

tin tax will fall with greatest force on the poor and middle classes, as proportionately much more tinware is used in their households than in the houses of the rich." It enumerates "tin pails, tin cups, tin plates, tin dippers and tin pans," and says that the poor man "must continue to use these tin articles; and the Protection party has decreed that he shall pay all the way from twenty to fifty per cent. more for these necessities than he did before the bill was passed. The advance will not be much on a five cent tin cup or a ten cent tin pan, but on a complete outfit of tinware for housekeeping the young working man will find the difference quite an item." An importer of tin plates is reported as saying that "in all probability there will not be as much tin used in the United States as there has been in the past. Tin has been so cheap that it has been put to a variety of uses on that account, and the field has been steadily increasing, much to the benefit of the whole tin trade of the country." Allusion is made to the fact that the canning industries "have been able to sell their goods in foreign markets," but that now the McKinley bill has added a fraction of a cent to the cost of their cans, they must get higher prices in order to sustain the extra expense thus put upon them. "Some kinds of business," we are told, "can put this additional price on their products, but there are some which have been obliged to sell so close to meet foreign competition that the least rise in their goods will drive them out of the foreign markets." A member of the firm of Armour & Co. is reported as saying that the increase of duty would make a difference of \$200,000 a year to his concern. Speaking of the effect the increased duty will have on the canning industry, the *American Artisan* says that "the difference in the old and the new price of cans will make such a difference in the profits that the canners will be obliged to raise the price of goods or close the doors of their factories," and that "the people who buy canned goods will have to pay the tin tax that McKinley has imposed."

A greater mess of balderdash was never printed. It is not probable that the tinware of every description in use in the average family of "the poor and middle classes" would weigh as much as a hundred pounds; perhaps not exceeding fifty pounds. No family buys an entire new outfit of tinware every year, and a fair estimate of purchases would not exceed twenty-five per cent. of the entire outfit—perhaps not more than ten per cent. But if the outfit were entirely renewed every year, and if there were a hundred pounds of it, the increase of duty from one cent a pound to  $2\frac{1}{2}$  cents would mean an additional cost of only \$1.20 a year; while if the outfit weighed fifty pounds, and the renewals amounted to twenty-five per cent. the additional cost because of the increased duty would be but fifteen cents a year. Emphasis is laid upon the fact that the increased duty on tin plates will double the cost of the poor man's tin dinner kettle. A good dinner kettle can be bought for twenty-five cents; and if this sum is to be doubled it would indicate that the kettle weighed about twenty pounds: for if it did, the increased duty of  $1\frac{1}{2}$  cents per pound on the twenty pounds of tin would amount to the difference. But no working man carries a dinner kettle containing twenty pounds of tin; and if there are two pounds of tin in it it is as much; and as with ordinary care a dinner kettle should last say four years, the increased cost, say  $2\frac{2}{3}$  cents, would be spread out over that period. As to the can-

ners of fruit, vegetables, etc., selling their goods in foreign markets, it is well known that when such goods are exported the Government remits ninety per cent. of the duty collected on the tin used in the manufacture of the cans; and that the difference in cost of cans under the higher duty is inconsiderable. When these facts are considered, the ridiculousness of the objection to the higher duty in tin plates is apparent. "The young workingman" just going to housekeeping will not object to paying fifteen cents a year additional duty on his tinware, particularly if he is employed in any of the many branches of industry connected with the production of tin plate; neither would he object if every four years when he bought a dinner kettle he had to pay two, or three, or even five cents more for it than before. As to the increased cost of tin cans, it is not even probable that there would be any perceptible increase in the cost to canners, for the foreign producers of tin plates would bear the burden. But if they did not, the additional cost of each can would be so small—not more than a small fraction of a cent—that there could not be any addition made to the price to the consumer. It would be ridiculous to suppose that a family would be charged more than ten cents for an ordinary ten cent can of fruit or vegetables.

#### WHY NOT?

WHY not have a tin plate industry in Canada? Why should not Canada have works in which would be manufactured all the tin plate we consume? The Dominion Government has never yet thought it desirable to encourage the establishment of this industry, and tin plates, like steel rails, are, and always have been, on the free list. Having always been admitted duty free, no efforts have ever been made to manufacture these articles in this country, and we are now quite as dependent upon other countries for them as we were at the time of Confederation. It is true that the consumption of tin plates in Canada is not very large, but it is large enough to support one or more works for its production; and there is no doubt but if such works were in existence, the consumption would be much larger than what it now is. As far as this article is concerned, we have always had the freest kind of Free Trade: but this Free Trade in the nature of things never can or will result in the establishment of tin plate works in Canada; and if it is desirable that we have such an industry it is evident that it can only be established under the auspices of Protection.

Do we need such works? The importations of tin plates into Canada in 1889 was 259,448 hundredweights, valued at \$871,856: and this does not include the considerable importations of tinware, coming chiefly from the United States. The canning industry in Canada is very small compared with that in the United States; but there are no sufficient reasons why it should not grow to proportionately large dimensions: if it has not already done so the fact cannot be charged to "Protection." It has been demonstrated that such fruits, vegetables, fish, meats, etc. as are now canned in Canada are equal in quality, if not superior, to similar articles canned in the United States; and there are no good reasons why the consumption of such goods here should not be entirely of Canadian production: and there are no good reasons why Canada should not do an extensive export trade in canned goods. With the expansion