

States, no American manufacturer could sell in Canada any such implements, because it would be a violation, not of our tariff law, but of our patent law. And so it is with the Westinghouse people—the patent law of the United States gives to them the exclusive privilege of manufacturing their appliances in that country, and because those appliances are meritorious, and must be used upon all railroads, they have a lead-pipe cinch in that country which is of more value to them than any tariff that McKinley could possibly dream of. They have the advantage of a similar patent law in Canada, and were it not that they would be compelled by our tariff law—our N. P.—to pay duty upon their appliances coming into Canada, they would never have started a branch of their works in this country.

It is quite certain that the present rate of duty upon Westinghouse appliances virtually prevents their entry into Canada, and therefore the revenue of the Dominion is not increased by the importation of them, but it is equally certain that if it were not for the protective duty we would not now have a branch of the Westinghouse concern established in Canada, giving lucrative employment to several hundred expert workmen. On the other hand if our tariff were formed for revenue purposes only, the Westinghouse company would feel, no doubt, that they could better afford to pay a low duty than invest their capital in a Canadian works. In one case, under a protective tariff, we are minus the revenue but plus the investment of capital and the employment of labor. In the other case we would be plus a small revenue but minus the investment of capital and employment of labor.

Which policy would be of the greatest advantage to Canada?

EXPERIENCE VS. LOGIC.

The Toronto Globe is one of the most incorrigible Bourbons that ever lived. It never forgets its old and oft exploded free trade fallacies, and it never learns wisdom from the every day events that are constantly transpiring within range of its vision. Another contemporary, discussing the probable course of the Republican party when it comes into power under Mr. McKinley next year, said:

By imposing sufficiently high duties they can make work plentiful and keep wages high in the centres of manufacture. In that way they can stop the extension of the silver heresy from the west and south to the east. Also, as the manufacturers thrive, the home market for the farmers must improve. To whatever extent it does improve it will check the growth of discontent among the agricultural classes.

The Globe objects to this and makes several very wild declarations. It tells us that by Mr. Bryan's scheme the prosperity was to spread from the farmer to the manufacturer instead of from the manufacturer to the farmer, as suggested by others; but that the expectations founded upon either scheme, i.e., Bryanism or McKinleyism, are equally ridiculous, but that of Mr. Bryan the more excusable. Currency debasement and tariff taxation, in the opinion of The Globe, are alike condemned by economic research and common sense, and that Mr. Bryan's perseverance in his folly is the more pardonable because it has not been recently exposed by the test of experience.

Our contemporary is blind, indeed, if it cannot comprehend that, admitting the necessity of a country for a certain commodity, and that that commodity can be produced there-

in, if it is thus produced the process of production must give employment to labor there, thereby making work more plentiful, with a tendency to keep wages high in the centres of production. If then, in the production of the commodity remunerative employment is afforded to manufacturing labor, it is evident that agricultural labor—those employed in producing food stuffs—will be benefited by this condition; for if, as The Globe has often told us, the farmer has to bear the cost of transportation of his products to the consumer, the closer to his own door he finds that consumer the greater the net profit he receives for his industry. Why should a Canadian farmer be compelled to market his chickens and eggs in Buffalo, New York, rather than in Toronto, Canada, or his wheat in Liverpool rather than to Toronto flouring mills? He must reach the consumer of his products, and that consumer is very greatly the employee in a workshop or factory. If Canadian workshops and factories are kept open and give employment to such large numbers of workmen that all the chickens and eggs that the farmer can produce are required for their sustenance, there would be no necessity for him to go to Buffalo to dispose of them. As the manufacturer thrives and gives employment to large numbers of people whose cravings require three good meals each day, even so the farmer thrives by the more valuable demands of his nearby home market.

It is remarkably absurd for The Globe to arrange currency debasement and tariff protection in the same category, and to declare that both are alike condemned by economic research and common sense. If we observe we will discover that the most important and enlightened nations of the earth indulge in no currency debasement, and also that, possibly excepting Great Britain, all these nations have adopted and practise tariff protection. Do not these two policies go hand in hand, the one a complement of the other? When The Globe makes its economic research, and finds that honest money is the system practised in all the most flourishing nations of the earth, does not its common sense teach it that tariff protection is also a strong element in that prosperity? Why should it be said that in the same nation common sense prevails as regards its currency, and that the people are fools for practising protection? Surely The Globe might learn from experience what it has failed to learn from logic. If it continues to hold to its heresies in spite of the lessons of experience, its course cannot but be condemned by all possessors of common sense.

THE SPECTATOR'S CATECHISM.

The Hamilton Spectator becomes quite nervous and fretful because this journal has explained why protectionists have usually voted in favor of the Conservative party in Dominion politics but have not felt it their duty to vote with that party in Ontario politics. In a recent issue, discussing this question we said:—

Sir Oliver Mowat, while premier of Ontario, comprehended this condition when he received a large and influential deputation from the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, who interviewed him to ask that some substantial assistance might be given towards the establishment of the iron industry in this province, and he was quick to respond to the wishes of the Association when he promised a provincial bounty of \$1 per ton upon all pig iron made in the province from ore