

mined in the province. As a result of that interview, and the subsequent action of Sir Oliver, we now have a plant in operation in Hamilton with capacity to manufacture 150 tons of pig iron per day.

In replying to this *The Spectator* says:—

Sir Oliver Mowat was forced by public opinion to give a bounty on iron. And while he did right we have no respect for the man who recognizes one branch of industry with one hand, and undertakes with the other hand to ruin not only that branch, but all others. Sir Oliver Mowat knew, and *THE MANUFACTURER* knows, that the publicly declared policy of the Grit party is to wipe out the last vestige of protection, and yet Sir Oliver, who gave a bounty to iron makers, allied himself to the Dominion party, which had publicly declared against protection, and did all in his power to defeat the government whose principal plank was protection.

The *Spectator's* nervousness is very acute, and, approaching a climax, it becomes hysterical because we said:—

We can assure *The Spectator*, and also the Conservative party and its leaders, that that party can never accede to power in Ontario, nor regain power in the Dominion, without the active aid of the protectionists, and we can also truthfully say that whichever political party most honestly and sincerely advocates and upholds the cause of tariff protection, will undoubtedly have the voting support of the protectionists of Canada.

It starts a catechism. It wants to know things. It enquires if the Conservative party has ever given the slightest reason to suppose that it is to abandon protection. We do not deny that the Conservative party has been very persistent in declaring its adhesion to protection, and, now that *The Spectator* is so very anxious for a statement, we can but apply the adage that actions speak louder than words. We will cite a couple of instances where a very decided deviation was made. In the revision of the tariff in 1894 Mr. Foster made a very obvious departure from the principle of protection; and we commend to *The Spectator* a perusal of the speech of the Finance Minister on the occasion of his introducing his bill at that time amending the tariff. We hope our contemporary will reproduce in its columns the opening sentences of that speech. It was an occasion when any sincere advocate of protection might lament that the Conservative party, by the very mouth of the Finance Minister, who had authority to speak for it, gave a very strong reason for the belief that in that respect at least, that party had abandoned the spirit of protection. That was an instance where profession and practise did not harmonize. The catechism also enquires "Is there any shadow of a reason for supposing that the Conservative party contemplates even the removal of protection from the first place in the list of party principles?" *The Spectator* thinks not. We think—nay, we know, that the party, or, more correctly speaking, the leaders of it, placed protection far in the background, and at a most fearful disadvantage, when it brought the Manitoba school question to the front, far in advance of everything else, and upon that question forced a conflict that could not but prove disastrous, not only to the party, but to protection. The Conservative party was not placed in power upon any school or religious issue; and when it acquiesced in the disturbing whims of some of the party leaders it became liable for whatever might follow from the injection of that inadvisable move into the issue of the recent election. And yet *The Spectator* asks for items, It should know that its party would never have acceded to power in any election ever held in Canada, had it not been

upon the special issue of tariff protection. It should know that in every election since the formation of the Dominion save one, up to that of June last, tariff protection was the shibboleth of their victory, and it should know that protection was not the shibboleth in the June election, but rather shibboleth, otherwise coercion of Manitoba, was the fatal signal for the defeat of what would otherwise have been a victorious party. And still *The Spectator* asks for items. Will it kindly say if, in this respect, there is no reason for the declaration that the Conservative party abandoned protection by removing it from first place in the list of party principles?

This journal does not put up the vote of the manufacturers of Canada at auction to be bid upon by the Grit or any other party, as *The Spectator* intimates. It has no authority, neither does it desire to do so, but we feel quite safe in declaring that when the Conservative party deserts the manufacturers, as we have shown, they are able, and quite prepared to look out for themselves. The adhesion of the manufacturers will be to the party that most closely adheres to their interests.

REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM.

(1.) The effect of ever high duty on imports is to make work scarce. (2.) The immediate result of a duty is an increase in the price with a proportionate shrinkage in the quantity consumed. (3.) If the consumption of a dozen articles gives employment to as many men, a reduction of the number consumed to nine would deprive three men of employment, however much the price might be increased. . . . (4.) The effect of higher duties will be to make work scarce and wages low.—*The Globe*.

(1.) "The effect of a high duty on imports is to make work scarce." Illustration:—Imports in this sense means merchantise. It requires "work," otherwise labor to produce merchantise. If, therefore, merchantise is imported from abroad, ready for consumption, according to *The Globe* it makes work plentiful. Per contra, if the merchantise is manufactured in the country, requiring the services of labor, according to *The Globe* the production at home makes work scarce. This is *Globe* logic.

(2.) "The result of a duty is an increase in the price with a proportionate shrinkage in the quantity consumed." Illustration:—The Canadian farmer is a producer of wheat, and the Canadian people are consumers of flour. The duty upon wheat is fifteen cents per bushel, and upon flour seventy-five cents per barrel, and yet bread is as cheap in Canada as in the United States or Great Britain. The duty upon wheat has not raised the price of bread, neither has the duty upon flour; nor has it caused a proportionate shrinkage in the consumption. Just as much wheat, flour and bread are consumed in Canada per capita under the present tariff system as before. Then why the duty? The duty upon wheat keeps out foreign wheat, and gives the home market to the Canadian farmer. If there was no duty the Canadian farmer would be handicapped by the competition of the foreign farmer. The duty upon flour gives the Canadian miller the benefit of the home market. If there was no duty the Canadian miller would be handicapped by the competition of the foreign miller. Both the farming and the milling industries in Canada give employment to large numbers of laborers, while the competition among those employed in these industries tends to and does keep prices from becoming exorbitant. Neither wheat,