

THE TARIFF.

THE *Monetary Times*, discussing the coming session of the Dominion Parliament, and the action or non-action that may be taken there regarding the tariff, says :

"Unless the resolution not to grant an increase of the tariff as a concession to importunity be announced at an early date, the Government will be assailed with endless applications by interested parties. The best way would be to let it be understood at the outset that no increase of the tariff can be sanctioned."

It is strange that intelligent people do not comprehend that the tariff laws of the Dominion are not like the laws of the Medes and Persians, that cannot be altered, nor that they are made with the inflexibility of cast iron, that may be shattered but can never be made to conform to any other than the original shape. Other laws are not thus made, and even the Divine Law has recently been subjected to some modifications, as shown in the revised edition of the Holy Bible. Why, then, should the tariff laws of the Dominion be considered of such peculiar character as to forbid any corrections changes or alterations of them? What are the "concessions to importunity" that the *Monetary Times* deprecates? Suppose the Government should be "assailed with applications by interested parties" for modifications or changes of the tariff, what is the Government for if not to respectfully listen to all such applications; to weigh the arguments presented, and to do substantial justice in the premises? It is not expected that disinterested parties will annoy the Government about the matter; and the "interested" ones are those who should carry the matter to the Government, and to insist that it should receive that careful attention and consideration that business men should give to matters of business. This is no time for the Government to ignore the claims of manufacturers, the very existence of whose business may depend upon there being made some modifications of the tariff. In asking for modifications of the tariff, the manufacturers do not approach the Government as suppliants for favors; and the *Monetary Times*, nor any of those who oppose tariff revision, need suffer heart-sickness in advising the Government to turn deaf ears to whatever suggestions they may have to make. On the other hand, the manufacturers do not anticipate any such treatment, but they will go to Ottawa, and they will show to the Government wherein there should be some modifications of the tariff, and they feel dead sure that their representations will receive the consideration they deserve.

The *Monetary Times* imagines that whatever changes there may be demanded in the tariff will all be in the direction of increasing the present duties. In this it shows its ignorance of the situation, for, as we have heretofore shown, there are some levies that are obviously too high, and that ought to be reduced or removed. There are also levies that are not high enough, and these will most assuredly be increased. There are also features of the tariff that should be made more plain and unambiguous, and this matter will certainly be attended to.

The friends of the National Policy are not on the defensive—not a bit of it. They know who their friends are, and they also know who their enemies are; and they do not count among their friends those timid and half-hearted ones who are afraid of shadows. The masses of the voting population of Canada are friends of the National Policy. They demand it

in the first place, and it sprung into existence in obedience to that demand. Time and again the Government have been sustained by the people in maintaining this system, and the people will sustain the Government now, and whenever they are appealed to for that purpose. The fact that for several years past there has been decline in the prices of farm produce cannot be charged against the National Policy; and the farmers of Canada have more sense than to do so, notwithstanding the suggestions of the Grit papers. It is the veriest nonsense to charge the decline in value of agricultural products to the tariff, and the doing so exhibits exceeding weakness on the part of the Free Traders. There will be no cry raised among the farmers against the tariff; there will be no revolution against it at the polls, and the National Policy is in no danger of sudden reversal.

STRIKES AND THE STRIKERS.

THE recent dock laborers' strike in London, and its results, impressed the labor unions in that city that they could win in any strike they might inaugurate, and that they had only to demand in order to obtain higher wages and shorter hours, or any other terms they might demand. Growing out of this was the strike of the gas stokers in London South; but the firmness and determination of the manager of the gas works, Mr. Livesey, defeated the strikers at all points. Finally, when the hopelessness of obtaining their demands induced the men to give it up, a delegation from their union waited upon the manager, but these he absolutely refused to see, saying that if his old employees had anything to say to him they could see him as individuals representing no organization, and no persons but themselves. The gas works in the meantime had been fully supplied with new hands, and, as a final effort, the old employees waited upon Mr. Livesey and proposed that they would all return to work on the manager's terms if the new men were discharged. "Never," answered Mr. Livesey, "we are bound in honor to stand by the men who have stood by us." The weather is now very cold for these strikers. The strike of the railway porters in London has also proved a miserable failure, and these men are out in the cold. The attempt at a fresh strike at the Victoria Dock, to prevent the delivery of goods to any but union cartmen, broke down completely; and the miners in South Wales, and the workers in the shoe factories in Bristol, who recently attempted to use their unions to force certain concessions from their employers, are now trying to obtain their old situations in terms not of their dictating.

Recently, at the Liverpool Assizes, Mr. Justice Grantham decided that boycotting is an offence at common law. In the case before him boycotted Irish cattle had been taken to England for sale. Emissaries followed the cattle and warned and threatened dealers against buying them. These men were indicted for conspiracy, tried, convicted and sentenced to imprisonment. His Lordship held that when a combination becomes a conspiracy to prevent a man from carrying on his business, it is unlawful, and is punishable at common law.

In the case of the London workmen, there is no doubt but that the pay they were receiving was most meagre and insufficient, and it is greatly to be regretted that these men should not have received better wages for their services. That they