

it to just cover the difference in wages to workmen and other necessary expenses over and above the cost in other countries. The present duty does more than that and enables the refiners to become millionaires, which it ought not to do. It is nonsense to argue in favor of protection from the standpoint that sugar is cheaper now than it was in 1878. Cheaper productions abroad, not protection at home is the cause. It is no excuse to the protection government of to-day that the Cartwright government of 1878 taxed sugar heavily. Cartwright should not be the criterion. Why not encourage the growth of the sugar beet and the manufacture of beet sugar in Canada and produce at home all the sugar we require. Millions of dollars per year are paid to labor in foreign countries for the sugar we use. Why not pay those millions to our own farmers?

One of the curses of this city is over-competition. No sane man goes into a new business in Toronto to-day unless he surrounds himself with some kind of protection against men who are watching his every move. As soon as he gets his business going half-a-dozen men begin to buzz around enquiring about the rent of the next door shop. It is not prudent to encourage the spirit of reckless competition that everyone knows to exist in Toronto. What business concerns we have we would all like to see getting fair returns for their investments. We do not say, however, that the city should actively oppose this kind of competition. But it should not at least encourage it.—Toronto World.

Toronto can never hope to become celebrated as a manufacturing centre until some of the obstacles that now intervene are removed. As a general thing manufacturers are not beggars for special privileges, but on the other hand they object to being subjected to burdens that they ought not to have imposed upon them, but which they must bear if they go into business here. They are most unmercifully taxed at every turn to enable rich people to worship in expensive churches that pay no taxes; and to sustain Universities sustained at public expense, that yearly turn out hundreds of lawyers, physicians and theologians who, most of them, will never earn the salt in their bread.

The United States Consul at Chemnitz reports to the State Department concerning the export societies of Germany. It appears that these unions exist in all parts of the Empire, and are active agents in helping to extend foreign markets. Of the material progress of the Empire the Consul says:

For so old a country the progress of the last twenty years seems incredible. The impulses of her unions, the energy of her agents, the patriotism of her people, the co-operation of her governments, the education furnished by her schools, the excellence of her products, the faithfulness with which orders are filled, and the wisdom with which each people's wishes are met are only a few of the many factors that make the Empire rich, prosperous and progressive. The nation's interest in foreign trade is intense. The newspapers teem with all kinds of information regarding it. Not a day passes that a Consul could not find information valuable to our merchants and manufacturers. On my table at this moment are editorials out of the local papers covering the Empire's commerce with many foreign countries.

In England they are trying to help the domestic silk manufacture by persuading patriotic women to buy British

rather than foreign silk fabrics. A Ladies' Silk Association, organized for this purpose, is in active operation. It is difficult for an American to understand why a protective duty upon silk goods is any more wicked than a boycott against foreign goods established by associations of individuals. In any event the duty would certainly accomplish a result which the boycott will almost surely not secure. At a recent meeting of this Association Mr. Thomas Wardle read a paper in which he related how, in 1852, there was a duty upon silk fabrics, and how 27 principal manufacturers in Manchester asked the government to remove the duty because it violated the free trade principle and, in their view, obstructed the business of the aforesaid manufacturers. This request was granted and Mr. Wardle related that as a "result the whole 27 firms have been wiped out, not one of them being left." Like some American manufacturers who favor free trade, these Englishmen made a considerable miscalculation. Their business, and much of the total silk business of the British Islands, was destroyed by the silk manufacturers of France and Germany operating under protective systems. These foreigners poured their products into the unprotected British market, while keeping their own markets closed against British fabrics. Under similar conditions the complete destruction of American silk manufacture would be accomplished within five years.

Mr. Edward Atkinson urges that low prices are a good thing to have, and that high wages always go with low prices; and he insists that the gold standard permits us to have both. But, low prices for what? The low price of wheat surely does not enable the farmers, 40 per cent. of the population, to pay high wages. Few of them are able to pay interest and taxes with wheat below sixty cents. When improved machinery in a mill permits the production of three or four times as much material at the same cost, then the price of the product falls while wages advance. The reason is that there is larger creation of wealth with no greater effort or cost. The world gains by this. But there is a different condition of things when a farmer must give five bushels of wheat to pay a debt which he could have paid a year or two ago with three bushels. In the former case there is enrichment. In the latter there is impoverishment. The manufacturer works no harder and makes more. The farmer works as hard and makes less. In the one case inventive ingenuity changes the conditions for the benefit of everybody. In the other case, legislative interference with the standard of value changes the conditions for the advantage of nobody but the creditor. This theory has behind it a solid mass of facts. The agricultural population of this country is swiftly moving towards impoverishment and bankruptcy, because of the oppressive influences of advancing gold. Indeed, producers all over the world are crying out because of the sufferings thus inflicted upon them. If Mr. Atkinson be right, the whole world-wide demand for the restoration of bimetalism is based upon a wild delusion; but Mr. Atkinson is decidedly and hopelessly wrong.—The Manufacturer.

A rather startling industrial development is reported from Victoria, where women are now being substituted for