who should be well acquainted with the fiscal policy of the Government which has such vital bearing upon his industry, should be so entirely ignorant of that policy and of the effects which it is intended to produce. It is not a happy illustration to suggest that the protection which the N.P. throws around our manufacturing industries is similar to housing children against the attack of wild beasts and then leaving them to starve. It is more like the care which a parent bestows upon his child in giving him a good education and teaching him the methods by which he may win his way in the world. When the child has arrived at man's estate, the parent is not leaving him to starve when he is able to help himself. It is true, protection makes

manufacturing quite possible and profitable; but it is no part of the duty of the Government to guarantee financial success to every protected industry which may be started. Something must be left to common sense. Before investing in a factory enquiry should be made as to whether the demands of the country are not already supplied by existing establishments. If they are the manufacturer should not complain that there was an overproduction when he himself had helped to precipitate the situation. But it is this very competition which reduces prices in protected countries as soon as the supply overtakes or exceeds the demand. No man exhibits wisdom who persists in producing articles for which he has no use and for which he can find no sale. According to the inexorable law of the survival of the fittest, where the supply exceeds the demand, the weak and inefficient goes to the wall; but the theory of protection has nothing whatever to do with the failure.

It is also surprising that in these days of general intelligence any one should suppose that such a condition prevails in the United States, as this writer seems to imagine. There is no bounty paid on exports of sugar, neither is there a bounty paid upon exports of woolen carpets or of anything else. The United States pays no export bounty upon anything. Neither did it ever pay a bounty to encourage the manufacture of steel rails. When American manufacturers demonstrated the fact that nickel-steel armor plates could be made as well in that country as in Europe, the Government were quick to award them large contracts for the article. It is a great mistake to suppose that the American tariff absolutely prevents outsiders from getting into that market. The fact is, since the McKinley tariff came into effect the imports of foreign products into that country are greater than ever before.

The N.P. was not created to build up big manufacturing industries at the expense of the small ones, as this writer imagines it should in his allusions to the window shade and carpet warp industries. He is doubtless aware that there are mills in Canada with capacity to manufacture all the textile material that the trade might require; then why should these Canadian mills lie idle so that a window shade factory might obtain cheaper foreign cloths? We have a large and valuable petroleum industry, and in the refining of our crude oils we make large quantities of benzine, but why should this by-product be thrown away, or why should our oil refineries be abandoned to the end that the Standard Oil Company may possess the Canadian market? As fine and serviceable paints are made in Canada as anywhere in the world, and the capacity of our paint works is equal to any demand which might be made upon them; then why should they be driven out of business? There is a great and most important interdependence of Canadian manufacturing industries one upon another which makes it possible for them all to live and thrive; but it was never intended that the N.P. should allow one of them to exist at the expense of the life of another. But if there must be any discrimination at all it should not be against the weak and feeble. Canada does not despise the day of small things, and if we can succeed in building up every small industry which might contribute to our necessities, we would have no anxiety regarding the larger ones.

It is unfortunate that such misunderstandings and misapprehensions should exist in the minds of the people upon such