

## PRODUCTION OF BESSEMER INGOTS.

1881.	Tons.
Great Britain.....	1,304,127
United States.....	1,519,430

Within ten years the figures had changed thus:—

## PRODUCTION OF BESSEMER INGOTS.

1891.	Tons.
Great Britain.....	1,535,225
United States.....	4,007,128

In the production of the open-hearth steel ingots the change has not been so great, but still the headway gained by this country has been noteworthy. Thus:—

## PRODUCTION OF OPEN-HEARTH STEEL INGOTS.

1881.	Tons.
Great Britain.....	583,918
United States.....	133,376

1891.	Tons.
Great Britain.....	1,724,737
United States.....	1,137,182

This is the result of the protective tariff which gives to us an opportunity to try to supply our own wants from our own resources.

These figures show what protection has done towards expansion of the iron and steel industries of the United States. The following shows what can be accomplished by home skill after a few years of experience, in the way of reducing cost. In 1867 steel rails cost in the United States \$166.00 per ton; in 1872, \$112.00; in 1880, \$67.50; in 1895, \$22.00 to \$24.00. The duty on steel rails is \$13.44 per ton. Will any one pretend that the United States railway companies are compelled by this protection duty to pay more for steel rails than they would be able to procure foreign rails for, even if free of duty? United States steel rails are now so cheap that they are frequently imported into Canada in preference to English rails. Very many instances could be given of same purport. Under a like policy, the iron industry in Canada would expand in same proportion as in the United States.

The above statements conclusively disprove the assertion that protection is an injustice to the consumer. Its aim and object is to provide the greatest possible diversity of employment for which the country affords a fair field of enterprise, by securing for capital and labor the home market. Its immediate effect may be to make goods a little dearer for a short time than under free trade; this disadvantage being counterbalanced by the indirect advantages accruing to the country through the diversification and expansion of its industries, the ultimate and early result will be that through the accumulation of capital, experience and skill, all kinds of goods for which the resources of the country are adapted will be produced of as good quality and at as low prices as in any country in the world.

With respect to the third proposition, that Canadian brain, brawn and muscle are equal to competition with any country, and therefore require no protection. This is simply clap-trap. Add the expression, "all other conditions being equal," and the Manufacturer will assent. In addition to these qualifications, there are required for success in all branches of commerce and manufacturing, capital, experience, skill and established connections. To claim that a young country like Canada, even with its great natural resources and vigorous and intelligent population, should be able to compete in manufacturing, etc., with old countries which for ages past have been

accumulating capital, experience and skill, is as sheer nonsense as to contend that a regiment of raw recruits, however hardy, brave and intelligent, should be able to compete on an open field with a regiment of highly disciplined veterans. Give to Canadians the same training and equipment as to their competitors, and then and not till then can they be expected to compete successfully. Training and equipment either of men or nations require time and expenditure, and being necessary, both the time and the expense must be granted. Protection to home industries is what education is for the young men and girls. In either case there may be a little temporary national or family sacrifice, but in both cases the ends to be attained are so eminently desirable that only selfishness or penuriousness would grudge the expenditure required.

The position of the opponents of the National Policy must be weak indeed, when they are compelled to resort to gross misstatements and fallacious conclusions which established facts completely disprove and refute.

## THE NATIONAL POLICY AND THE EXODUS.

The census returns were made to do some strange duty during the last election campaign. Special items separated from their context were made the basis of very deceptive conclusions. Many hours of speechifying and many columns of newspapers were occupied in dilating upon a fact that no one disputes, viz:—That in many of the long settled and rich agricultural counties in the province of Ontario, there had been an actual decrease in rural population, and not only this, but that the increase in the population of the whole Dominion had been smaller than the natural increase. From these two facts it was argued that during the ten years, 1881 to 1891, there had been a considerable exodus of Canada's population. On this slender proposition, the conclusion was drawn, that inasmuch as the National Policy was in operation during these ten years, therefore it was the cause of the alleged exodus. Queer conclusion, that because two facts are coincident, therefore the one must be the cause of the other, while it may really be that the alleged cause actually mitigated the result which a variety of other causes produced; and this is just what a fair consideration of the census would have established. From the isolated item showing a slight decrease in rural population, it might be inferred that there had been an abandonment or neglect of many farms. Reference to another point established by the census shows the true position of the agricultural industry, and the actual cause of this decrease in rural population; and as the political hacks who have been misleading the people on this subject must have been quite cognizant of this point, it was discreditable on their part to withhold and conceal it. The census returns show that during the ten years, 1881 to 1891, there was an actual increase of 6,638,062 acres in improved lands throughout the Dominion, the increase being 30.31 per cent. This is quite a favorable exhibit. On the other hand, there was a decrease of 7,206 in the number of farmers and farmer's sons in 1891, as compared with 1881, the decrease being 1.09 per cent. The statistics show that in 1881 there was a farmer or farmer's son for every thirty-three acres of improved land, while in 1891 the proportion was only one for every forty-four acres. Here is found the true reason for the decrease in rural population. It was not that there had been