

depression was caused by matters of permanency, and was not merely a temporary misfortune. Twelve years ago a great part of British foreign trade was being transferred to other countries; that the world was buying as many manufactured goods now as then, but that England was not supplying them. This trade had been taken away from England "owing to causes which need not be mentioned." England had been flooded with foreign made merchandise which had resulted in an enormous loss to home manufacturers.

At the recent banquet of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association, at Baltimore, Mr. Butterworth, who was an invited guest, in advocating Commercial Union said:—"We manufacture only to sell, and our purpose is to find a market in which to sell." He advocated Free Trade with Canada, but claimed that Protection had made the United States the greatest manufacturing country in the world. Senator Vance attacked Mr. Butterworth's arguments, and exposing the animus of the Commercial Unionists, said:—"There will always be people who endeavor to secure the enactment of laws that will give them a legal advantage of their neighbors." Senator Vance seems to be of the opinion that if unrestricted Reciprocity or Free Trade between Canada and the United States is desirable, it should be brought about—not through special legislation, but by the acceptance of Free Trade generally in which all nations might participate.

AMERICAN Protectionists are sending out tariff tracts in almost countless profusion all over the country, with a view to enlightening the people on the subjects discussed in them, in anticipation of the Presidential election, which occurs on November 5th next. A series of six tracts, which are being sent out by the Industrial League, of Philadelphia, discuss:—"The Farmer and the Tariff," an address delivered before the recent Farmers' Congress in Chicago; "The Western View of the Tariff," a paper recently published in the *Forum*; "How Protection Benefits Farmers and Mechanics;" "Reduction of Internal Taxes;" "European Wages;" and "Producers and Consumers," a series of statistical statements proving the benefits of Protection to consumers as well as producers. These are all able and unanswerable arguments, and indicate some of the lines on which the great battle for and against Protection is now being fought in the United States.

OPPONENTS of the National Policy tell us that Commercial Union would be the panacea for Canadian ills, and that if we were blessed with it all articles of iron and steel would be greatly reduced in price. It cannot but be admitted that the iron and steel industries of the United States have grown to immense proportions under Protection, and that without Protection they would have remained small and inconsequential; and from this fact we may fairly conclude that if the iron and steel industries of Canada are ever to assume relative importance it must be through the operation of similar laws. The United States duty on pig iron is 50 per cent. greater than the Canadian duty; and great as the production of the article is in that country, during the year 1887 the importations of it into

the United States amounted to 467,000 gross tons. Why should we pay \$6 a ton duty on pig iron under Commercial Union with the United States, when we can now get what we want from Great Britain at \$4 per ton duty?

SPEAKING of the radiation of industry from centers where important works are established, the *Baltimore American* calls attention to the fact regarding two coke furnaces now nearing completion at Anniston, Ala., and where four charcoal furnaces are already in successful operation. It says:—"These furnaces will require weekly, in order to make 2,200 tons of pig iron 5,500 tons of ore, 2,800 tons of coke, and 1,400 tons of limestone. This weekly business is calculated to be equal to 100 carloads per day, brought into a small town. Hundreds of men will be employed in mining ore; digging coal, preparing coke, making iron, and managing the additional railway trains required to feed these furnaces and transport their product. This means the distribution of many thousands of dollars in wages. It means population, house building, prosperity to all trades and professions. It means a market to the neighboring farmer for everything he can raise by diversified agriculture. It means that around these great furnaces smaller industries will spring up, and they in turn create thrift and wealth. There is another meaning in such enterprises. The practical understanding of and belief in Protection are inevitably established over a considerable area where Free Trade once held benighted sway.

THE annual report of the Ontario Minister of Education calls attention to the remarkable disparity between the salaries paid to male and female teachers in this province. The salaries paid in country schools average to male teachers \$400 a year, and to the females \$270. In towns the respective salaries are \$617 and \$288; and in cities, \$794 and \$401. When it is remembered that these teachers must of necessity be well educated and possess other requisite qualifications, the salaries paid them are ridiculously small and entirely inadequate. It is noticeable that female teachers are paid but little more than half as much as male teachers are paid, although in most cases they perform an equal amount of work and bear quite as much responsibility; while, as the Minister says, in certain grades of schools, female teachers are more successful than male teachers. Teaching is an honorable and responsible occupation, and there are thousands more of qualified applicants for teachers' certificates than there are situations to be filled, owing to which fact, it would seem, school trustees, instead of paying adequate salaries, avail themselves of the necessities of applicants, and award the situations to the lowest bidders.

THIS journal recently took occasion to criticize the action of Mr. Freed, of Hamilton, as a member of the Labor Commission, in that while the Commission was in session in Hamilton it failed to take any notice whatever of the fact that the labor union there had so persecuted some poor laboring bricklayers because they were non-union men, as to cause them and their families intense suffering. The facts in these cases have been published from time to time in the *Hamilton Spectator*, of