

per week, according to expertness. Besides this, the laws there insist upon proper factory regulations as regards age, hours of work, and other restrictions, which affect the health and comfort of employees. But in Redditch the work is largely performed in private houses, by women and children, who earn the merest pittance, and who, so far as the comforts of life are concerned, are not nearly so well-to-do as the slaves of the South in all that goes to make up the sum of human happiness.

WE have received the following inquiries from a Canadian correspondent:

Question: What was the consumption of iron ore in the United States during last year and during any number of recent years? What quantities thereof were imported foreign ore?

Answer: The consumption of iron ore in the United States in 1888 was 12,650,000 gross tons, against 12,500,000 tons in 1887, and 11,300,000 tons in 1886. Of the above aggregates, we imported, in 1888, 587,470 gross tons, against 1,194,301 tons in 1887, 1,039,433 tons in 1886, and 437,680 tons in 1885. For the ten months ending October 31, 1889, our imports were 716,859 tons, against 516,623 tons for the corresponding period of last year.

Question: What was the duty on iron ore under the Morrill tariff, in 1865, and what changes have been made since then?

Answer: Iron ore was not specifically mentioned in the Morrill Act, but it was subject to a duty of 20 per cent. *ad valorem* under the section which read, "all mineral or bituminous substances not otherwise provided for." This was equivalent to from 45 to 55 per cent. specific duty; but the imports of iron ore prior to 1879 were inconsiderable, and hence there was no special call for a protective duty. It was in view of the rapid increase in importations subsequent to 1880 that the present specific duty of 75 cents per ton was imposed.

Question: What was the duty on pig iron at similar dates?

Answer: The present duty on pig iron is \$6.72 per ton. Prior to 1883 it was \$7 per ton. The importations of pig iron in 1885 were 164,349 net tons; in 1886, 405,180 tons; in 1887, 523,625 tons, and in 1888, 220,905 tons. For the ten months ending October 31, 1889, they were 123,853 net tons, against 157,542 tons for the corresponding period of 1888.—*Cleveland Iron Trade Review.*

If it could only obtain Reciprocity, the *Toronto Globe* and its subsidizers, the Americanized owners of Canadian iron mines, say they could export to the United States 2,000,000 tons of iron ore annually. This is what the *Globe* says:

The export of only 2,000,000 tons of iron ore annually would give subsistence to 63,000 people, besides the 9,000 men engaged in mining * * Reciprocity would not only give Ontario an iron mining industry employing 9,000 men, and supporting altogether 72,000 people, but would also give Toronto immense blast furnaces, rolling mills, and other manufactures of iron.

The *Globe* had quoted the estimate made by statisticians that about seven people are wholly supported by each able-bodied workman in the country. As cheap as labor now is, the *Globe* says it would be cheaper under Reciprocity, in the min-

ing of iron ore. Mr. Ledyard says that the ore in his Peterborough mine can be taken out at a cost of one dollar a ton. Mr. Carnegie, an authority introduced by Mr. Ledyard, says that the mining of Cuban ores costs one dollar a ton, and that the workers in the Cuban mines receive from sixty to seventy cents a day for their services. This means that the Canadian workers in Mr. Ledyard's mines would receive from sixty to seventy cents a day for their services. The *Globe* says that each of these workers would support on an average seven other persons. In other words, that 72,000 people would be supported by 9,000 working miners, who would receive from sixty to seventy cents a day each for their services. These 9,000 workmen who would produce 2,000,000 tons of ore for the Americanized subsidizers of the *Globe*, would, under the competition of Cuba, probably receive from \$5,400 to \$6,300 for so doing; but when this 2,000,000 tons of ore reached the American market the owners of it would be paid \$7 a ton for it, of \$14,000,000. Of course the Americanized owners of these Canadian iron mines could well afford to give the *Globe* a very liberal subsidy for its services in working up a Reciprocity that would put so many millions of dollars in their pockets at so small an expense to them for miners' wages.

In a recent issue of this journal allusion was made to the very cordial reception in Britain accorded to Mr. C. C. Taylor, of Her Majesty's customs, this city, while there last summer. Mr. Taylor delivered addresses in a number of English cities showing that the people and the industries of that country would be benefited by the adoption of tariff protection. The *Toronto Mail*, alluding to the incident, inquired if Mr. Taylor was anxious that the British Parliament should place a duty on Canadian wheat; in answer to which Mr. Taylor, in a letter in the *Mail*, speaking of his discussions of the subject in England, says that the argument was advanced, sustained by the figures, that the exports to the United States had not fallen off for many years; but, Mr. Taylor remarks, the speaker "forgot that in the great bulk of staple Manchester goods the trade had entirely ceased." Mr. Taylor lived in Lancashire for several years as a buyer and exporter to the Toronto market, and also for six years represented in Canada and the United States that large Manchester house of which Mr. Thomas Bailey Potter, the president of the British Free Trade League, was the head. During those six years Mr. Taylor saw line after line of British made goods shut out from the United States, and their places supplied by domestic manufactures, fostered by a protective tariff averaging sixty per cent. Mr. Taylor would rather have some reciprocal arrangement with Britain than with the United States; and if the mother country would discriminate in favor of Canada by admitting all her products free, and placing a duty on American products, the *Mail's* question would be answered. A letter recently received by Mr. Taylor from Mr. H. F. Hibbert, Mayor of the important manufacturing town of Chorley, England, alluding to the "Fair Trade" party in that country and the efforts that are being made in that direction, says "We are still fighting, and I am beginning to feel that the day of our deliverance from this vast mass of foreign manufactures which invades our shores daily, and which takes the bread from the mouths of British workmen, is approaching."