

the N.P. is to restrict trade with other parts of the British Empire and with the United States, and also with the balance of the human race; that it compels the farmer to pay a heavy duty upon the goods he buys from Mr. Caldecott, who buys them in Great Britain, and that it often compels him to purchase inferior goods manufactured in Canada, "and pay a heavy tax to a manufacturer, who proclaims, by his demand for a heavy protection, that nature never intended that he should be a manufacturer at all."

Dear, good Mr. Caldecott should not use such language, for it is simply insulting, and he should not be surprised that manufacturers and sensible people generally should feel indignant thereat. Of course he knows that if it were not for the tariff he could sell more imported goods than he now does; and he knows that if it were not for the tariff it would be utterly impossible for many manufacturers to keep their factories in operation. As it is, these factories give employment to thousands of Canadians, who earn more in them than they could possibly earn by tilling the soil and growing wheat for the British market. But what does dear, good Mr. Caldecott care for the welfare of poor, humble Canadians whose condition is bettered because of the employment they find in Canadian factories? He does not seem to care whether they sink or swim in the fierce struggle for life, so long as Mr. Caldecott makes big profits on British made goods. And then what does dear, good Mr. Caldecott mean when he says that nature never intended that a Canadian manufacturer should be a manufacturer at all, if his success as a manufacturer depends upon protection? In another place in his letter he quite irreverently uses the term, "God-made flow of trade," and we take it that his intention was to make the words "nature" and "God" synonymous; that God never intended that a Canadian manufacturer who believes in protection should be a manufacturer at all. Is the dear, good man authorized to enunciate God's views on a Canadian trade question? It is either that, or he imagines that he knows more on the subject than the manufacturers, who are adding more to the honor and glory and prosperity of Canada than all the importers of Mr. Caldecott's stamp in the country.

This dear, good man tells us that protection is a reproach, and that "the only way to get this reproach removed is to change the policy and go in for free and unfettered trade with all who can sell us goods cheaper than we can produce them, or who will buy from us those things nature (God) has amply qualified this great country to grow or make." In other words he wants to smash the N.P. to smithereens so that, Canadian manufacturers being driven out of business, Mr. Caldecott could sell lots more of imported goods than he is now able to work off. How exceedingly unselfish of this dear, good man. And who is to determine what particular articles God has qualified this great country to grow or make? Mr. Caldecott seems to think that he has been endowed with a divine mission to arrange this matter, and that it is to be in the direction of universal free trade. Quite modest, indeed, of this dear good man. The manufacturers are of the opinion that manufacturers and factories are quite as indigenous to the country as such importers as Mr. Caldecott and his big wholesale warehouses. The success of the one depends upon protection, the success of the other upon free trade. Which

is of the most value to Canada? Without the factories Canada could never be more than a hewer of wood and a drawer of water for manufacturing countries. With them Canada is prosperous and happy, and the more there are of them the more prosperous and happier she becomes. Without the importers and their warehouses—well, if Mr. Caldecott should go out of business to-morrow the vacancy created by the event, and the disastrous effect upon the prosperity of Canada, would resemble the hole made in the water caused by thrusting the finger into it. Such is the difference in the value to the country of manufacturers and importers of foreign goods.

This dear, good, modern Solomon, this wise man of Toronto, talks about "the restrictive and barbaric custom houses undoing by unnatural restrictions the natural and God-made flow of trade between nations." If free trade is the handiwork of God, as Mr. Caldecott impiously asserts, then the inference is deducible that the gentleman with hoofs and a forked tail has defeated the plan.

THE FIGHT AGAINST PROTECTION.

ONE of the strangest proceedings that has come under our observation recently is the arguments advanced by Mr. Stapleton Caldecott, an importer of foreign merchandise, doing business in Toronto, against the N.P. This argument consisted in part of an article purporting to have been taken from the *New York Daily News*, which stated that the McKinley Bill had raised the prices upon nearly all the necessities of life, and which was embodied in a letter written by Mr. Caldecott published in the *Toronto Globe*. It is charitable to suppose that Mr. Caldecott has been imposed upon by some thoughtless person less scrupulous than wise, in supplying him with this New York screed. It was a campaign lie made to do duty in New York and elsewhere in the United States last summer during the then pending elections; and its falsity and ridiculousness were well ventilated at the time. When this lie got started the editor of the *American Economist* made a thorough investigation of it; and in the October 2nd issue of that staunch protectionist journal was printed a table of prices of fifty articles in common use in that country, showing the price in October 1890, a year before the McKinley Bill was passed, the "campaign prices" of 1891 and the prices since then; also the prices of the same articles in 1857. These figures were gathered from over a thousand different points, and were of such cumulative evidence as no free trader, even Mr. Caldecott, would dare dispute. This able-bodied and fleet-footed lie went the rounds of the press at the time, even finding its way into some Canadian free trade papers; closely followed by the facts as given in the *Economist* and other tariff journals. Mr. Caldecott is justice to himself as well as in fairness to those whom he thought might read his letter, should have informed himself in this matter. He could have done so by reading both sides, and discovering that the lie had been successfully contradicted time and again. If he had this knowledge honesty should have prompted him to refrain from giving further circulation to a free trade lie; if he did not have it, his ignorance is inexcusable.

Mr. Caldecott is a fair representative of those who hold that "cheapness" is the *sine qua non* of trade. This is the free