

discreet and liberal system of bounty to that industry were adopted, it would in a few years develop the production of home-made sugar, which would, to a very large extent, or entirely obviate the necessity of importing sugar from abroad. As it is now we pay several millions of dollars annually to sustain the sugar industry in foreign countries, while if we made our own sugar that money would be distributed at home, and to more numerous classes of labor than is done by any other industry in the country.

DISCRIMINATION.

In 1890 the commerce of Britain with foreign countries and with her own possessions amounted to £685,000,000, of which that with British North America (Canada and Newfoundland) came to only £19,000,000. Britain herself finds it necessary at times, in her treaty arrangements with foreign nations, to discriminate against us, that is, we are not included in some of her trade conventions. She sacrifices our interests to her own, which are of vastly more importance. This rule ought to work both ways. If our welfare would be greatly promoted by free trade between us and the States, and Britain's but very slightly injured, why should we be denied the boon? What are we here for if not to do the very best we can for Canada? The N.P. discriminates against British trade by taxing manufactures at a higher rate than natural products, and thus letting the American off more lightly than the British exporter. Last year we imported for home consumption British goods of the value of \$43,400,000. Of these \$10,120,000 were admitted free, the remainder paying duty to the extent of \$9,600,000. Our imports from the States amounted to \$52,300,000 of which \$21,700,000 were admitted free the rest paying a tax of \$8,130,000. If a Canadian Tory is asked how he defends this manifest discrimination against British commerce he answers that Canada is entitled to regulate her tariff in the way she deems best for herself. Liberals have no confidence in the N.P., but assent with one accord to the principle of Canadian interests first, and find in it full justification for the more open-handed discrimination which complete free trade with our neighbors would entail.—*Toronto Globe*.

This quotation from the *Globe* is taken from a long article in which it seeks to justify a discrimination which it would like Canada to make against Great Britain and in favor of the United States. It makes the point that Britain herself finds it necessary, at times, in her treaty arrangements with foreign nations, to discriminate against Canada, therefore, the working of the rule the other way would justify Canada in discriminating against her. It would have been but fair if the *Globe* had shown that Canada had been injured in any way in any so-called discrimination by Britain against us, and until this is shown its proposition may be doubted. Its postulate that Britain sacrifices our interests to her own is untenable; nor can it be proven that our welfare would be greatly promoted by free trade with the United States, while our trade with Britain, under such circumstances, would be but very slightly injured. If the N.P. discriminates against British trade by taxing manufactures at a higher rate than natural products, it discriminates in the same way against American trade by taxing American manufactures at precisely the same rate; and if the rate of duty under the N.P. is lower upon "natural products" whatever that may mean, and if under this lower rate American trade is favored, it is because the United States produces such products, they being in demand in Canada, while

Britain does not produce them. For instance, Canada consumes large quantities of hog products, but how can it be said that the Canadian duty upon hog products discriminates against Britain since Britain is not an exporter of hog products? Reference is made to the value of imports into Canada from Great Britain and from the United States, and that more revenue is derived from duties upon British than upon American merchandise. This reference is made to deceive. The reason why we collect more revenue from British merchandise is because we buy more of such merchandise from Britain than from the United States. This merchandise is of a character that is not produced in Canada and the production of it in Britain is cheaper than in the United States. On the other hand the revenue collected upon merchandise from the United States is comparatively small because a very large proportion of it is what the *Globe* calls "natural products," the same being essential to greater or less extent in the manufacturing industries of this country. Britain does not produce these articles, therefore, in admitting them at the low rate of duty, no discrimination whatever is made against Britain.

The *Globe* should remember this: many of the manufactured products of both Britain and the United States imported into Canada are of very similar character; and the reason why such large quantities of them are imported from the United States is because they are quite as cheap, or cheaper there than in Britain, and this incident clearly demonstrates the value of protection as practiced in the United States, seeing that under it manufacturing industries have expanded, and the cost of production lowered to a point where that country can successfully compete with free trade Britain in the markets of the world.

There is another view to be taken of this question of discrimination. It is evident that Canada is in no mood to enter into any arrangements with the United States whereby there will be any discrimination against Britain. Britain does not discriminate against Canada, but that is just what the United States does, as exemplified by a duty of five cents per dozen upon Canadian eggs. For years and years Canada has maintained a standing offer to the United States to have a free exchange of certain natural products, but the invitation has not only not been accepted, but has been replied to by excessive duties levied upon most Canadian agricultural products. But Canada admits American manufactures on the same terms that British manufactures are admitted, and under this arrangement many millions of Canadian money goes into the pockets of commercial enemies instead of British friends.

The *Globe's* plan for overcoming this commercial discrimination on the part of the United States against Canada is for Canada to crouch at the feet of the American Government and beg to be taken under its protecting wing. It wants to sacrifice those things that Canada holds dear—its self respect, its autonomy and its British connection; and these sacrifices mean the same measure of discrimination against Britain than now characterizes the McKinley tariff. We, too, are in favor of discrimination, but not of that character. The discrimination we would suggest would be for Canada to adopt the McKinley tariff as against all importations of manufactures from the United States, while maintaining our present tariff as against the rest of the world. Surely the