

party to enter into another presidential campaign without having done anything toward the revision of the tariff. Two national elections—those of 1904 and 1906—have been held since the agitation for tariff revision became so strong in certain parts of the country—notably in Massachusetts and in the middle western and north-western states. The senator referred to has not been known as a revisionist at all, but he has always been a powerful influence in the Senate, and his word on tariff matters has always been listened to with close attention. As for Senator Aldrich, chairman of the committee, he has frequently been referred to as a standpatter, but he is not opposed to revision in the same uncompromising way that Speaker Cannon, Representative Payne and Representative Dalzell are opposed to it. He has held for a long time that the Dingley law would have to be revised in the not distant future, and he has not followed the example of the dyed-in-the-wool standpatters by regarding the present tariff law as a sort of divine institution.

It is probable that any scheme of revision which may be adopted will involve modifications in section 4 of the present law relating to the negotiation of reciprocity treaties; and it is certain also that the question of a maximum and minimum tariff will be fully discussed in Congress. Since it has been seen what Germany can do, if that country is so disposed, to restrict American trade by the imposition of a maximum scale of duties, interest in the maximum and minimum system in this country has increased visibly. Some members of Congress believe that the United States should have a means of retaliation in such circumstances.

Only that and nothing more. The Commercial maintains a regularly paid correspondent at Washington as all up-to-date American newspapers do, and, as will be seen by his letter, qualified by ifs and perhapses every statement he made. In fact he stated nothing but what was and is old gossip such as floats about the capital at all times.

It is worth noticing, however, that The Globe goes considerably out of its way to denounce a policy of the United States government with which a large majority of the eighty odd millions of people of that country are quite contented, and have been ever since they turned Grover Cleveland out of the presidency. The Globe calls the America tariff, "the most gigantic humbug of the age," that it is "ready to tumble like a house of cards," that "consternation followed the announcement of the Commercial's correspondent that the Senate Finance Committee may take up the question of tariff revision during the recess of Congress," and so ad nauseam.

It has a fling, too, at the Treasury Board—a something with hoofs and horns in the opinion of The Globe, forgetting that the machinery of the Canadian government includes a Treasury Board also, created for similar purposes. The Merchants' Association, the Board of Trade and the Chamber of Commerce of New York, are composed of business men who differ in politics among themselves, some of them favoring free trade, and others very much in favor of tariff protection, generally of the existing sort. We have similar divergencies even here in Canada.

The Globe tells us that the process of tariff building in the United States has gone on heedlessly as in Canada

during the so-called national policy regime; and it therefore squirts a lot of such inuendoes at protective tariffs as cannot be equalled by any other paper, respectable or otherwise. The Globe forgets that ever since the foundation of the United States government with a few exceptions and brief periods, tariff protection has been, as it is now, the aegis under which the industrial pursuits of the country have grown and prospered; and it fails to remember that, without exception, every financial reverse has occurred as a result of a change of policy. The Globe should read history, at least such as is taught in the school books.

The Globe mentions Mr. Cleveland, the unfortunate gentleman who while he was president, tried so hard to embroil Great Britain including Canada, with his country. Mr. Cleveland's inspiration was no doubt drawn from a black bottle during a fishing excursion. We would willingly allow the event to sink in oblivion; but he again bobs up in the political horizon, and again urges his free trade Democratic party to again try "tariff reform," such as The Globe holds in such high esteem. Mr. Cleveland, when president, gave his country a tariff measure, and from that day to this the United States has been overwhelmingly Republican, and his country will never again act upon his free trade ideas.

It might be imagined from what The Globe says that tariff legislation in the United States is a constantly continuing process—that every one who secures the ear of Congress has the taxation of the people increased on some special commodity for his benefit; that each increase helps a few by injuring the many; that those who are injured seek compensation that is readily granted in the form of new imports favoring their special interests at the expense of a broader circle of taxpayers, and that thus the needless burdens are multiplied and multiplied, each new import necessitating demands for many more. A more outrageous falsification of facts was never uttered, even in the yellowest of yellow, scandal mongering publications. The ruinous semi-free trade tariff which was instituted in the United States under Cleveland was most happily displaced after having been weighed in the balance of public opinion and found wanting, Clevelandism giving place to McKinleyism. The Globe knows, or should know that the McKinley tariff was ratified, and went into effect on July 24, 1897—ten years ago—since which date no item, or line, or word, or punctuation point has been changed. In verification of this we would say that in the preparation of copy for our current tariff edition of THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURER, having reference to the United States tariff, in reply to an enquiry we were informed by Mr. C. H. Heep, acting-secretary of the United States Treasury: Division of Customs, that no legislation affecting rates of duty in the tariff act of July 24, 1897, had been passed. So much for the stability of the American tariff.

We cannot say as much for the Canadian tariff. The present Dominion Government came into power in 1896 and found the Foster tariff in force. It was an excellent tariff, not unduly protective in character, but good and effective. The government not being favorably disposed to pro-