



Published on the first and third Friday of each month, by the
CANADIAN MANUFACTURER PUBLISHING Co., (Limited).

63 FRONT STREET WEST, TORONTO.

FREDERIC NICHOLLS, *Managing Director.*

J. J. CASSIDEY, *Editor.*

SUBSCRIPTION, - - - \$2.00 per year.

ADVERTISING RATES SENT ON APPLICATION.

MR. FREDERIC NICHOLLS is Secretary of
The Canadian Manufacturers' Association,
The Woolen Manufacturers' Association, and
The Tanners' Association.

His Office is at the Publication Office of the

CANADIAN MANUFACTURER,
63 Front Street West, Toronto.

TARIFF GRUMBLERS.

THERE are those in Canada who are chronic grumblers at the tariff, and who never allow an opportunity to escape that can be made use of to illustrate their contentions. For some time past certain New England iron manufacturers have been making themselves conspicuous by their endeavors to have the American tariff modified so that pig and scrap iron and coal should be placed on the free list. This effort has elicited considerable notice from the enemies of Protection, both in the United States and in Canada, the object being to bring odium upon the tariff. Canadian Free Traders have shown much zeal in calling attention to the fact that even American manufacturers complain of the injury the tariff is inflicting upon their business, warning Canadian manufacturers that a similar condition prevailed or would be sure to prevail under the operations of our National Policy.

Of course there is another side to this question, and *The Bulletin* has been analyzing some of the phases of it. It mentions the name of the principal executive officer of the Tremont Nail Company, of West Wareham, Mass., as being conspicuous as an advocate of lower duties or no duties at all on certain so-called raw materials which are used in the manufacture of iron and steel. The Tremont Nail Company is a manufacturer of iron and steel, its leading specialty being nails. The company's works are among the first of its class in New England, both in capacity and equipment. They were built originally about 1820, and rebuilt in 1846; and of late years their capacity has been steadily enlarged by the addition of new machinery; their production in nails alone in 1888 being larger than in any other year for fifteen years. In 1874 the works embraced 4 trains of rolls and 75 nail machines; in 1884 they embraced 3 trains of rolls and 75 nail machines, and

they were reported to have an annual capacity of 100,000 kegs of cut nails, in addition to other products. In 1887 a steel plant had been added to what was formerly only an iron plant; the number of trains of rolls had increased from 3 to 5; the number of nail machines had increased from 75 to 173; and the annual capacity of the works had increased from 100,000 kegs of nails to 225,000 kegs, in addition to other products. From this it will be seen that the Tremont Nail Company have not been going to the wall very fast, nor losing money very rapidly, or it would not have so largely increased its plant only two years ago.

This specimen New England manufacturer declares that he is not a Free Trader, and all he wants is that his raw materials—pig iron and coal—may be admitted duty free. He wants this because, he says, pig iron cannot be made in New England as cheaply as it can be in Pennsylvania, and coal cannot be mined there as cheaply as in Nova Scotia. His zeal as a Protectionist is unbounded when the duty on nails is considered. The unselfishness of the proposition is remarkable. This policy would certainly injure the New England manufacturers of pig iron, but it would add to the prosperity of the Tremont Nail Company, great as that prosperity has been and is. He wants the duty on the products of other concerns reduced or removed, but he does not desire any reduction of duty on nails.

It is natural to enquire if what is said about the inability of New England to manufacture iron is correct. The grumblers say it is, and taking this as granted, they paint a deplorable picture of the fate imminent to all other industries there in which pig iron is a raw material. On the other hand the statement is denied, and facts are produced to substantiate the denial. Mr. W. F. Durfee, a well known American metallurgical engineer, writing to *The Bulletin*, proves that New England is not necessarily compelled to abstain from manufacturing pig iron. Alluding to the closing of New England iron works, Mr. Durfee calls attention to the fact that the wrecks of iron manufacturing establishments in Pennsylvania alone, during the past twenty-five years (some of them in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, where it has always been assumed that the economic conditions for the manufacture of iron were phenomenally excellent), represent the destruction of more than double the capital ever invested in rolling mills in all New England. He says that in Pennsylvania, as in every other locality, "it is not so much what God has given to men that insures success, but what use men make of God's bounties—that had New England iron manufacturers, who have put out their fires, dropped their tools, and in a most cowardly manner accepted defeat, spent as much money at the proper time in reconstructing their antiquated mills, and in pensioning off such of their ignorant managers as were clogs to their progress, as they have lost by not doing so, the mills now dismantled would be roaring with all the activities of a busy and profitable industry."

An evidence of the mismanagement of some of the New England nail mills lies in the fact, as stated by the manager of one of them, that his nail kegs cost him fifteen cents each; and that it took three tons of coal to turn a ton of pig iron into a marketable commodity. Mr. Durfee shows that the capacity of the Fall River Iron Works was about 11,000 net