

INDUSTRIAL WORLD

AND NATIONAL ECONOMIST.

DEVOTED TO HOME INDUSTRIES, SCIENCE, COMMERCE, FINANCE, INSURANCE, RAILROADS AND MINING.

Vol. II—No. 44.

THURSDAY, MAY 12, 1881.

\$3 PER ANNUM.

THE INDUSTRIAL WORLD

AND NATIONAL ECONOMIST.
PUBLISHED ONCE A WEEK.
FREDERIC NICHOLLS, GENERAL MANAGER,
TORONTO.

SUBSCRIBERS.
For the United States, in advance, per year, Three dollars.
Remittances should be made by registered money order payable to F. NICHOLLS, 100, INDUSTRIAL WORLD.

TO ADVERTISERS.
The INDUSTRIAL WORLD, on account of its large general circulation, commands itself as a desirable medium for all who seek to place their views on interesting subjects before their brethren in the trade. Its advertising rates are low when compared with those of other leading scientific and industrial publications. Care of rates on application.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.
The "National Industries" is published for the unrestricted use of those who place their views on interesting subjects before their brethren in the trade. The nature of an advertisement printed in this department.

INDUSTRIAL WORLD OFFICE.
Drawer 1010, Ottawa, Ont.
All business letters, inquiries and advertisements to be addressed to
FREDERIC NICHOLLS,
INDUSTRIAL WORLD OFFICE,
TORONTO, Ont.

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN RAILWAYS.

It was announced a few days ago that the Duke of Sutherland and several leading English railway officials had arrived in New York for the purpose of investigating the working of leading lines in the United States. The object of the visit is stated by Mr. Nixie, Superintendent of the London and North-Western railway, who is one of the party. — Primarily, its purpose is to inspect the railway system of the United States, and learn from personal observation whether there are any features worthy of introduction upon the London and North-Western line. The transportation of baggage as well as of passengers will be studied. Of course, being Englishmen, the method of registering luggage now in vogue in England, under firm defenders in them. At the same time, the convenience of the American system of checking is not understood, and particular attention will be given to its details. The company, Mr. Nixie says, had made an effort at one time to forward baggage from any point on its line through to the United States, but had met with so much opposition from the steamship companies that the system had to be abandoned. As regards the passenger coaches, he thinks that those on their line give fully as much satisfaction as those on the American ones. They are a combination of the Pullman and the conventional English coach, combining all the conveniences of the one and the privacy of the other. Still, there was always something new to be learned from the workings of every railway system, and any American ideas of value would find ready appreciation. The devoted railroads may receive some attention, although they at present form no part of the English company's system. As some of the directors are financially interested in some of the railroads of the United States attention will doubtless be given to those particular roads. There was nothing to warrant the impression that the Duke of Sutherland had crossed the Atlantic to in-

vest in railroad stock, as he is already one of the largest stockholders in companies at his own door. As a rule Old Country people are very conservative in their ideas on railway as well as other matters, being slow to make changes simply for the sake of change. In some respects the English Railways are better managed than those of the United States; while as regards the convenience of the travelling public, it is safe to say the latter are in some, but not all, respects superior. The checking system on this side of the Atlantic is a decided improvement upon the English system; and it is only necessary to have it put in operation in England to insure its general popularity. A marked difference between travelling by rail in the United Kingdom and in the United States and Canada is the comparative privacy connected with the former. We have no hesitation in saying, however, that the majority of those who have had experience of both systems would, if appealed to, decide in favour of the style of carriage used on this continent, which are better adapted for long journeys than the narrow compartments into which English carriages are divided. In England no difficulty is experienced in recognizing the officials of the road, as every man in a company's service, from the station master to the brakeman, is dressed in official uniform. On this side the "herring pond" it is with the utmost difficulty in many cases that the traveller can tell "who's who," so far as the officials are concerned. While on this subject, it may be remarked that there is a great room for improvement on some of our Canadian railways. The accommodation for the travelling public at many of the stations is anything but what it might be—in some cases disgracefully deficient. Under the new and more prosperous condition of affairs which was recently inaugurated, the directors should be able to see their way clear to effect many much-needed improvements.

"PROGRESS AND POVERTY."

