



ESTABLISHED IN 1890.

PUBLISHED ON THE FIRST AND THIRD FRIDAYS OF EACH MONTH

**The Canadian Manufacturer Publishing Co., Limited.**

McKinnon Building, Cor. Melinda and Jordan Sts., Toronto.  
Cable address: "CANAMAN." Western Union Telegraphic Code used.

**MESSRS. DAVISON & CO.,**

164 Federal Street, - Boston, Mass.  
AGENTS FOR UNITED STATES.

Index to Advertisers .....Page 42

J. J. CASSIDEY, - - - Editor and Manager.

**THE AMERICAN TARIFF THUMB-SCREW.**

The Philadelphia Record for November 9 contained the following:—

Mr. John Charlton, a member of the Canadian Parliament, made an interesting speech before the New York Chamber of Commerce on Thursday last on the trade relations between Canada and the United States. His address deserves serious attention. He showed that Canada was the third largest customer in the world for the products of the United States, having bought of us in the last fiscal year goods valued at \$119,306,000. Our purchases in Canada for the same time—excluding gold and silver—were valued at \$39,497,000. In other words, we sell in Canada three dollars worth of merchandise where we buy one. This one-sided exchange of products is in part due to the excessive Dingley tariff rates, which are about double the Canadian rates.

Regarding which The Bulletin of the American Iron and Steel Association comments as follows:—

The Record would change "this one-sided exchange" by admitting more of Canada's products into our markets. That would mean less work for American farms and factories. That is what free traders aim at all the time. Canada, of course, does not buy anything of us as a matter of sentiment, or anything that it does not want or can not buy from us cheaper than it can buy elsewhere. It has been doing a great deal in late years to divert its foreign purchases from the United States to Great Britain by discriminating in duties against the United States and in favor of the mother country, which The Record seems to have forgotten. And yet Canada continues to buy from us because she can do better in our markets than in those of the mother country, even with discriminating duties in favor of Great Britain. Our protective duties cheapen everything that we make, as The Record ought to know. As for reciprocity with Canada, or any other scheme for reducing our duties on Canadian products we have nothing to gain but much to lose, as The Record also ought to know.

It is a hobby with Mr. Charlton to preach reciprocity in season and out of season, and he has been doing so for years. Time was when his utterances and sentiments possessed a certain value for a portion of the Canadian public, but in our opinion they always tended to place this country in a false position, Mr. Charlton's ideas being that the prosperity of Canada depended upon the closest possible trade relations with the United States. We have no objections whatever to that country enacting tariff laws to suit the requirements of its people; but it was through the preaching of just such persons as Mr. Charlton that the American people imbibed the idea that the welfare and the destiny of Canada required not only closer trade relations, but political annexation also. The prevalence of this

**The Canadian Manufacturer**

**Reaches all the Blast Furnaces, Iron and Steel Works, Rolling Mills, Manufacturers of Iron and Wood-Working Machinery, Steam Engines and Boilers, Pumping and Mining Machinery, Electric Machinery and Appliances, Machinery Dealers and Steam Fitters' Supplies, all Hardware Dealers, Cotton, Woolen, Knitting and Yarn Mills, Pulp and Paper Mills, etc., in Canada.**

idea induced the American politicians to adopt a thumb-screw policy which they believed would result in developing a sentiment in Canada which would inevitably and speedily lead to annexation. Their ambition was, and is, to have their territory extend to the North Pole, their belief being that the thumb-screw process would accomplish it. But it has not, nor will it; but, on the contrary, Canada is awake to the fact that her best interests lie in another direction. Canada has for many years held out the hand of trade fellowship to the United States, but, more unfortunately for that country than for this, it has been persistently declined; and self-respect now impels us to look elsewhere and make other arrangements more becoming our dignity.

Our American friends talk much about "reciprocity," but really their idea of the meaning of the word differs widely from that which is usually accepted. The reciprocity they propose for Canada is to take all they can get of value from us and give nothing of value to us in return. As Mr. Charlton points out, Canada is the third largest customer in the world for the products of the United States, in answer to which The Bulletin shows that Canada continues to buy American goods because she can do better by doing so than purchasing in the markets of the Mother Country, even with discriminating duties in her favor. A Bourbon, it is said, never forgets and never learns. When a previous reciprocity was in force our American friends thought that Canada was obtaining some undue benefit from it, and, therefore, abrogated it. This abrogation was a part of its thumb-screw policy, for they believed that no other market than theirs was open to us for our agricultural products; but The Bulletin knows that Canada is not now dependent upon its country in that direction, but has, rather, become a no inconsiderable competitor with it in the markets of the world. This is where it forgets. On the other hand, it has not sufficiently laid the lesson to heart, nor learned that the thumb-screw policy has driven millions of American dollars to Canada for investments in manufacturing and industrial enterprises, and that the flow is steadily in this direction. Under a more equitable condition of things this situation would not have become as accentuated as it has now become. Was the lumber industry of Michigan and other border States ever of value to the American people? The consumption of several hundred million feet of Canadian logs per year in Michigan mills alone indicates that it was; yet the Dingley tariff demanded the imposition of a duty of \$2 per thousand feet on Canadian sawn lumber with the result