

## THE N. P. IS ALL RIGHT.

EFFORTS are being made by its enemies to show that because a revival of the old preferential tariff system between Britain and her colonies is advocated by some in favor of it, the N.P. is losing ground. It is said that some manufacturers like Mr. Armstrong are supporters of a movement for free trade with the United States, whilst others suggest reforms in the existing system.

No people except the Medes and Persians of old ever made laws with the inflexibility of cast-iron; and no people who are progressive in their character and disposition desire laws that cannot be made to conform to the highest requirements of society. Therefore, even in the construction of the N. P. its best friends never claimed that it was immaculate, or that it would never need to be amended. The proof of this lies in the fact that from time to time at each succeeding session of Parliament the N.P. has been amended and made to conform to the conditions that prevailed at the time. These amendments, it should be observed, have always been made by friends who were ready and willing to make them, so that the system might be perpetuated, and not by its enemies who seek to destroy it. And the manufacturers as a class understand that whenever weak points appear in the N.P. they may be strengthened; and the enemies of it understand that the manufacturers will never consent to its destruction.

It is said that over-production of manufactures is one of the evils of protection; by which is meant that the manufacturers are caged up in a home market too small to absorb all the stuff they produce; and as a consequence stocks accumulate, and they are obliged to work shorter hours and at times to close down. Some believe that a remedy for this congestion would be found in an export trade, and that it is impossible to benefit such a trade so long as the manufacturers have to "pay through the nose" for their raw material. We can show that over-production is not justly chargeable to protection. Admit for argument that protected manufacturers are caged up in a home market too small to absorb all they produce, and that without protection they would not have to "pay through the nose" for their raw materials—that if they had free trade with all the world they could obtain their raw materials at the lowest possible cost, and that they could sell all they could produce, having no fear of over-production. The answer is that Great Britain has free trade with all the term implies, and still her manufacturers suffer from over-production, many of them demanding protection as a remedy therefor. A great many British manufacturers are in this plight to day; and in their dilemma some of them are proposing to remove, nay, are removing their industries to protected countries. They are not able to save themselves in their own home market because it is free to the manufacturers of protected countries who can produce cheaper. They see their stocks accumulate, and they are obliged to work shorter hours, and at times to close down. Their export trade is no remedy for the congestion; and thousands of British workers are thrown out of employment, and are walking the streets of British manufacturing centres, swelling the army of the submerged tenth of the population so graphically described by General Booth of the Salvation Army. Of what benefit is free trade to these manufacturers and these workmen? It is their curse.

It is a fatal mistake for manufacturers to suppose that because they embark in the production of merchandise Government must guarantee the profitable sale of it. The wants of the people require certain quantities of merchandise, and in protected countries the manufacturers have reasonable expectation of producing it; but when they enjoy this protection, and hold the home market against foreign manufacturers, they should be satisfied. As between themselves competition may be depended upon to keep prices at a minimum; but they ought not to expect Government to hasten to their rescue when, after fully supplying the home market they continue to produce in excess of the consumption, and want special favors, the granting of which would operate against other manufacturers and against the very system by which they thrive and without which they could not live. Let the law of the survival of the fittest prevail; but the Government should not change a policy that builds up and maintains the industries of manufacturers of brains and experience on the demands of amateurs who do not possess those valuable qualities. Therefore we are opposed to Government allowing drawbacks to the amount of the duty paid upon imported raw material if such material is also produced at home; and we are opposed to the payment of export bounties. If a manufacturer in any particular line finds that over-production is occurring that cannot be remedied in any of the ways herein indicated, except by the interference of Government; and if he is not financially or otherwise inclined to try conclusions with the rest of the trade, abiding by the law of the survival of the fittest, let him embark his capital and energies in some other line of manufactures where the field does not seem to be so fully occupied. If he can find no such opening, and if he is convinced that he cannot succeed as a manufacturer without Governmental interference in his behalf, these facts should indicate to him that he had mistaken his calling, and that the cultivation of turnips and cabbages was a sphere in life that he might occupy with honor and profit to himself and to his country.

## SUCCESSFUL MANUFACTURERS DO NOT WHINE

THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER is angry with those manufacturers who have expressed a desire for unrestricted reciprocity in the columns of *The Globe*. It asks us to note that "successful manufacturers do not whine and beg for reciprocity," the implication being that Mr. Raymond (who is criticised by name), Mr. Waterous, Mr. Armstrong of Guelph, Mr. Folger of Kingston, Mr. Frost of Smith's Falls, Mr. Doherty of Sarnia, and the rest of the reciprocitarians are mere bunglers. Our contemporary is making too large a draft upon public credulity. The manufacturers who are afraid of meeting American competition in a common market may possibly be successful enough in the sense of making their industries pay through the instrumentality of a law which enables them to sweat the Canadian consumer, but by their own confession they are inferior in brains or in experience, or in both, to their American rivals, as well as to the men who are ready and willing to face those rivals. That much is clear enough. The truth is that the industries which shrink from a square competition are the least vigorous and the most sickly of the lot. To-day they are shaking in their boots lest the Old Man should make some trade arrangement