

flour nor bread would be any cheaper under free trade, but the foreign producer would share the market with the home producer, and the home producer would be injured to that extent. The *Globe's* argument is in a directly contrary direction, which is *Globe* logic.

(3.) "If the consumption of a dozen articles gives employment to as many men, a reduction of the number consumed to nine would deprive three men of employment, however much the price might be increased." Illustration:—If the consumptive requirement of the country amounts to a dozen articles, these articles must be produced either at home or abroad. If abroad, employment is afforded to a dozen foreigners, and a dozen natives are deprived of that labor. If the foreign competition is so keen as to force the retirement of three natives from the business, it is certain that it supplies work for three foreigners. Depriving natives of their employment does not necessarily mean any increase or decrease in the price of the merchandise in the manufacture of which they had been engaged. But it does mean that the producers of food stuffs and other necessities that had previously been required by the unemployed, would find their market narrowed to that extent. The *Globe's* logic is bad.

(4.) "The effect of high duties is to make work scarce and wages low." Illustration:—The effect of high duties is to keep out foreign goods and to encourage the production of domestic goods. Production of merchandise means the employment of labor, and the employment of labor means good wages. Therefore, according to The *Globe*, if we remove high duties and thereby encourage the importation of foreign goods, in the production of which employment is given to foreign labor, employment to home labor is made more abundant and wages are increased. A queer argument, but this is *Globe* logic.

It is a most remarkable feature in so-called high class, intelligent journalism, such as The *Globe* is an exponent of, that in four consecutive sentences in a leading editorial such illogical and ridiculous postulates should be advanced.

#### TO BE OR NOT TO BE.

Discussing an editorial in this journal in which allusion was made to the recent Conservative conference in Toronto, and in which attention was directed to the fact that Sir Oliver Mowat, while Premier of Ontario, had acceded to the request of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association to give some substantial assistance towards the establishment of the iron industry in this province, to which he was quick to respond by promising a bounty of \$1 per ton upon all pig iron made in the province of ores mined in the province, The *Ottawa Citizen* comes to the conclusion that this journal "supports the Ontario Government on the ground that it is a protectionist government." It tells us that the Ontario Government is a protectionist government in fact: that it has actually given the bounty mentioned for the manufacture of pig iron, and that in that one practical case it has acted upon protectionist lines. But it qualifies its remarks by declaring that in so doing the Ontario Government has stultified the profession of every member of the government, of every newspaper that supports it, and of the party in the Dominion to which it belongs.

The reason why The *Citizen* thinks this journal in the wrong

in commending Sir Oliver Mowat for bestowing an encouraging bounty upon the Ontario pig iron industry is that the Ontario Liberals are a wing of the Dominion Liberals; that for federal purposes they profess a belief in free trade; that they declare on the hustings and in the press that protection means the robbery of one class for the benefit of another; that it fosters the growth of artificial industries; that it stunts and mangles those that are proper to the country, that it cuts down our foreign trade and maims commerce, and a lot more of such objectionable things; and that, in the unique and classic language of Sir Richard Cartwright, one of the sacred principles of the Liberal party is that protected manufacturers are scoundrels. The *Citizen* tells us that this journal is oblivious to these facts—to this phase of the question—and is favorable to the Ontario Government because of its practical adhesion to protectionist principles in the matter of pig iron; and it volunteers the suggestion that if the success of the Ontario Government means the continuance in power of the Liberals at Ottawa, the cause that this journal has at heart will have little to be thankful for.

It is really distressing to be thus lectured by The *Citizen*. It harrows our feelings to a most poignant degree. It breaks our heart, or words to that effect, and causes us to lose much sleep. In fact we lay awake at night grieving to think that the Liberals are such naughty fellows, and that we have been found in company with them. But blows upon our devoted head do not come singly, for The *Hamilton Spectator* lends a willing hand in the infliction simply because we said that Sir Oliver, whatever his political profession may be, had acted the role of a protectionist in the pig iron matter. It seems to be a staggering blow to these protectionist journals that such a pronounced free trader as Sir Oliver should have so far demeaned himself as to steal protection thunder. The failure of the political party to which The *Citizen* and The *Spectator* are attached, to do all that might have been done in the direction of protection, might have been the inducement for Sir Oliver to help along the neglected cause, but is it not rather unkind of them to denounce the man who supplied the deficiency, and the journal that patted him on the back for so doing? The *Spectator* goes to the rabid extent of saying that the Ontario Government has properly nothing whatever to do with political questions, by which it means to say that the encouragement of the manufacture of pig iron in Ontario, being a political question, Sir Oliver should not have meddled with by bestowing a bonus upon it; and that sooner than see such an act performed by a Liberal, it would have been better pleased, and it would have been better for the interests of Ontario, had it not been performed. We are thankful to say that in this respect our views are widely different from those of The *Spectator*. In this connection, however, it might be pertinent to remark that The *Spectator* never lost an opportunity to berate Sir Oliver because he did not interfere to prevent the export of Ontario pine logs to the United States, which question is undeniably one that does not come within the scope of the legislation of Ontario, but of the Dominion. The *Spectator* abuses Sir Oliver because he sold Ontario timber limits to whoever would pay the most for them, but it had but little chidings for the Dominion Government because it did not, and does not, prohibit the export of pine logs.

The *Spectator* tells us that "the Ontario Government iden-