

GRIP

AN INDEPENDENT JOURNAL OF HUMOR AND
CARICATURE.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY

BY THE

Grip Printing and Publishing Co.

26 and 28 Front Street West, Toronto, Ont.

President J. V. WRIGHT.
Manager T. G. WILSON.

Terms to Subscribers.

PAYABLE STRICTLY IN ADVANCE.

To United States and Canada.	To Great Britain and Ireland.
One year, \$2.00; six months - \$1.00	One year - \$2.50

NOTICE.

As many people, either thoughtlessly or carelessly, take papers from the Post Office regularly for some time, and then notify the publishers that they do not wish to take them, thus subjecting the publishers to considerable loss, inasmuch as the papers are sent regularly to the addresses in good faith on the supposition that those removing them from the Post Office wish to receive them regularly, it is right that we should state what is the LAW in the matter.

1. Any person who regularly removes from the Post Office a periodical publication addressed to him, by so doing makes himself in law a subscriber to the paper, and is responsible to the publisher for its price until such time as all arrears are paid.

2. Refusing to take the paper from the Post Office, or requesting the Postmaster to return it, or notifying the publishers to discontinue sending it, does not stop the liability of the person who has been regularly receiving it, but this liability continues until all arrears are paid.

Artist and Editor J. W. BENGOUGH.
Associate Editor PHILLIPS THOMPSON.



Comments ON THE Cartoons.

THE ONLY "SAFE CURE."—Miss Canada is fiscally a pretty sick young woman at the present time. She has been for years indulging in tariff tight-lacing, and destroying her system with the poisonous stimulants of "Protection-

ism." It is no wonder that she complains of a general faintness and depression. In our cartoon she consults Dr. Cartwright, as the fiscal expert of the Liberal school. This is what she will be obliged to do, as her official physician has nothing better to advise than tighter corsets and double doses of the poison—a prescription which she can plainly see means death. And, also, according to our picture, Dr. Cartwright gives her the eminently sound advice that what she really requires is Free Trade and Direct Taxation. We may be doing Sir Richard more honor than he has fairly earned in making him the medium of this wise and radical sentiment. So far as we know from his public utterances, the hon. gentleman in question is only a theoretical Free Trader. Like all the rest of the Liberal leaders of Canada he respectfully defers to the popular superstition which makes a bogey of Direct Taxation, and is therefore numbered amongst the tariff-for-revenue-only men. Sir Richard, of course, knows quite well that the sentiment against Direct Taxation is only a superstition—and one of the most stupid and costly of modern superstitions. Only he has never told the people so in plain terms, and pointed out to them that, as a tariff is necessarily a clog on trade, what we want is not a low tariff, but no tariff at

all. Let us sweep away the customs houses altogether, so far as Canada is concerned, and raise the money for the public estimates by a direct tax on domestic trade, houses, personal property, etc., if the people *insist* on industry and its fruits being the subject of taxation; or on *something else* which doesn't represent industry as soon as the people get enlightened enough to recognize the folly of the former plan. Meanwhile, the question as between the indirectness and directness of the tax deserves to be discussed. We candidly confess, however, that there is, to our view, only one side to the debate, and we can never cease to wonder why any man not wrong in the head should prefer *not to know* how much he is paying in taxes. The average opponent of Direct Taxation would apparently prefer to be robbed out of his very boots with unjust charges rather than to know exactly what he had to pay, even if it were a much smaller sum. This is simple silliness which should not be encouraged by our statesmen, and Sir Richard Cartwright would be doing a public favor by giving it some attention when next he takes the platform. Indirect taxation is a device for picking the pockets of the taxpayer, and as long as the process is easy we may look for extravagance and corruption in the public administration. When the people of Canada decide to pay their taxes directly, it will be in order to fix upon the fit and proper thing or things upon which taxes ought to be levied. We need not go into that now further than to express our own opinion that *monopoly* is the only thing which should be taxed—the monopoly which is enjoyed by every man who is holding for his own exclusive use a portion of that which by nature belongs to all equally. In other words, land-value is that other *something*.

THE KIDNAPPERS.—This is one of the cases in which "comment is unnecessary" to those who are aware of the historical fact that Mr. Edward Farrer, long known to fame as the Editor of the *Mail*, has been captured and carried off by the *Globe* management, and will hereafter employ his versatile pen in the interests of that journal. The cartoon sets forth with a good deal of realism the business-like hustle which was displayed by the *Globe* people in this matter; but it falls short in depicting the frenzy and wrath of Bunting. That was beyond the scope of any pencil.

THE *World* has had a good deal to say lately in favor of progressive politics and true Democratic ideas, but it is still in bondage to capitalistic teachings and an abject upholder of the divine rights of the usurer and land-grabber. A recent issue has the following:

Speaking of the annual bank meetings, *The Sault Express* refers to the prosperity of the banks as a proof of the poverty of the country. This is a new doctrine in political economy. Most people have been taught to believe that when the banks are doing a good business times are lively all round. If this is a mistake, the whole theory of political economy will have to be revised.

It stands to reason that the more the banks and other usurers and parasites take of the total earnings of productive industry, the less there must be left for the actual worker. It is true that people have been taught to believe otherwise. That is easily accounted for. The teaching upon this class of questions has been mainly in the hands of the literary and scholastic hirelings of capitalism—men dependent for their bread and butter on the favor of the plutocrats—just as the *World* is, for instance.

IF burglars were doing a good business there would be "lively times all round." But it doesn't follow that this liveliness would be profitable to the victims of illegal robbery. Naturally they would have to work extra hard to make up for the losses sustained by theft, just as the farmer, artisan and storekeeper now have to work a good deal "livelier" than they need, to satisfy the legalized plunderers—the money and land monopolists. Certainly "the whole theory of political economy will have to be revised" before justice prevails and the people get their own. But where on earth has the *World* man been living that so obvious a conclusion should strike him with amazement?