

would come in. I doubt if the revenue would decrease, and the stronger competition would keep our factories from overcharging. Thirty per cent. on United States makes means \$1.20 on a \$4.00 coat. Surely 80c., or 20 per cent., should be ample protection.

Women's and Children's Dress Goods mainly woollen (many kinds), per tariff article 563, unfinished, duty 25 per cent. from United States, 15 per cent. from Great Britain, 22½ per cent. from France.

Fabrics, etc., Cloth, Ready-made Clothing, mainly wool, per article 567: Duty from United States 35 per cent., duty from Great Britain 30 per cent.; duty from France 35 per cent.

Could not the duty on all these woollen goods be reduced 5 per cent., or even 10 per cent? Our imports would increase, and thus the loss of revenue might not be over \$2,000,000, which does seem a large loss. Cost of imported woollens would, however, keep down the prices here. The consumers would get lower prices, and the factory companies would get less profit.

In 1918 the revenue from wool goods, all kinds, grossed \$9,577,000, which shows that our factories were unable to supply Canada's needs.

Cotton Goods. Total revenue of 1918 \$9,036,000. Of these embroidery, cords, handkerchiefs, laces, tapes, hralda, etc., (cotton and linen) per Article 575, paid duty at

35 p. c. x 7½ p. c. from U. S.

25 p. c. from G. B.

35 p. c. x 7½ p. c. from France.

Velveteens, Velvat, etc., not pure silk—duty:

30 p. c. from U. S.

17½ p. c. from G. B.

27½ p. c. from France.

Velvets, pure silk, per Article 581—duty:

30 p. c. from U. S.

17½ p. c. from G. B.

20 p. c. from France.

Ribbons, all kinds, per Article 582—duty:

35 p. c. from U. S.

22½ p. c. from G. B.

25 p. c. from France.

All of these that are cotton and linen might be reduced 5 p. c. or even

10 p. c. They are largely used by the workers. The vests and ribbons made of silk, and all silk might well be taxed at 10 p. c. to 25 p. c. higher than now. It is curious to see silk velvets, and silks at 20 p. c. from France, whereas staple woollens and cotton goods are 35 p. c. from the same country. By increasing duties on silk goods, and decreasing tariff on woollen and cotton goods, we reduce costs to the poor and increase costs to the rich. The revenue would not be too much reduced and ordinary clothing would be lower.

Silk Goods paid duties in 1917 \$3,070,000. In 1918 \$3,487,000.

Those who can afford to be clad in velvet and silk surely would not object to paying more for French and Italian silks, if they knew that meant lower priced coats and dresses for the young people who make up these costly garments for the more fortunate.

The Liberal platform has failed to pledge an eight-hour day, or a minimum wage act, but it has struck a true note when it demands "free wheat, free cements and fertilizers, principal articles of food free, and a reduction of Tariff on footwear and wearing apparel."

The Platform does not state if it includes canned goods, Beans, Peas, Meats, Cheese, Bacon, Butter, Eggs in the "principal articles of food" but it is fair to assume that it does.

None of the speakers have yet intimated how they will make up the four million dollars revenue loss on meats, nor what reduction should be made in the duty on woollen and cotton goods. This Platform, however, has alluring features, and these have to be met by other contending parties.

The times are very much out of joint, and the mere politician, veering to every wind, has no firm grip on the rudder.

Here is the chance for these two parties to develop the men who will not be bound by precedent and custom men who will not be tied to the past, and who will hew out the future policy. Underneath that policy must be, shall be, the broad rock principle of justice to the vast throng of workers. They are to be considered first. Almost every order-in-council consid-