

importations there was no competition with the Canadian farmer, as there certainly was in the importation of dutiable animals.

The contention is also made that because early fruits and vegetables, on which the consumer is required to pay a duty, are on sale in Montreal that the duty is not of the slightest value to the Canadian farmer. This is an untenable position. There are a large number of concerns in Canada engaged in canning fruits and vegetables. They give employment to large numbers of hands, mostly the wives and children of farmers, and they consume immense quantities of Canadian grown fruits and vegetables. It is true these farm products come into season later than in the United States, and it may be somewhat more expensive to produce them, but it is certain that if there were no duty upon such things Canadian consumers would not have to depend upon Canadian farmers for their supplies, but would get them from the United States. The season for getting them from there would be longer and the supplies would be cheaper; therefore it is plain that as far as raising fruits and vegetables for canning purposes is concerned the tariff is worth a great deal to the Canadian farmer.

Perhaps the most excruciatingly funny paragraph ever promulgated in a free trade journal is that in the *Herald* in which it asserts and maintains against the world that "every tax on an imported article is paid by the consumer." It lays this down as "a broad general principle," and asks this journal to wrestle with it "catch-as-catch-can." Consider us in the ring with the *Herald* on that. No protectionist ever assumed the contrary ground that all import duties are paid by the producer. Circumstances alter cases, and as a broad general principle rule. But to please our esteemed contemporary, and to agree with it in its argument, for this time we accept its broad general principle, which it maintains against the world, and ask it to assent to its own proposition that the American consumer of Canadian barley and eggs pays the thirty cents per bushel duty upon the one and the five cents per dozen duty upon the other. Of course the *Herald* won't try to back out of this proposition and go sour on its broad general principle which it maintains against the world. Perhaps not! but we rather think it will try to slip away and bury this "principle" out of sight behind the asylum wall. In this catch-as-catch-can wrestle we hope the *Herald* will stand up and take its medicine like a little man.

#### VAGARIES.

A FREE trade country like Britain readily adapts itself to and even sometimes profits by the vagaries of protectionist nations. The more they "protect" themselves the less formidable do they become in neutral markets, and the more she sells there. Her free trade gives her a favored-nation footing everywhere, and above all tends to the comfort of her people, who get their food and clothing at the lowest figure going, whilst wages are higher by a good deal than in any of the protectionist countries in Europe.—*Toronto Globe*.

It is really interesting to observe how readily free trade Britain adapts itself to and even profits by the protectionist vagaries of, say, the United States. Before a protective tariff became the established vagary of that country, Britain was acknowledged to be the greatest iron producer of the world,

and a very large proportion of all the iron and steel consumed in the United States was manufactured in Britain. When protection became the established vagary in the United States, however, Britain's trade in iron and steel with that country began to decrease; and now the important fact is presented for the consideration of free traders that the United States, under the vagary of protection, surpasses even Britain in the production of pig iron, and we believe of steel rails also.

It is not clear what the *Globe* means in speaking of "neutral markets." Perhaps it means that a "neutral market" is a country which does not produce certain lines of merchandise which it requires does not indulge in any vagary of protection, by which industries producing such merchandise are called into existence, and is therefore compelled to supply its wants from other countries. As in the case of Brazil, that neutral market country does not manufacture nor produce many lines of merchandise required at home, and heretofore the demand was supplied chiefly from Britain. Brazil is a large producer of several lines of merchandise, for the sale of which she has to depend upon the markets of the world; but while she sold to some extent to free trade Britain, strangely enough she found the United States her best customer for a very large proportion of what she had to sell of her chief products. The chief products of Brazil are sugar, molasses, coffee, and hides; and although the United States bought more of these, probably, than all the rest of the world, for many years Britain sold to Brazil more general merchandise, probably, than all other nations, including the United States. The trade between Brazil and the United States was of a very round-about character, and entirely contrary to the theory of free traders, who contend that if you buy liberally from a foreign country, you can also sell liberally to it. As we have stated, the United States bought very liberally of Brazil, but the payment had to be made by sending American products to Britain, and drawing against them in favor of Brazil.

Mr. Blaine, however, used protection, as explained in the McKinley tariff, to offset Britain's free trade and to all appearances John Bull has been badly worsted in the transaction. The *Globe* says that the more protectionist nations "protect" themselves, the less formidable they become in neutral markets, and the more free trade Britain sells there—that her free trade gives her a favored nation footing everywhere. As we have shown, Britain, until recently, sold to Brazil a very large proportion of what she had to buy; and if this favored nation footing there was to be attributed to her free trade policy, it would be exceedingly interesting to learn why it is that that trade is rapidly slipping away from her, and why it is as surely going to the United States. If free trade is such a powerful factor in international trade, why does not Britain hold on to what she has, or had with Brazil?

This change in the current of trade is easily explained. The United States is Brazil's best customer for her sugar, molasses, coffee and hides. On the other hand the United States desires to sell to Brazil a large and varied line of manufactured products, such as Brazil had been getting from Britain. Mr. Blaine held the whip handle. He suggested to Brazil that if she wanted to continue to sell her products to the United States, they would be admitted there on very favorable terms, but on condition that certain American products should