

protection by the dissemination of literature throughout the country, particularly the agricultural classes in North-West Canada. The results of this campaign so far, he said, had been very satisfactory, showing the growth of a strong protectionist sentiment in Canada.

While emphasizing the point that the Association was not a political organization, Mr. McNaught also wished to correct the misconception that might arise from the report that Mr. Drummond wanted the American tariff for Canada. "We do not want the American tariff," he said, "and Mr. Drummond did not convey that meaning. The American tariff might not be suitable for Canada. We want a tariff framed to suit Canadian interests, which will protect them as effectively as the American tariff. Our average tariff now is only equal to about one-half the average of the American tariff, whereas it ought to be equal."

**A RIDICULOUS PROPOSITION.**

The Mail and Empire, discussing the tariff propositions of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, says:

Canada's market for manufactured products is of great and expanding capacity. To keep it filled, scores of thousands of hands, maintaining hundreds of thousands of other consumers dependent on them are continuously at work. Of the many millions of dollars distributed in wages for this work, a very large proportion goes to the United States. For this Canada gets no equivalent. Our neighbors are sending us goods to the value of \$125,000,000 a year and are buying from us only about half as much. They have lately redoubled their enterprise here, and their "slaughtered" goods are displacing more and more of the products of Canadian labor. To give United States manufacturers a market here for about \$60,000,000 of their annual output is to lay out that buying power to the utmost disadvantage. As our neighbors give us nothing for it, it should be taken from them. By raising our tariff to a level with their own we can close their manufacturers largely out of this market. The demand they served can then be disposed of in a way to further our interests, not theirs. We can turn it all into the hands of our own manufacturers, or we can exchange some of it for a British preference in favor of our foodstuffs. The latter arrangement would be the better, for it would make the United States' loss the direct gain of both our manufacturing and farming industries. If we take from the United States a market for, say \$40,000,000 worth of manufactured goods, the preference to Britain might be so gauged as to give her one-third of the amount.

To say that it is not possible to give both Canadian and British manufacturing interests greater advantages than they now have in this market is to imply that we either must not or cannot dispossess the American manufacturers from the large trade they hold here and for which we get nothing in return. We can exclude their goods exactly as they exclude so many million dollars' worth of our staples, namely, by establishing a tariff as high as theirs. When we have thus fenced in our own we can apportion it to our home industries and to those of Great Britain, the latter reciprocating.

The article abounds in false statements and wrong conclusions. Canada most certainly gets an equivalent for the merchandise she purchases from the United States, dollar for dollar, else there would be no purchases of American goods. If we did not want the goods we would not have purchased them; nor would we have purchased American goods could we have obtained them from Canadian manufacturers—goods "Made in Canada." If our neighbors are selling us goods to the value of \$125,000,000 a year, it is because we want them; and if they are buying from us only about half as much it is because they do not want more. What would Canadian wheat fields produce without agricultural machinery; and if our manufacturers are unable to meet the demand for it, would it not be better to buy American machinery than to let the fields lie idle?

Our wise contemporary thinks that because our neighbors supply our wants, the Canadian market "should be taken from them." Why should they not sell us their goods if we desire to purchase them? Why should our market be taken from them? How does the Mail and Empire propose to do it? It tells us it is to be done "by raising our tariff to a level with their own, thus driving their manufactures out of this market." Very sensible indeed, to increase the cost of production in Canada by increasing the duty on articles that we need and must have, although our manufacturers cannot supply them.

It is a brilliant idea, too, to suggest that after having driven American goods out of the Canadian market, we can turn the demand for them into the hands of our own manufacturers, who cannot supply them, or exchange some of the trade for a preference in the British market, unmindful of the fact that our imports of agricultural implements from Great Britain do not amount to enough in any one year to cultivate a row of beans.

We are told that we can exclude American goods, which we do want, exactly as the United States excludes Canadian goods, which they do not want, by establishing a tariff as high as theirs. In other words the United States does some thing which we do not want it to do, and to spite it we are to do just as that country does, to our own great disadvantage. A wonderful and original proposition.

**MINERAL FUEL.**

The imports of mineral fuel into Canada, in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903 and the value thereof, were as follows:

	Tons.	Value.
Bituminous and slack.....	3,862,295	\$8,197,034
Anthracite and slack.....	1,456,713	7,028,664
Coke.....	256,723	1,222,756
Totals.....	5,575,731	\$16,448,454

These imports were the output of mines chiefly in the states of West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. The imports from all other countries, chiefly Great Britain were as follows:

	Tons.	Value.
Bituminous and slack.....	69,779	\$220,884
Anthracite and slack.....	62,038	345,015
Coke.....	15,638	70,469
Totals.....	147,455	\$636,368

The duty upon bituminous coal is 53 cents per ton of 2,000 pounds and upon bituminous slack 20 per cent. but not to exceed 13 cents per ton. No duty is imposed upon either anthracite or coke.

Substantially all of the bituminous coal and slack imported into Canada from the United States finds entrance through ports in Ontario, in which province it finds its greatest consumption, the supply for Manitoba reaching them through Port Arthur. And this is true also regarding anthracite and coke, there being a much smaller demand in Montreal. The demand for mineral fuel in the province of Quebec is supplied almost entirely from Nova Scotia mines; and that for the mountainous sections of the Far West and of British Columbia from the mines in that province. Ontario is the largest consumer of mineral fuel, but is not a producer.

Canada, however, is an exporter of bituminous coal, our exports in 1903 being as under:

	Tons.	Value.
Great Britain.....	25,335	\$92,119
United States.....	1,719,027	4,640,064
Newfoundland.....	126,169	330,054
Other countries.....	109,420	390,197
Totals.....	1,979,951	\$5,452,434