

every day's experience has demonstrated its worthlessness." And again, to re-quote, "I must say that this Protection business, in which I do not believe in the slightest degree, in any shape or form, *looking upon it as a clear robbery* of the consumers, is being run into the ground."

Another statement of Mr. Blake's that merits criticism is, that "We have a deficit to overcome, and that done, we have a tremendous charge to overtake. 'Oh, but,' say some Tories, 'you can yet do this and make a free trade or non-protective tariff.' The statement is dishonest and absurd."

Neither dishonest nor absurd, Mr. Blake, although you include your own lieutenants in your sweeping denunciation for was it not Mr. Paterson (Brant) who stated from his seat in the House of Commons, on the evening of April 16th, 1886, that "if he [the Minister of Finance] wants money, as there is no doubt he does, it would be better for the people of Canada if he put the increased duty which he proposed to put on sugar, on tea and coffee." Such a staunch Reform paper as the *Montreal Witness* also rises to remark: "Mr. Blake knows that the tariff may be lowered and yet the revenue increased by the operation, while the taxation is lightened."

The points I have drawn attention to are but a few of those wherein there is such a lack of harmony between the *professions* of the leader of the Reform party and the *convictions* of his most prominent supporters; that not only manufacturers, but every Protectionist may well distrust the genuineness of such an eleventh hour conversion. I doubt not that on election day they will decide, like my friend the manufacturer with Reform sympathies, to cast in their lot with the party which has not yet faltered in the patriotic work of developing our material resources, for "A country which manufactures for itself prospers."

FREDERIC NICHOLLS,

Secretary of the Industrial League.

TORONTO, Jan. 31, 1887.

## A MANUFACTURER ON THE TRADE QUESTION.

(Written for this paper by an N. P. Reformer.)

MR. BLAKE, in his 1882 address, to which he still adheres in trying to remove the doubts of the manufacturing classes as to his friendliness, says: We have large obligations to meet, and it is impossible for us to lower the tariff to any great extent. We must get revenue, and that revenue must be raised to a great extent from goods similar to those made in the country, and that being the case you will have incidental protection enough. We must have revenue.

Well, how will he get the revenue? Stoves are made in the country, so are reaping and mowing machines, so are axes and edge tools, so are nails, and harvest tools, plows, wagons, buggies, wheels, carriages, coarse cottons, woollens and many other articles. Are these imported to any extent at present? No. Why? The tariff is too high; it is protective. But Mr. Blake says we must have revenue from these things, and to get revenue they must come in through the Custom House from outside. The tariff must therefore be lowered till they do come in. We will not put it any lower than that, because we need all the revenue we can get, but we will not have the tariff on anything so high that it will not yield revenue. We want no

protection for the sake of protection, as that is taxing the many for the benefit of the few.

Well, the tariff is lowered on all these lines till they can and do come through the Custom House, and pay duty and yield a revenue, and the more of them come in the larger the revenue, and that, of course, is the first consideration. But the more of them come in the fewer will be made, and if one quarter or one-half can and do come in, why not all? If the tariff is put low enough to let any in, then it is low enough to let all, and where are the manufacturing classes then? Mr. Blake simply proposes, and does not seem to know it, to wipe the Canadian manufacturers out of existence. A tariff for revenue is bound to do it. He says: "I am not a free trader; I cannot be a free trader. The necessities of the country preclude, and my opponents are doing me a great injustice in calling me so. Let us see what he is. He says, I will reduce the tariff" such a figure that the goods you manufacturers are now making for the supply of the Canadian market shall come in through Customs and yield revenue. Won't that hurt the manufacturers? Can the goods come through the Custom House and be made here too? Mr. Blake says, "They must come through the Custom House, as we must have revenue, but we will not let them come in free. We will charge all the goods will bear and still come in, and that will surely be sufficient protection for you—at least I am so informed by some of the moderate Protectionists." But what difference will it make to the manufacturers of Canada whether the goods come in under a moderately high tariff or absolutely free? If they come in they will not need to make them, and he will close their establishments just as efficiently under a revenue tariff as under an absolutely free one.

His proposition in plain English is a proposition to discriminate against Canadian workmen in favor of foreign workmen, and that even in cases where the consumer is getting the goods under a protective tariff lower than he could get them under a revenue one. Here is a case which is only a sample of hundreds of others where the duty has been placed high enough to practically exclude the foreign article. The home demand for axes is almost exclusively supplied by the Canadian manufacturer. Any American axes brought in are simply to meet isolated cases of demand by individuals who used certain brands years ago and are still prejudiced in favor of them, but they only come in small lots and full price is paid for them. Axes have been sold in the United States in 1886 at \$5.25 per dozen in lots of 1,000 dozen. In Canada they have been sold in lots of 100 dozen at that figure. The cost in Canada is not affected by the price in the United States, but by the home competition. If it were regulated by the U. S. prices the Canadian makers could get \$5.25 and 30 per cent. duty, equal to \$7 per dozen. Sir Richard Cartwright claims that they do, as his contention is that consumers pay the foreign price, plus the duty, on not only what come from abroad, but on all produced at home. That is the free trade theory; they call it a self-evident truth—according to Cartwright—and Blake endorses all he says.

Axes costing 5.25 in the United States will cost, with a duty of 30 per cent. added, \$7, therefore all axes used in Canada will cost the consumers \$7 and the manufacturers are assisted by the tariff to rob the consumers about \$1.75 per dozen. It can be proved that axes have been freely sold at \$5.25 per