

the United States. Of course, Maine could not pass a tariff law which would discriminate against Texas, both being integral parts of one country, but it fails to observe that Canada is an integral part of the British Empire, and the British preference to Canada would not discriminate against any particular foreign country. Great Britain does not find it a cause of war because the United States discriminates against all foreign countries in the matter of export duties on hemp from the Philippine Islands. But it is a most unfriendly discrimination aimed directly against the cordage industry of Canada. It might be said that the Philippine Islands are related to the United States somewhat as Canada is related to Great Britain. But if it is wrong and unfriendly for Great Britain to give tariff discrimination to Canada, to the detriment of the United States, is it not also equally wrong and unfriendly for the United States to give tariff discrimination to the Philippine Islands to the detriment of Canada? The United States imposes an export duty on all manilla fibre exported from these Islands, the full amount of which is remitted when the article is imported into the United States.

One of the non-gunpowder acts of war which the United States, according to Mr. Carnegie and Harper's Weekly, threaten to inflict upon Canada, and with wonderful and sudden effect, is the abrogation of the bonding privilege by which Canadian grain and other merchandise is allowed to be transported in bond from Canada through United States territory to shipping ports in that country to Great Britain and other countries; but it should not be forgotten that that privilege works the other way also, and that millions of tons of merchandise of United States origin are transported from New England points to the Western States, passing through Canadian territory. Suppose Harper's Weekly talk the matter over with the New England manufacturers and the western consumers. And what about the free use of Canadian canals?

No doubt great inconvenience and loss would occur to the commercial interests of Canada were the impractical ideas of Mr. Carnegie and Harper's Weekly be carried into effect, but it should be remembered that they are far astray in supposing that Canada has no Atlantic ports that are ice-bound and closed to shipping at any season of the year; and that Boston and Portland are our only dependence. These American ports are used as a matter of convenience and economy, not of absolute necessity. There is a large volume of trade done by Canada with countries other than the United States which would be affected, and it would be the transportation companies that would probably insist upon having something to say in the matter. During the fiscal year 1903 the value of the merchandise imported into and exported from Canada through the United States from and to countries other than the United States, was as follows:

Imported.....	\$24,843,380
Exported	49,509,926
	<u>\$74,352,406</u>

Do New York, Boston and Portland comprehend what the handling of nearly seventy-five millions of dollars worth of merchandise means to their commerce—merchandise to be transported to and from Canada? Do they comprehend what their loss would be were they deprived of the trade?

He who even threatens to disturb the friendly relations now existing between Canada and the United States can be no friend to either country—he who attempts to disturb them should be squelched. Let us have peace!

INDUSTRIAL CANADA—AN "ORGAN."

There is a paper published in Toronto called Industrial Canada, which is the official organ of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association; and is owned and run by the Association. In its January issue it has some pretty things to say about THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER, preliminary to some things which are not so pretty—or truthful. It says:

THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER for many years well deserved its name, but which might now be more appropriately called the "American Manufacturer," as its chief aim at present seems to be to promote the sale in Canada of United States manufactured goods. For about thirty years THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER has been earnestly advocating adequate protection for Canadian industries, and during the past year it has published some admirable editorials in favor of higher protection, but a few weeks ago it made a sudden change of front and is now favoring a reciprocity treaty with the United States, alleging that Canadian manufacturers cannot supply the goods the people require, and opposing a general revision of the Canadian tariff. . . . It is true that our factories would have to be enlarged if American goods were, to a great extent, excluded by a higher tariff, but there would be no difficulty in securing capital for such extensions if adequate protection were given to Canadian industries. . . . THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER certainly does not represent the views of Canadian manufacturers. Under its present name it is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It should change its name to suit its new policy.

A few weeks ago, that is, in our issue of December 4 last, in an editorial entitled "Which" we discussed the various tariff propositions that are before the voters of Canada, and which, in our opinion, deserved careful and intelligent consideration. We alluded to them as follows, but gave no opinion regarding either of them. We said:

Perhaps the most important questions now being forced upon the attention of Canadians are: tariff revision, as advocated by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, where, as it is declared, the entire schedule should be revised; a tariff of a distinctly retaliatory character against imports from the United States, the idea being to make the tariff of Canada impose as high duties against the United States products as the United States tariff imposes upon Canadian products; a tariff granting an increased and enlarged preference in favor of British products, and the renewal of a reciprocal trade arrangement with the United States by which no duty would be imposed by one country upon imports of natural products from the other.

Industrial Canada, in alluding to this editorial, omitted entirely the above paragraph.

Tennyson, in writing of such omissions, says:

And the parson made it his text that week, and he said likewise,
That a lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies;
That a lie which is all a lie may be met and fought with outright,
But a lie which is part a truth is a harder matter to fight.

Had our critic been honest enough to have reproduced the above paragraph he would not have dared to have said that we favored a reciprocity treaty with the United States on the ground that Canadian manufacturers cannot supply the goods the people require, or on any other ground; nor could it have said that in that article we opposed a general revision of the tariff. As the caption "Which" indicated, the object of the article was to direct attention to the different propositions regarding the tariff now before the people. There was no allusion made to a reciprocity treaty with the United States which would in any way affect the manufacturing industries of Canada, the reference being to reciprocity in raw materials and natural products only.

A lie which is half a truth is ever the blackest of lies.

Is it an offence against good morals or Canadian interests that THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER, or any other journal, or