Some little stir has been created by the recent appearance of a book bearing the above title, and from the pen of an American writer, Mr. HARRY GEORGE. It is one of the most "radical" books ever written, in any language, and the author is certainly getting himself talked about, though not much in the way of compliment. He starts with the rather discouraging statement that what we call the progress of the human race—civilization, enlightenment and modern improvements generally—does not tend to make man better off and happier, but the reverse. The greater our progress, the greater becomes the contrast between vast wealth and squalid poverty, existing side by side. That the rich are becoming richer and the poor poorer is an old story, and one that has been often told before. And yet it may not be wise to dismiss it too curtly, as if we attached no importance to it, and might safely refuse to consider it. The rise of Socialism in Western Europe, and of Nihilism in Russia, the murder of the late Czar and the acknowledged peril of his successor, are facts that cannot be pooh-poohed, but must command attention. Even in that country of unhampered "land and liberty," the United States of America, dark shadows are creeping forward. We have learned that the "dangerous classes" exist in American cities, as well as in London and Paris, and the flames of Pittsburg have caused us to see what before would not believe to exist on this side the Atlantic. Nor may we comfort ourselves with the idea that the dissatisfied and discontented are wholly without ground of complaint, and have no "case" with which to challenge public opinion. Only within

a very few years has it become a matter of general knowledge that there are two railway kings in the United States who hold wealth to the amount of about a hundred millions each, and this in a Democratic country. They may not be far wrong who believe that such colossal fortunes constitute a real danger to the State, and that all property would be safer were there none such in existence. That OGDON and VANDERBILT have themselves really created this enormous wealth of theirs nobody believes; nine-tenths and more of it have been created by the labour of others and the progress of the country generally. But, in whatever way or from whatever cause it comes about, the fact is forcing itself upon public attention that the contrast of great poverty beside great wealth, is to be seen in the new world as well as in the old. Mr. GEORGE'S remedy for the poverty which he affirms to be co-existent with progress is a very sweeping and radical one indeed. He would confiscate the rent of all land, which would become again what it was at first—the property of the State. Present owners would retain their buildings and other improvements but would pay ground rent to the Government, and this ground rent would be the only tax levied by the Government at all. Mr. GEORGE styles him "the philosophic apostle of confiscation," and pronounces the theory that rent is the universal source of pauperism a "marvellous" one. The sources of pauperism are many and various, and the evil cannot, so says the Professor, be cured by the confiscation of private property in land. No such change could be effected without terrible civil wars, and after frightful bloodshed the present system would probably remain, in spite of all that the attacking party could do. Taking up the Irish land question, Mr. GEORGE says that it is not really different from the land question in England or America, and that Irish tenants are positively living under more favourable land laws than those which prevail in Great Britain. The power of the landlord to take the highest rent he can get, and to make distresses and evictions, is just as great in Lancashire and the State of New York as it is in Connaught. This is true enough, but the fact remains that circumstances alter cases, and that the working of the same law is very different in the two islands. Mr. NIXIE rightly points out that the Irish Land Leaguers certainly do not take Mr. GEORGE'S view of property. Were he to propose to them to make their farms the common property of the human race, he would probably get a few slugs in the body for his own share. Give an Irish tenant his bit of land free, and then ask him to share it with the first homeless labourer that passes who has none. It would be found that the new owner of ten or twenty acres would not, any more than the owner of half a county, allow anyone else to claim a share, and that he would fight and die sooner than give it up. It appears safe to conclude that, in either Ireland, or Canada, or the United States, for instance, halt the grown up men of the country would have to be killed, or made prisoners of war, before Mr. GEORGE'S plan could be carried out. It is not within the range of practical politics. Impracticable as the proposed remedy is, however, the existence of poverty along with progress is no wild fancy, by any means, but a grave fact. It is only too true, though there is nothing new in saying it, that the competition for employment—the struggle to obtain work and wages—becomes keener and more pressing with the advance of civilization and material progress generally. In a new country there is more work to do than hands to do it; in an old country there is not work enough for the hands. From these unquestionable facts what infer-

ence should be drawn as to the probable future of the question between Protection and Free Trade? A certain inference of vast importance there is, we think, to be drawn from them, and one that is perfectly unassailable. If the competition for employment is to become greater as the world progressed, then each Government will be more and more pressed to keep for its own people as much as possible of such employment as the country's own home market affords. The more that any Government is pressed to find work for its people, the less can it afford to admit foreign commodities free, and thereby diminish the general sum of employment at home. Import from abroad a year's produce of a thousand looms, and a thousand looms that would otherwise be running at home will stand idle. It is futile to say that if the people are not weaving cloth they will be raising grain or making lumber. Starting a cotton factory, for instance, does not diminish by a dollar's worth the country's annual production from the farm and the forest; it merely adds a new production of cotton goods to the former production of lumber and grain. It is this addition of a new production, the old production going on as before which is the true secret of the prosperity which Protection brings. But if the world's progress brings keener competition in all countries for work and wages, then each Government must adopt Protection in order to keep as much as possible of its own country's work for its own people. And this is precisely what is going on now, witness France, Germany and the United States. The system of Free Trade has, therefore, no future before it in the civilized world outside of England.

