

ing upon this subject says that the continental nations retained protection for exactly the same reason that England adopted free trade, because it was to their economic interest to do so. It was not, at bottom, a moral sentiment that controlled Britain's policy, but merely the fact that she no longer needed protection for her manufactures, and saw a definite economic advantage to herself in free trade and wider foreign markets. Had not this change of economic interests come, she would have remained a protectionist country for the same reasons that caused her to maintain the policy during five centuries.

Continental Europe and the United States did not refuse free trade because of any moral inferiority to Britain. They refused it simply because the same circumstances that made protection unnecessary to Britain made it doubly necessary to themselves. Britain, having developed the factory system almost exclusively, and protected it rigidly, had gotten away beyond reach of competition. Nobody could undersell her manufactures in her home market, but she could enter any other market and drive all others out; therefore, continental Europe and the United States had either to abandon manufacturing or retain protection. With them it was a question, not of gaining foreign markets, but of retaining home opportunities. Granted that manufacturing industries were very desirable, it was plainly to their interest to protect them, which they did; just as Britain relinquished protection because it was to her interest to gain more foreign markets.

But why should there now be talk of re-establishing protection in some form in Great Britain? Is it possible that moral sentiment is less strong there now than fifty years ago? Not at all. In truth, the theory of protecting one's own best opportunities for development is even more moral than that of throwing down all barriers and letting in whatever may come. All social, religious and domestic institutions are based upon this protective principle. After economic interests have determined economic policies, it is natural to seek to give those policies a moral justification; and this is really all there was of the alleged moral foundation of British free trade.

PURE DAIRY PRODUCTS.

Hon. John Dryden, Ontario Minister of Agriculture, has issued a bulletin of very great importance to the growing dairy interests of Canada. He has taken a line which THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER has always advocated, viz., that Canada must keep up her reputation for producing the best of everything and not yield to the temptation to use adulterants to compete with United States products sold at low prices. Canada don't want to become a producer of cheap dairy products or of cheap anything else, whenever cheap products mean cheap labor. For the benefit of any of our readers who are interested in dairying and have not seen Mr. Dryden's bulletin, it is appended. His long experience and proved ability in agricultural matters make his words of special interest and paramount weight. Mr. Dryden says:

In building up the dairy industry of Ontario two things have been taught and urged, namely, purity and high quality of products and economy of production. Whatever setbacks this great industry may have met in the past few years can be traced to a neglect of one or the other of these important points. The cheese industry of Ontario is now fairly well established, and the annual production of a large amount of well made, whole milk cheese of uniform quality

has given Canada a controlling influence in the British cheese market. Our creamery industry is now rapidly developing, and it is of vital importance that the strictest attention be paid to the turning out in an economical manner of butter of uniformly high quality, pure and unadulterated. The industry will, if properly conducted, assume very large proportions, since the average consumption of butter is much greater than that of cheese, and the British imports of butter greatly exceed those of cheese. In the British market our butter meets in competition similar goods from Ireland, Denmark, France, the United States, Australia and Argentina. Denmark has attained a chief place by studying the requirements of the market, and now produces nearly all of her creamery export butter from pasteurized milk or cream with the use of special ferments. In some of the countries exporting to Great Britain—Australia in particular—it has become a practice to use some kind of "preservative" in butter-making. Sometimes this is added to butter as a salt; sometimes it is added to the milk. These preservatives are sold under various names, such names as preservale, preservatine, preservitas, being favorites. They are nearly all mixtures of boracic acid. The increasing use of these preservatives has alarmed the British consumer, and most radical measures are now proposed to exclude all butter in which traces of these preservatives are found. The British public has become alarmed, the press is actively discussing the matter, and public officials are now on the lookout for butter so adulterated. It must be carefully noted that all butter made from milk or cream to which anything but common salt has been added is adulterated. The butter producers of Ontario must make no mistake. The use of any of these preservatives is dangerous to the dairy interests of this country. Everything possible should be done to discourage the use of such substances, and the press should as far as possible prevent the advertising of them in this country. Ontario has a reputation for producing pure dairy goods of high quality. That reputation must be maintained, and every person interested in the dairy business of Ontario should assist in preventing these "preservatives" from getting a foothold in this province. "An ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure." We have a reputation now for making pure butter and cheese. Help to maintain that reputation. Do not advocate preservatives. Do not advertise preservatives. Do not use preservatives.

"WILL THE MOTION BE SUSTAINED?"

"That the good faith on the part of the present Government with the farmers of the Northwest should compel them to place agricultural implements on the free list."

The above motion was introduced in the Ottawa (Can.) Legislature by Mr. Davin on March 31. In arguing the question he said that he did so from the standpoint of a protectionist, and that as the agricultural implement manufacturers of Canada had become strong under protection, they were now competent and able to compete with the manufacturers of the world. What will become of the motion is not at present known.

Canada's present tariff duties on agricultural implements are not exactly prohibitive, yet they are high enough to place a check on foreign competition. The rate on mowing machines, harvesters, self-binding or without binders, binding attachments, reapers, cultivators, plows, harrows, horse-rakes, seed drills, manure spreaders, weeders and malleable sprocket or link chain for binders, is twenty per cent. ad valorem.

On steam engines, boilers, ore crushers, pumps, windmills, horse-powers, portable engines, threshers, separators, fodders or feed cutters, potato diggers, grain crushers, fanning mills, hay tedders, farm wagons, and all machinery composed wholly of iron or steel, twenty-five per cent. ad valorem.

On freight wagons, drays, sleighs, and similar vehicles, the duty is twenty-five per cent. ad valorem, and upon buggies,