

any land, and that even the title to the little home that shelters the family of the industrious, hard-working laboring man shall be vested in the Government. The natural and inevitable tendency of this sort of preaching and teaching is to anarchy and nihilism. Those whose improvidence has prevented them from accumulating wealth, either personal or real, are usually the ones who cry the loudest for the subversion of the existing order of things, demanding measures that are revolutionary and dangerous. Their desire is to take from the provident and frugal and distribute among the improvident, the idle and the vicious. Henry George, Father McGlynn and the whole gang of socialists in the United States are busily planting crops of dragon's teeth that will soon produce hordes of armed men, red-handed and ready to subvert society and bring sorrow to all lovers of law and order. Canada stands in danger of similar trouble through the teachings of those who would if they dared observe no law except that of their own wills. Lovers of Canada do not want any innovations looking to the making of fiat money, state ownership of railroads, state ownership of all land, etc.; nor any such paternal government as will embrace such "absolute ownership" as the *Labor Reformer* longs for. It might do in Russia, or Turkey, but not in Canada.

THE MANUFACTURERS' "LITTLE INTEREST."

MR. THOMAS SHAW, the secretary of the Central Farmers' Institute, has on several occasions alluded to the manufacturing interests in a very offensive manner, and has also indulged in misleading statements as to the extent and value of what he is pleased to term the "manufacturers' little interest."

In order to expose Mr. Shaw's misrepresentations, I wrote the following letter which appeared in the *Toronto Mail* of the 5th inst.:

To the Editor of the Mail.

SIR,—I have noticed that on several occasions Mr. Thomas Shaw, secretary of the Central Farmers' Institute, has taken the trouble to misrepresent the action of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association and of myself. Heretofore Mr. Shaw's misstatements have been ignored and probably for this reason, he now considers himself absolved from a very careful consideration of the veracity of his assertions when dealing with the manufacturing interests. At a recent meeting of the Wentworth Farmers' Institute, held in the city of Hamilton, Mr. Shaw is reported to have spoken as follows:—"A Mr. Nicholls, who writes as secretary of the Manufacturers' Association of Ontario, accuses us farmers of trying to build ourselves up by pulling the manufacturers down. This, as you well know, is a calumny. All we ask is fair play and an opportunity to make the most of our energies, which cannot be obtained under the existing state of affairs. The farmers can, if they will, show this special agent of the manufacturers that they know not only how to govern their own affairs but that they are the balance of power in the Dominion. I must confess that I have been marvellously struck with the force, the common sense and the knowledge of the men who have been practically characterized by the secretary of the Manufacturers' Association as know-nothings."

In reply to Mr. Shaw's personal references contained in the above extract I would say, sir, that they lack the essential elements of truth and candor; that if he has read any of my letters to the press he knows that not a single line warrants his gratuitous fabrications, and I would further say that in

the discussion of a question of such moment, cheap personal clap-trap belittling a crossroads politician is neither the most effective nor dignified means of presenting one's views to the public, at a time when we are all sincerely desirous of arriving at an unprejudiced opinion as to which course would result in the greatest good to the greatest number.

I have not written on this question as secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. I have not accused the farmers of trying to build themselves up by pulling the manufacturers down, and I have never even by implication characterized the farmers as know-nothings. These denials are emphatic and the onus of proving his assertions lies with Mr. Shaw.

This same gentleman has said in reference to the manufacturing industries:—"But when this flourishing little interest tell the 200,000 farmers of Ontario that Commercial Union with the United States is not in the interests of Canada, that respectable body can surely afford to accept the statement as a good joke." Whilst regretting the offensiveness of Mr. Shaw's chosen language I must also differ with his deductions. It is claimed that the total annual production of Canadian farms is \$400,000,000 annually, truly a brave showing, hence the covert sneer at the industrial classes. But there are two sides to every question, and although in the last census year, 1881, our industrial establishments were neither as numerous nor as extensive as the present, I find that, according to the official figures, the value of their products amounted to \$309,000,000, and that they paid out in wages the enormous sum of \$60,000,000 for that year. From personal knowledge I venture the statement that were a census taken this year the total value of productions would exceed \$500,000,000, so that Mr. Shaw's jibe at the "manufacturers' little interest" was as injudicious as it was boorish and uncalled for.

Let me analyze these figures still further. Our total production of farm products is estimated at \$400,000,000, of which 10 per cent. or \$40,000,000 is exported, and 90 per cent. or \$360,000,000 enters into home consumption. Who buys this, and who pays for it? Apart from those engaged in professions and in commerce, what percentage of the annual amount of \$360,000,000 (now possibly \$100,000,000) paid by manufacturers to their employes goes into the pockets of the farmer? Supposing that free traders have all the time erred in claiming so persistently that the consumers pay the duty, and admitting, for the sake of argument, that in the event of Commercial Union the farmer would get an increased price for his horses and barley equivalent to the full amount of the duty now levied by the United States, would it offset the certain loss of custom he is now in receipt of from the mechanics and artisans, let alone those engaged in our financial institutions and in mercantile pursuits? Let me try and establish a conclusion. For the fiscal year ending June 30th, 1886, the total value of exports of horses to the United States was \$2,104,355, on which \$420,871 was collected as duty. Of barley, we shipped 8,528,287 bushels, valued at \$5,708,130, on which duty was collected to the amount of \$852,820. From the above it will be seen that on the items of horses and barley, about which we hear so much, the total value of the duty collected by the United States on imports from Canada amounted to \$1,274,000. Are the Canadian farmers willing to sell their birthright for this mess of pottage; or in other words, are they willing to jeopardize a sure and reliable home market which consumes 90 per cent. of their productions, in pursuit of a mythical advantage which the most strenuous advocates of Commercial Union have hitherto failed to put into tangible shape? I do not accept Mr. Shaw as the farmers' oracle in this matter, and I repudiate his assertion that nine-tenths of the farmers are of his way of thinking. At this stage of the question we require facts, not suppositions, and with Mr. Shaw the wish is very evidently father to the thought. The onus of proof again lies with Mr. Shaw.

To still further arrive at a correct interpretation of the official figures the following statement of the destination of our