BRITISH FOREIGN AND COLONIAL TRADE.

A pamphlet has been published containing an analysis of the British Board of Trade returns for the last twelve years, a summary of which is before us, and from which we make some extracts, as the subject is one of interest at the present time. The following table of European trade is published:—

Country.	Average Trade 1870-80	Per Cent. 1880-81	Per Cent. 1881-82	Per Cent. 1882-83
Germany.....	13,125,022	-33	-11	-17
Holland.....	6,331,443	-31	-49	-21
France.....	6,237,738	20	-131	-61
Russia.....	5,774,014	19	-19	-27
Italy.....	3,632,643	-31	-18	-21
Spain, etc.....	2,992,837	-61	-17	-21
Belgium.....	2,292,674	53	1	18
Portugal, etc.....	825,848	-171	-91	-20
Austria, etc.....	330,273	-39	-37	-29
Total.....	44,502,406	-14	-30	-11

The reviewer points out that British exports of manufactures to the principal European countries have either declined, or, if they have increased, the increase is almost wholly in machinery and coal. The figures furnished are regarded as evidence that the chief foreign nations with which Great Britain trades have, during the past decade, been gradually diminishing their purchases of manufactures. Then comes the statement that "this is a serious state of things, and calls for careful consideration." Next we have the important question, to what cause is the decline to be attributed? The answer is:—"It is difficult, perhaps, to point to any particular influence which has been at work to produce this result. Hostile tariffs have had no little effect. The advances made on the continent in manufacturing enterprise, and perhaps the collapse of many foreign loans, have also acted in the same direction." The British manufacturer is beginning to find that "hostile tariffs" are operating against him. By painful experience he is discovering that the growth of a Protectionist principle—the development of home industries

in other countries of Europe is seriously operating against his interests; and he finds the home market flooded with the manufactures of the United States, which are taken across the Atlantic and sold at his own door at as low a figure as he himself can sell to the wholesale dealer. Under the circumstances it is no wonder that dissatisfaction is growing in the United Kingdom, and that it is becoming a question of the gravest import how long shall this state of affairs be allowed to continue? The return next examined possess particular interest for Canada. The colonial export trade for the last ten years is thus analyzed:—

Country.	Average Exports 1870-71	1877-78	1878-79
India, etc.....	41,532,466	42,208,000	43,770,000
Australia.....	7,257,708	11,117,007	11,177,800
Canada.....	6,732,500	6,643,100	6,300,000
British Possessions.....	3,322,228	4,292,000	5,077,000

On these figures the reviewer makes the following comments:—"It must of course be borne in mind that during the last three years trade throughout the world has been greatly depressed. But the important fact which these figures distinctly prove is that whereas our trade with continental Europe for 1878-80 shows a decline of 11 per cent, as compared with the trade of 1869-71, our colonial trade shows an increase of 35 per cent. This, however, is not the only consideration. In 1869 India was only the third on the list of customers for British manufactures. She is now the first. Australia has advanced from the seventh to the fourth place, and has increased her imports from Great Britain nearly 50 per cent. Our miscellaneous dependencies and colonies, classified under the head of 'other British possessions,' take now nearly 60 per cent. more than in 1869. Moreover, if we take the average of the last nine years, we find that the value of our exports to the colonies amounts to nearly one-fourth of our whole export trade, whereas in 1869 it was less than one-sixth. The result, as a whole, is looked upon as satisfactory. The article closes as follows:—

"We think we are certainly justified in claiming consideration for these returns. They show in the most conclusive manner that the oft-repeated maxim that 'trade follows the flag' is not the exploded fallacy which some political economists have wished us to believe. We have been told by some writers that the British colonies are not more anxious to purchase the products of home industry than the Frenchman, Italian or Turk; that a colony is in fact no better than a foreign country; and that we must infer that its possession brings with it no commercial pecuniary advantages of any kind. This argument, it seems to us, is completely destroyed by the statistics which we have quoted. Australia, we find, takes, in proportion to population, twenty times the quantity of our goods that France does, notwithstanding the advantages enjoyed by the latter from its proximity to our country, and the commercial treaty in existence between the two nations. Were this fact a little more widely recognized it would be greatly to the advantage both of this country and of the colonies generally. We should hear less of the grumbling which every now and then is indulged in, that our colonies have involved us in great expense and in great responsibility, for which we receive no compensation whatever." The cry that was raised in Canada after the adoption of the present tariff that it