



ESTABLISHED IN 1880.

PUBLISHED ON THE FIRST AND THIRD FRIDAYS OF EACH MONTH

The Canadian Manufacturer Publishing Co., Limited.

McKinnon Building, Cor. Melinda and Jordan Sts., Toronto.

J. J. CASSIDY, - - - Editor.

D. O. MCKINNON, - - - Business Manager.

Montreal:—E. J. Chave, 439 Grosvenor St.

London, Eng.:—H. Crankshaw, 101 Leadenhall St., E.C.

Cable address: "CANAMAN." Western Union Telegraphic Code used.

SUBSCRIPTIONS:

Canada and United States \$1.00 per year. All other Countries in Postal Union ten shillings sterling, including postage.

Classified IndexPage 42

Index to AdvertisersPage 49

ANOTHER SACRIFICE FOR THE MOTHER COUNTRY.

The Toronto Globe suggests that another important Canadian industry should be sacrificed as an evidence of our love for the Mother Country. It takes its cue from an article in the London Morning Post, which proposes that Canada and the other colonies give Britain a preference by allowing her vessels the privileges reserved to ourselves in our coasting laws. It is argued that Canada has only to act in accordance with our frequent protestations that the Empire is, or ought to be, a political unit to secure a preference for British vessels in every British port throughout the world. No other power, it tells us, which reserves its coastline trade could take offense—that we should run no risk of our legislating against those countries which exclude British ships from their own coastal colonial trade—that the reservation of our coastal privilege exclusively to Britain would be little more than a formality—that, except on the lakes, where natural barriers keep out the world's competition, American vessels could not take advantage of the abrogation of Canada's exclusive coasting laws—that British vessels, relieved of the burden of our protective laws, could crowd the American vessels off the routes, and that, in fact, American vessels could not keep their own coasting trade were it not for the rigid exclusion of British vessels.

The Globe says that Canada, by adopting protection, has killed off our own merchant marine, but (because of protection) still maintains small coasting fleets by excluding other vessels from the trade between our seaports—that Canada at one time had the prospect of a high place in the world's merchant marine, but that that prospect was killed by protection. Were the coasting laws relaxed, this trade—(ship-building)—would also pass to British shipbuilders.

It is to be regretted that The Globe remembers so

little of what every school boy in Canada has been taught, and ought to remember. At one time the shipbuilding industry exceeded in importance all others in the province of Quebec, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. These provinces abounded in all requisite materials for shipbuilding, and their shipyards turned out as fine ships as ever floated on salt water. Some—many of the speediest and most trustworthy clipper ships that ever made record time between Liverpool and China, in the tea carrying trade, were launched from yards in our Maritime Provinces, and such was the case until the necessities of commerce required that wooden sailing ships should give way to iron vessels propelled by steam. At that time Canada was not even the Dominion it now is, and no such policy was then in existence as tariff protection to the shipbuilding or any other domestic industry. Tariff protection had no more to do with the decadence of the maritime shipbuilding industry than it had to do with the building of the "wooden walls" of old England. Both retired from active service at the same time and substantially for the same causes.

One of the most conspicuous features of current politics, particularly in Canada and in Great Britain, is the constant discussion of what is called "British preference." Why British preference? Great Britain is an old and most prosperous country. She is called the "Mother of Nations." Firmly seated as she is upon her rock-bound island, she is able to defy the world. She is "Mistress of the Seas." She has fleets of the most modern and powerful warships floating upon every sea; and in every harbor and roadstead in the whole world may be seen the "Meteor Flag," covering a greater commerce—much greater than can be claimed by any other country. What's the matter, then, with Great Britain? She's all right. Then why this constant and tiresome talk now so much indulged in about making fiscal and other kinds of concessions to Great Britain?

This last feature regarding a British coasting preference in Canadian waters, now put forward by the London Morning Post and endorsed by the Toronto Globe, is mean, mendacious and greedy in the extreme. There is no country on the face of the earth that allows such absolute free trade in and over its internal and costal waters as The Globe proposes Canada shall grant to Great Britain—in fact no such entire freedom is allowed in the waters of the United Kingdom itself.

We are told that if Canada should do this thing we might thereby be relieved of a part of the burden of protection which we now bear, and at the same time give a reciprocal part of the resultant advantage (?) to Great Britain. The "burden of protection" so disparagingly spoken of is one voluntarily assumed by Canada, and Canada has adjusted it to her own shoulders to suit herself; and Canada has no occasion to ask Great Britain to lift so much as her little finger to ease it. Canada not only adjusts her share of the burden to her own shoulders according to her own ideas, but, as far as Canadian trade with the rest of the world is concerned—as far as the admission of foreign merchandise through her own ports is concerned, adjusts the share