

to realize this fact. But how are we to induce the United States to accept these products upon terms upon which we can afford to sell? The *Globe's* plan is to sacrifice the manufacturing industries of the country upon that altar. It tells us that "the larger manufacturers are not afraid of unrestricted reciprocity, but there is a small and comparatively unimportant class, who undoubtedly would be injured through being subjected to American competition;" and it enquires "Why should the interest of these few stand in the way?" And it strengthens its argument by vulgarly calling these manufacturers "small fry" who "fleece" the public. The monotony of the *Globe's* constant iteration and reiteration about a "reptile fund," squeezed from the manufacturers for corrupt purposes, and a "Red Parlor," composed of manufacturers who desire the perpetuation of the N.P., indicates a paucity of ideas, quite lamentable to be observed in a great newspaper, but we suppose it is about the best it can do. We are not told who the large manufacturers are who are not afraid of unrestricted reciprocity. If it includes the sugar refiners we would remind it that although these gentlemen say they can refine quite as cheaply as the Americans, yet they have some 60 per cent. more protection than American refiners, and therefore they cannot be expected to favor the fad; and most of those whom the *Globe* gave considerable free advertising to last February, as inclining in that direction, we showed at the time to be not accurate representatives of Canadian manufacturing industries. Indeed there are comparatively few Canadian manufacturers but who are vigorously opposed to any change of policy of the Government which would subject them to the unfair competition of American manufacturers. The Canadian Manufacturers' Association, which voices the sentiments of the manufacturers generally, has frequently and vigorously protested against unrestricted reciprocity; and it is safe to say that any Government who might contemplate the sacrifice of our manufacturing industries in favor of the fad, would find itself most uncompromisingly antagonized by Canadian manufacturers. Therefore, if the natural products of Canada are to gain admittance to the United States, it cannot possibly be by the *Globe's* plan.

Why not try Mr. Blaine's plan? For many long and weary years the United States, in endeavoring to gain access to certain foreign markets for certain of its natural products, had to whistle against the wind, just as Canada is doing at this time. Germany and France excluded American hog products, and Cuba and Brazil excluded American flour. But these countries found in the United States their best market for some of their most important products. Germany sold her raw beet sugar there, and France her wines; and the American market was indispensable to Cuba for sugar, molasses and tobacco, and to Brazil for hides, coffee and sugar. Mr. McKinley made it possible for Mr. Blaine to say to these countries—to say to Germany, France, Cuba and Brazil: "We propose to make certain tariff concessions to you, provided you will reciprocate and make certain tariff concessions to the United States." The result is that Germany and France have concluded that Yankee hog meat is not a bad thing—in fact it is good enough for them—and Cuba and Brazil have quickly changed front in excluding American flour. If that plan has proved so successful in

American diplomacy, why would it not prove successful if tried by Canada? The United States wants and must have our nickel and saw logs, and American manufacturers sell more of their products to Canada than to all the South American markets they are now so anxiously struggling for. Our neighbors are enamored of their McKinley tariff, and of the way it operates in their favor and against others—surely they would not object to taking some of their own medicine—and whether they liked it or not would be a matter of indifference to Canada, provided it had the desired effect. The McKinley tariff threatens that if we impose an export duty upon saw logs, the duty upon Canadian lumber imported into the United States shall be increased. Instead of ignominiously backing down as the Dominion Government did in this matter, they should have answered this menace by raising the export duty to correspond with the American import duty upon lumber. Our backdown at the demand of this Yankee bluster resulted in closing nine-tenths of the saw mills in Canada, and the transfer of the lumber cutting industry to the American side of Lake Huron. The McKinley Bill was in process of incubation just at the time when it was demonstrated that nickel was indispensable in the manufacture of armor plates for war vessels. Previous to that time the American duty upon nickel was fifteen cents per pound, whether refined in the matte, or contained in the ore, and so it was in the McKinley bill, but a change was made placing the ore and matte upon the free list, a heavy duty still being retained upon the refined metal. This was to force and encourage the importation of the crude material, so that the refining of it would give employment for American capital and American labor. If our neighbors were not entirely dependent upon Canada for their supplies of nickel, it would be quite as well, perhaps, not to interfere with the free export of the ore and matte, but surely, as according to Mr. McKinley and Mr. Blaine, we could well afford to impose a heavy export duty upon nickel ore and matte, giving us the opportunity of removing the same—for a consideration. In another editorial, in discussing the iron question, it is pointed out that of the more than fifteen millions of dollars of Canadian imports of manufactures of iron a very large proportion are admitted free, and that the average duty imposed upon these goods, which were dutiable, amounted to only 20 per cent. Under this low rate of duty American manufacturers are able to sell us millions of dollars' worth of their products, while at the same time the McKinley tariff upon similar products is three times as high. Canada is well satisfied to enforce a 20 per cent. duty against such goods, and will continue to do so as regards all other countries, but the McKinley tariff should be our standard as regards the United States; to be void nevertheless, and the 20 per cent. rate restored, in consideration of decent tariff treatment by that country. Canada could not suffer in doing this, for if American manufacturers were barred out, British manufacturers would profit thereby, and Canadian manufacturers also; and if our Yankee friends desired to regain their market, they would have to revise their tariff items which were intended to discriminate against Canada.

Mr. Carling, in his Woodbridge speech, did not seem to catch onto this idea. He did not seem to comprehend that sauce for the Canadian goose would be equally good for the American gander—that there is no necessity whatever, in