

New York for the purpose of having a duty imposed upon, say, every basket of grapes that is sent from the other side of the Hudson into Massachusetts. On their side, the New Yorkers should impose a tax upon the fish, salt or fresh, that is sent from Gloucester and Boston to Albany and other interior cities. At present people of the Bay State are obtaining a luscious and beautiful fruit at an extraordinarily low price, in place of the poor fruit which, for climatic reasons, would be the result of our own raising, while the people of New York State obtain at relatively low prices fresh and salt sea fish as a welcome change from their accustomed diet. The Herald says that the Canadian market is naturally just as accessible to the citizen of Massachusetts as the New York market; the Massachusetts market is naturally just as accessible to the Canadian producer as it is to the New York producer, and it believes that the sooner trade between the Dominion and the Republic can flow back and forth as freely as it does between the States the better it will be for all the people upon the American continent.

For reasons good and sufficient unto themselves the British colonies that are now comprised in the United States, after achieving independence from the Mother Country, attempted to maintain an inter-independence among themselves to the extent of attempting to obtain revenues for carrying on their several governments by imposing import duties upon merchandise brought into their several territories from the others. There were no political ties that bound them to Great Britain, and the ties that bound them together were weak and intangible, and promised no substantial good; nor could they see how they were to reap the full benefit of their political independence under what was only a confederation of weak, and to a certain extent, helpless states. In fact they were in much the same condition that we now observe in some of the Central and South American republics. Their strength came to them, and their importance became a strong factor in the affairs of the world, when their confederation was merged into a union, and when the individual states for the sake of establishing their nationality, surrendered to a central or general government all of their previous rights that conflicted or might conflict with the power of the general government to maintain itself as a unit in the family of nations. This surrender of state rights was to the extent only of making every state as free as every other state, and the rights and privileges granted by any state to its citizens equally free to the citizens of all the other states. There could be no barriers raised between states nor the citizens of the different states; and the only power to impose import duties upon foreign merchandise reposed in the general government.

How foolish, then, for the Boston Herald, to suggest that, using the protectionist argument, or any other argument, there is no reason why a tariff barrier should not be raised where Massachusetts abuts upon New York. How foolish, too, for that respectable journal, and for the Toronto Globe, to suggest that, there being a law forbidding the levying of interstate tariff duties within the United States, it would be equally wrong to maintain a tariff barrier in Canada against the United States, and in the United States against Canada. The situations are entirely dissimilar.

It should not be supposed that because in the last century Massachusetts and New York and the rest of the thirteen colonies found it to their interest to cast their lots together, Canada should be forced to join her political fortunes with them. The barriers that have always existed between them and us are the price of our separate nationalities, and unless these

distinct nationalities are to be abandoned, the one swallowing and absorbing the other, the barriers must remain. The German market is naturally just as accessible to the citizens of France, and the French market naturally just as accessible to the Germans, as is the Canadian market to the citizens of New York and New England; and the American market to the citizens of Canada, but The Globe surely would not argue that the trade between Germany and France can be brought to flow back and forth between those countries as freely as it does between the different states of the American union, or that it would be better for all the people upon the European continent that such a condition should prevail.

AD VALOREM AND SPECIFIC DUTIES.

The iron men are not alone in their protest against the faulty classification of the present tariff. The dry goods dealers on Wednesday presented a strong case for the simplification of the schedules affecting the articles in which they are interested. The uniformity of the demand for simplification is a striking testimony to the incapacity of the framers of the present tariff. Let us hope that the present Government will be able to enact a tariff which, at least, its own friends may defend.—Montreal Herald.

The protestant alluded to by The Herald against the faulty classification of the present tariff are not manufacturers, but importers of iron and dry goods, their desire being, chiefly, that all specific duties in the tariff be abandoned. This is the old, old cry. These importers cannot be happy unless they make unusual profits which would be impossible with specific or even compound duties. We commend to them a careful reading of the following views of the New York Dry Goods Economist which most forcibly express its opposition to ad valorem duties. It says:—

No stronger arraignment of the ad valorem method of levying customs dues can be found than the statement contained in the annual report of the Board of United States General Appraisers, extracts from which will be found on another page. The report shows an increase in the number of reappraisements for the year ending September 30, 1895, of no less than 5,101 compared with those of the twelve months ending October 31, 1894, which almost fourfold increase is described by the Board as chiefly due to the enlargement of the scope of ad valorem rates of duty by the existing tariff law. The only other reason assigned for the increase—the better diligence and efficiency of appraising officers, to which the Board says the increase is in some measure due—may be put aside as complimentary and the Board's statement may be fairly read as attributing the increase wholly to the greater scope of ad valorem duties.

The loss of time and annoyance caused to merchants by these 7,000 reappraisements it is impossible to estimate, nor can any one calculate the loss in actual dollars and cents arising from delay in passing upon the cases and the consequent inability of the importer to dispose of his goods. And yet, in spite of all this, no actual security is given to the domestic manufacturer against unfair competition resulting from undervaluation—if 7,000 cases, why not 7,500? Who can tell how many entries have been passed with an erroneous appraisement?

Ad valorem duties have had a thorough trial during the past two years and have been found fatally wanting. They offer a premium to double dealing not only on the part of the importer, but by the domestic manufacturer. The Economist has been informed, for instance, of cases where entries have been advanced not because the goods were undervalued, but as the result of influence exerted by domestic concerns. With unfair methods of this kind the appraiser cannot escape complicity.

A series of specific duties, for which The Economist has long contended, is the only one to which men who are practical as well as honest can subscribe.