

reasons given for this was that in this country our producers, that is to say, the wage-earners, required better remuneration than those of the countries from which we were importing.

So far so good. I do not think that anybody, certainly no reasonable person, would object to the higher price he has to pay for what he buys, if it means that there is a fairer distribution of wealth and the position of the wage-earner is being improved. But it would be worth while to enquire whether the position of the wage-earner is being really improved or not. Mr. Shortt's exposition would have been more satisfactory if he had been able to assure us that the wage-earner is not losing more than the increased prices he is paying for his goods. Is he gaining by any additions to his wages.

#### SELLING CHEAP ABROAD.

I have not the knowledge that would justify me in offering an opinion on this point. But what makes me suggest there may be something in it, is the more important fact brought out by Professor Shortt's discourse, the fact, namely, that several articles which we were producing in this country are being sold in England, with all expenses of transportation added to their cost, at lower prices than those at which they are being sold at the very place in which they are being produced. "Why is this?" Is it because the producer who sends his product abroad is obliged to compete in an unprotected market with the products of the country in which he makes his sales, while he is enabled by a protective tariff to add the amount of the duty to the cost of production in the protected market of his own country? If this is the case *surely the matter is worth looking into and every householder should belong to a society for discovering whether we are not being fleeced under the operation of our present fiscal system.* That system, let us assume, was designed by one party and has been sustained by both parties for the purpose of encouraging native industry, but if these guesses are cor-