

cost them nothing, their success in business would not be as assured as though they were operating with their own money entirely.

We fail to discern why butchers, bakers, dentists, grocers, physicians, and even lawyers, should not be bonused to the extent at least of having their places of business furnished to them by the municipality free of charge, or even have considerable sums of money given them, as well as other business men who may happen to think that they would be successful in operating foundries, workshops, flour mills, or carriage works. There are many hard-working, industrious and competent dress-makers, for instance, who, if they had suitable places of business for which they would not have to pay any rent, and a few hundred dollars in cash with which to keep going until prosperity and wealth should crown their efforts, would give employment to considerable numbers of sewing women and girls; and there are plenty of blacksmiths, carpenters and bricklayers who, under similar favorable conditions, would also employ large numbers of assistants, and thus add to the general prosperity of the town which might thus favor them. It is very true that those who were already in business in such places, unless they were also equally favored, might not like the arrangement, seeing that as tax-payers they were forced to contribute of their hard earned gains to establish competitors in business and keep them going; and we fail to observe why concerns, some of which are reputed to be worth hundreds of thousands of dollars, should be granted valuable rights and franchises, and large sums of money, and the others go without. It is all wrong. It is commendable in municipal authorities to do what they properly and equitably can to induce capitalists to establish industrial works in their midst, but the unfortunate system of bonusing for the purpose, now so prevalent in some parts of Canada, cannot but fail in accomplishing the desired prosperity, for it is too much like endeavoring to lift oneself over a fence by the straps of his boots.

The town of Markham, Ont., is now undergoing an experience in this direction that other towns afflicted with the bonusing craze would do well to observe. Not long since the Markham authorities granted \$5,000 bonus to a woolen manufacturing company as an inducement to start a mill there. It is true that a mortgage was given by the company on their machinery to secure the repayment of the bonus if the mill should cease to be operated, but the mortgage is found to be valueless inasmuch as it comes in as second to another mortgage for a much larger amount, similarly secured, and behind the \$4,000 lien of the manufacturers who built the machinery. The machinery and fixtures, it is understood, have been removed to another town, presumably on the inducement of a tempting bonus, and the Markham people are in a terrible but impotent rage.

It is to be hoped that the Ontario Legislature at its next session will take this matter in hand and enact a law that will put a stop to this foolish bonusing system, and the people at large should see to it that their representatives in the legislature do their duty in this respect.

THE shoe manufacturers of the United States held a meeting in New York this week for the purpose of organization for mutual protection against what they consider unjust demands of their employees.

MARINE SUBSIDIES.

In a recent issue of this journal we quoted the St. John, N.B., *Globe* as saying that a great many people were interested in learning what measures could be devised for the purpose of restoring Canadian shipping to its former prestige. The *Globe's* remarks were prompted by the occurrence in Boston of a convention of persons interested in the restoration of the American shipping interests, our contemporary taking the occasion to remark that "Canadian ocean-going shipping appears, under a protective tariff, to be suffering quite as badly as that of the United States." We showed very conclusively that that portion of the shipping of the United States which was employed exclusively in trade within the United States, was protected by laws which gave it that trade to the exclusion of vessels of any other nation; that because of this protection that interest was in a most flourishing condition, and that it was only those American vessels which were employed in international trade, and where the protective laws alluded to could not apply, that we were suffering from competition from foreign vessels. The remedy we suggested was that the United States should liberally subsidize all American-built ships employed in foreign trade, and that Canada should do the same for her own vessels.

We are aware that free traders do not agree with us in these views. They argue that the true policy is to be allowed to purchase ships or anything else wherever they may be bought the cheapest, regardless of all other considerations. The fallacy of this proposition is apparent when it is shown that for many years a number of the European nations enjoyed unrestricted free trade in ships, during all of which time their merchant marine decreased in numbers and efficiency, almost as deplorably as did that of the United States during the two decades succeeding the war of the rebellion. It was not until these European nations resorted to the plan of subsidizing or awarding bounties to their home built sea-going vessels that their respective flags began to be more numerous, and their ships to increase their proportion of the traffic done in the carrying trade of the world. By an Act passed by the French Legislature in 1881, construction bounties were granted upon the gross tonnage of all vessels built in France, amounting to \$11.58 per ton for iron or steel vessels; \$7.72 for composite vessels, and \$3.86 per ton for wooden ships over 200 tons; and for every 225 pounds of machinery placed on board, \$3.32 was allowed. A navigation bounty is also provided for at the rate of 29 cents per ton for each 1,000 miles traveled in foreign trade. This bounty is reduced one cent per ton for each year an iron vessel has been afloat, and one and one-half cents in the case of wooden vessels. Vessels built of iron, according to the plans of the Government, receive 15 per cent. additional bounty. In Italy a bounty is based upon tonnage for iron and steel ships built and registered in Italy at the rate of \$5.70 per ton; \$1.92 for indicated horse-power on machinery; 58 cents per 100 pounds upon boilers, and a bounty upon navigation of 13 cents for every 1,000 miles steamed from Italy to non-European ports. The Spanish Government has a graduated system of bounties, especially favorable to Spanish ships engaged in the West Indian and South and North American trade, and it is stated that under this system the Spanish steamers that ply