

which all parties should hold themselves bound to promote. And one object for which this journal will strive, to the best of its ability, will be to make the trade question a purely industrial, non-political issue, to be debated only on its own intrinsic merits, as just stated.

PERPETUAL ORGANIZATION.

It is an oft-quoted saying that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. We may take the idea which inspires the remark give it another application, and say that perpetual organization is the price of safety to Canadian manufactures. The hope is a proper one to express, that the time may soon come when Protection to home interests will be a settled thing for Canada, and when attempts to reverse this policy will cease. But evidently that time has not yet come; in fact it appears that the fight on the trade question is still going on, and is likely to keep going on for years. Nor is this so much to be wondered at. In the United States, with Protection established for twenty years, our neighbours are only now nearing the end of the long struggle. It will not last so long in Canada, for the reason that the settlement of the question there involves very largely its settlement in Canada too. The material circumstances of the two countries are so much alike that the commercial system which gains the victory over the border will certainly carry the day in Canada as well. We take our political institutions, laws, morals and manners mostly from the Mother Country, with, however, the important difference of having the State Church and the landed aristocracy left out. In religion, in poetry, and in philosophy, we draw from transatlantic sources of inspiration; our opinions are swayed by the thoughts, written or spoken, of Macaulay, Carlyle, Disraeli, and Gladstone. On all such subjects we think very much as the great leaders of English thought have chosen to think for us. Far otherwise, however, is it with our industrial enterprises, whether on the farm or in the factory. In their own respective domains we may follow Dickens, Reade, Huxley, or Matthew Arnold, but in our ways of mechanical working we are Americans, as much as our neighbours over the border. In certain realms of thought we may follow Oxford, or Cambridge, or Edinburgh, or Dublin, but when it comes to driving shoe pegs by machinery we follow Massachusetts. Our cotton machinery, brought from England though it be, is worked so as to produce goods like those of Lawrence and Fall River, not like those of Blackburn and Preston. Our agricultural machinery is made after Ohio and Illinois patterns, with perhaps a few Canadian improvements: our stoves are copies from Albany and Troy. We are likely from the mere force of material circumstances to go the same road as our neighbours have been and are still going on the trade question. The same material reasons which dictate their commercial and manufacturing course will dictate ours. Canada belongs industrially to the American continental system, though not perhaps in the sense implied by Mr. Goldwin Smith. The force of material circumstances is upon us, and we cannot escape from it. We must manufacture and manage and organize our manufactures as the Americans do. And from this fact, which appears to be really beyond dispute, we may draw a lesson.

In the United States each particular manufacture of any considerable importance is organized for self-protection. There the number of special trade journals is legion, each one devoted to its speciality. There are trade associations which have their regular meetings once a year at least, taking cognizance of everything appertaining to their respective lines. Now, it may be that our population and manufactures are neither of them yet large enough to warrant a considerable number of trade associations and trade journals speaking their views. But trade associations we should have, and the CANADIAN MANUFACTURER AND INDUSTRIAL WORLD offers itself as the

medium for their expression. It is not likely that our children will wonder by what trick of legislation this natural destiny of that Province was so long delayed. That Province was marked out by nature for a manufacturing district as clearly as Clydesdale or Tyneside, and nothing but the delusion that wealth was to be found only in shipping and importing prevented that destiny from being realized long ago.

We are not without warning as to the danger of neglecting organization in connection with manufactures. In 1858 there was a movement in Old Canada, under the leadership of the Hon. ISAAC BUCHANAN, for the adoption of Protection to home manufactures. The movement succeeded, and the same year, not in 1859, as seems to be generally supposed, a 20 and 25 per cent. tariff was placed on the statute book. Then the men who had been the life of the movement rested, allowed their organization to drop, and with what result? Why, with this result, namely, that when the details of Confederation were settled, in 1865 and 1866, the figure was reduced to 15 per cent. A brave minority in Parliament, including men of both parties, fought against the change, but were powerless to prevent it. The Canadian Industrial Association of 1858 had become defunct: there was no machinery at hand for supporting out of doors the earnest protest which was made by the minority in the House. The pressure from the Maritime Provinces in favour of free trade was strong, and at the same time open and understood. The pressure from England in the same direction was stronger still, though mostly exercised in a manner of which the people of these Provinces knew little or nothing. Our public men succumbed to it, the pressure was too much for them. Let it be remembered that the change adopted in 1858, and somewhat amended in 1859, was then