

—"Our Infant Woollens" is a tract, put forth we believe by one of the highest authorities in New England, showing in a striking instance how infant industries keep their promise that as soon as protection has given them a foothold they will dispense with it and stand alone. From the first protective tariff, that of 1789 and 1791, vaunted as the foundation stone of American prosperity, to the McKinley Bill, the protective duties on Woollens have advanced through successive stages from $7\frac{1}{2}$ to 100 per cent. The people are now not only being robbed by the monopolists of the 100 per cent. duty on their clothes, but their earnings are being taken from them and squandered in pensions at the rate of a hundred millions a year to prevent the reduction of the tariff. Meantime the treasurer of the Arlington Woollen Mills reports to his stockholders: "I have been your treasurer for a consecutive period of twenty years. During this period the average earnings have been 20 8-10 per cent. upon the capital. . . The earnings last year were nearly three and a half times those of the year previous, and there is every indication that the current year will be the most profitable one in the Company's history." The artisan votes for protection because he is told that it keeps up wages. Have wages in the Arlington Mills been kept up to the level of the profits? The development on the largest scale of fertile lands, rich minerals and water-powers with a vast immigration, as the writer truly says, have stimulated production and have really created the prosperity which Protection falsely arrogates as its own work. Canada has now been consigned by Sir John Macdonald for his political purposes to "infants" of the same kind, and we shall have a similar succession of demands for further applications of the pap-boat, enforced as they are in the United States by the lavish use of corruption. Unfortunately, Canada if she has, like the United States fertile lands, rich minerals and water-power to make up for the drain of taxation, is by the same policy excluded from her natural market, whereas the United States are a vast market to themselves. However, we say once more