

ESTABLISHED 1866

THE MONETARY TIMES, TRADE REVIEW

And Insurance Chronicle,

With which has been incorporated the INTERCOLONIAL JOURNAL OF COMMERCE, of Montreal (in 1869), the TRADE REVIEW, of the same city (in 1870), and the TORONTO JOURNAL OF COMMERCE.

Issued every Friday morning.

SUBSCRIPTION—POST PAID.

CANADIAN SUBSCRIBERS	\$2.00 Per Year.
BRITISH " "	10s. 6d. Sterling Per Year.
AMERICAN " "	\$2.00 United States Currency
SINGLE COPIES	10 Cents.

Book and Job Printing a Specialty.

PUBLISHED BY THE

MONETARY TIMES PRINTING COMPANY OF CANADA, Limited.

EDW. TROUT, President. ALFRED W. LAW, Sec'y-Treas.

Office: 62 Church St., cor. Court

TELEPHONE: { BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICES, 1892
PRINTING DEPARTMENT, 1485

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 16, 1897.

THE SITUATION.

At last the day on which the new tariff bill is to be brought down at Ottawa has been fixed for the 22nd inst. The circumstances under which the change is to be made will not be without influence, and will modify the character of the measure. Party zeal for sweeping tariff reforms has had its edge dulled by friction with an extreme tariff movement in the United States, and unless the cool prudence of statesmanship prevail at Ottawa, we shall be in danger of allowing ourselves to be betrayed into a policy of extensive reprisal. It is quite clear that even the United States has learned something from the disastrous effects of the blighting policy of restriction, which originated with Charles V. of Spain, which was copied by Turgot, in France, and thence extended its malign influence to the rest of Europe. As a rule, the States no longer restrict on more than one side. They do not follow the original example or the early copyists as far so to prohibit exportation of raw material, as well as the importation of manufactured articles. They do not in terms prohibit at all, but are content to achieve the same object under the form of high duties, put on in the name of intense patriotism.

A spirit of exclusiveness on this side is responding to the initiative of exclusion embodied in the Dingley bill. The House of Commons, at Ottawa, has unanimously retorted the exclusion of labor at the frontier, in the terms of the original aggression. The city council of Vancouver, with only a single dissenting voice, resolves that only British subjects shall be employed in civic works; the Legislature of British Columbia has taken the first step towards excluding aliens, meaning particularly Americans, from the right to take up mining claims in the Province. At the rate this mutual industrial antagonism is growing, it may soon be formidable enough to attract attention to the desirability of coming to an amicable understanding on the subjects of dispute.

Though two generations have passed away since Huskisson said of prohibition: "The patent for that fine invention has expired," we seem to be in danger of seeing the old patent renewed. The American tariff bill threatens Canada, at more than one point, with practical prohibition, not under that name, but under tariff forms and in the name

of American labor and American patriotism. Should Canada be driven to take reprisals in the form of prohibiting the export of a raw material, saw logs, and excluding bituminous coal by a countervailing duty of 75 cents, we need not shut our eyes to the fact that both countries will injure themselves by their restrictive policy. Though the aggressor will certainly not be Canada, she will at least be responsible for her own policy, as the United States will be responsible for hers. The danger is that public opinion in Canada will justify the Government in meeting practical prohibition by absolute prohibition in one or two raw products. Indeed, pressure which the Government may not be able to withstand, is likely to be brought to bear on the Laurier Cabinet to secure this result.

It will probably be impossible for moderate tariff men in the States to secure reasonable reductions in the Dingley bill. There high tariff has come to mean something more than the exclusion of foreign products. It means war to the knife between western and eastern iron makers. These patriots are just as ready, when dollars are to be made by the process, to crush one another as they are to exclude the products of the "pauper labor of Europe." So far as the western iron men have natural advantages over their competitors in the east, their enjoyment of the superior gifts of nature need not be grudged, but when they count on success through prohibitory duties on foreign coal, they will evoke and array against themselves a feeling with which they will one day have to reckon. There is here a gleam of hope for the ultimate success of a sound policy; its attainment is in the future, and meanwhile Canada is confronted by facts of a contrary kind, which have an unpleasant meaning for us as well as for the iron makers of the Eastern States.

One gleam of practical wisdom found its way into the Dingley bill. Raw hides were made free. The growers of hides raised a fierce protest that they were being treated to buzzard, while other people were invited to make their repast on turkey. The battle of the buzzards and the turkeys is being fought with an energy worthy of a better cause; at present the odds are in favor of the anti-buzzards. A hopeful sign is to be found in the extravagance of the demands of the friends of the grazier for higher duties on wool than those contained in the Dingley bill. Some of them would carry the maximum figure to 50 cents per lb. Doubtless these rural enthusiasts never heard that France once lost the market of Naples for her cloths by putting a high duty on Neapolitan wool, and the prospect of something like a repetition of this fact would not abash them if they had. Let the Americans fall into the trap they are unconsciously preparing for themselves. Let them put the wool duties at the highest figure that will please the wool growers. This will create for Canada the opportunity to drive an immense trade in English woolens. It would be necessary to find some means of doing this without creating a ground of complaint from our own woolen manufacturers. If we did this, tens of thousands of Americans would come here and buy clothes made of English cloths at one-third the price of American.

Senator Chandler is afraid that the demands of the American wool growers for excessive duties on the raw material, and the woolen manufacturers for what they call compensatory duties on woolen cloth, may, unless care be taken, cause a revulsion of feeling that will defeat the tariff bill. Some critics, who doubt the sincerity of this statement, think it a stratagem for inducing the Senate to agree to the high rates in the bill, as passed by the House. The