

risk of burdening ourselves with such people in the mass. We strongly approve of and believe in efforts to reform and elevate the submerged tenth, but we wish to avoid placing them here under conditions which would soon smother them again. It is a sound sociological instinct which has prompted the Toronto Trades and Labor Council to start a propaganda on the subject. The Week.

No policy is national that leaves any branch of industry out of account.—R. W. Elliot.

Free importation is but half of free trade, and the worse half.

Before the foreign producer enters the Canadian market in competition with the Canadian producer he should pay as much or more by way of customs duties as may be equivalent to what the Canadian producer is compelled to pay in support of the state.—R. W. Elliot.

Attention is directed to the correspondence to be found in another page under the caption "Under Which Banner." The first letter is from Senator Boulton who challenges the deductions drawn by Mr. R. W. Elliot in favor of the National Policy in a paper read by him before the recent meeting of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association; the second being from Mr. Elliot in reply thereto. Senator Boulton is a theorist who argues from the standpoint of the British free trader and the Canadian importer, while Mr. Elliot views his side of the question from the standpoint of an old and experienced manufacturer who has for many years given close study to the effects of both the fiscal policies that have prevailed in Canada, and also to those that have resulted to Great Britain under the Cobden idea. Mr. Boulton seems very much concerned in behalf of the Canadian farmer, his idea being that if we had in Canada "free trade as they have it in Great Britain" the aforesaid farmer would be immensely benefited thereby. His argument would be more or less plausible if his facts were correctly stated, but he very studiously avoids showing what the effect of free trade has been upon the British farmer. Certainly if "free trade as they have it in Great Britain" can be a good thing for the Canadian farmer, it should also be a good thing for the British farmer; but we all know that the British farmer is in a much worse condition under free trade than the Canadian farmer is under protection.

We have fortunately made no currency mistakes, nor have we, thanks to the steadfastness of the Liberal party, run to the extremes of protection. The earlier measures of a Liberal Government would tend to the encouragement of every industry which was not a clog to its fellows, for each raw material is as important to the manufacturer as to his customers. The needs for the revenue would not be lost sight of, nor would the position and relations of the various callings that make up the activities of the people. The policy of the Liberal party makes it the savior of industry and not its destroyer.—The Globe.

The people of Canada are not likely to swallow such guff. The Globe's language is intended to be ambiguous. It ought to give a diagram explaining what are raw materials. In many lines Canada is better fitted to produce so called raw materials than the highly finished

products. She is fitted to produce pig iron but not prepared to manufacture steel rails. She can produce bar iron but is not prepared to make fine steel, and articles of steel, such as needles, etc. The Globe wants to sacrifice the industries that produce so-called raw materials, and the needs of the revenue would be looked after by the lowering of the duties to a revenue basis upon everything else that is now produced in Canada. It won't do.

If the overthrow of the manufacturers is to be the first and all-important step taken by the Liberal party should they attain to power at the next election, as The Globe says it will be, how can the people of Canada look upon that party in any other light than as commercial assassins?

The Globe tells us that "Liberals are not a party of commercial assassins." The disclaimer comes with bad grace from a journals that also tells us that "the overthrow of the great taxing combine" as it denominates the manufactures, "is the first and all-important step towards a commercial regeneration of Canada."

Mr. William Paterson is a queer man, if our Conservative friends are to be believed. He is a manufacturer who, according to Dr. Montague, grew enormously wealthy under the N.P. He is pledged to support a policy which, according to the Conservatives, will close up his factory or factories, is it? and make him as poor as any of his fellow-citizens. And still, as if unmindful of his fate, he goes about asking, "Has the National Policy made you rich?" The Globe.

Mr. William Patterson, M.P. for Brant, now one of the leading exponents of Mr. Laurier's free trade policy, spoke as follows in the House of Commons in 1876:—"I am not one of those who believe in erecting a wall so high that you cannot trade with any other country, but I must admit I am in favor of a defensive policy. I cannot view with complacency what I see in this country. We live beside a country with a population ten times greater than ours, whose industries have been fostered by protection until they are enabled, even in some article in which Britain excelled, to challenge supremacy with her. While that nation has erected against us and other countries a hostile tariff, we have our hands bound, and give them a free and unrestricted right to trade in our markets. Fancy a commissioner, delegated by this Government and sanctioned by the British Government, sent to Washington to negotiate a reciprocity treaty. The question might be asked what he desired. He replies: 'I wish to have a free market in the United States for the products of our forests, fields and mines.' Then the United States commissioner might ask: 'And what will you give us in return?' Our representative replies: 'The free use of our markets for similar products of your country.' The astute American would naturally say: 'We have that already; I do not see that you offer anything.' We must remember that we should have something to offer when we attempt to open up anew the reciprocity question. I need not remind this House that the great lever we had before in negotiating a reciprocity treaty is ours no longer.

Dominion Analyst McKinley, after a careful analysis, declares the iron ores of Ontario to be at least equal in richness to the best American ores. The policy of the Liberal party is to allow these ores to remain in the earth until the supply elsewhere becomes scarce and foreign iron-workers are compelled to purchase it. The policy of the present Dominion Government, backed by the Conservative