

in September last, Mr. Young, the secretary, stated that the roster of the Association contained 1,272 names. This is a good showing, and indicates that that number of members were leagued together in the desire to advance the manufacturing interests of the country. But it does not indicate that all of them are unanimous in a desire for a thorough revision of the tariff. It is quite true that the tariff should be framed so that manufacturing in Canada may keep pace with the changing conditions of our market, and that Canada's resources might be developed and her industries built up. But this position is neither new nor startling, for there are not only the 1,200 members of the Association who favor it, but 12,000 or more other Canadian manufacturers who are not members who favor it; and not only they but every man in the country favors it. There are 641 items included in the tariff, and it is inconceivable that all these are to be thoroughly revised. Should such a thing be attempted there are hundreds of members of the Association whose interests would be adversely affected who would protest against the effort; there would be thousands of other manufacturers who would join in the protest, and millions of other voters would be quick to depose from power any government who might attempt it. When a man who is ill sends for his physician he does not merely say "I am sick," but he locates and describes his ailment. Why not pursue a similar method regarding the tariff? It can be shown that both the iron and textile schedules of the tariff need revision; but this does not imply that a "thorough revision" must be made affecting all of the 641 different articles enumerated therein, and such revision had better not be attempted.

This journal has always declared itself as being in favor of a protective tariff—a tariff that will give adequate protection to every Canadian manufacturing industry. Our opinion is that the tariff we now have does not afford such protection to our iron and steel, and to our textile industries, and that it should be changed in those respects; but it certainly cannot be in the best interest of Canada that it should be changed for sentimental reasons so as to give undue preference to Great Britain, or to restrict or prohibit imports from foreign countries from which we obtain our "surplus requirements"—requirements in excess of what home producers can supply, and which Great Britain is not disposed to compete for. In the December 18 issue of this journal was a tabulated statement which emphasized the situation in which Canada finds herself in this respect, in which it is shown that in a selected list of two hundred manufactured articles imported into Canada, and in strong demand here, Great Britain supplied us with less than 10 per cent. and the United States with more than 83 per cent., all the rest of the world, including all British possessions, sending us the small balance of 7 per cent. Loyalty to the Old Flag is a good thing, but if the Mother Country does not supply a larger proportion of our "surplus requirements," it is not to be supposed that we are to be deprived of them; but this is what the proposed "thorough revision" of the tariff means.

LET US HAVE PEACE.

Heretofore Harper's Weekly was considered one of the most staid and reliable journals published in the United States, not being given to hysterical nor fire-eating exclamations. But it seems to be getting over that, and preaches blood and thunder and other disagreeable things in view of what may result from Mr. Chamberlain's movement in Great Britain. In a recent issue it takes some of Mr. Carnegie's

utterances as a text, and threatens Great Britain and Canada with all sorts of dire calamities if the Mother Country should presume to give any tariff preference to her colonies, particularly to Canada, that is not also accorded to the United States. It tells us that American tariffs have not discriminated against any particular foreign country; that all foreign purveyors of a particular product are subject to the same customs duty; that the only preferences that that country has ever given have been accorded under reciprocity treaties in return for equivalent concessions; that Germany and France have framed their tariffs on protectionist principles, but which have not discriminated against the United States and that such a discrimination would be regarded as a provocation and would lead to tariff reprisals, which almost certainly would culminate in war. We quote from the Weekly:

Without the good-will of the United States the grain of Canada would never reach the Atlantic ports for shipment. It is obvious that to interrupt the railway communication between the seaboard and the North-West provinces which constitute the granary of the Dominion, would be child's play for the military power of the United States. It would be superfluous, however, for us to commit an act of war. We need not resort to overt hostility in order to cut off England from connection with her principal grain-growing colony during a large part of every year—that part, moreover, during which the wheat crop is moved. Here again Mr. Carnegie shows himself thoroughly alive to all the possibilities of the situation. As he points out in his pamphlet, a word from the President might cancel the privilege now generously granted to Canada, of reaching ice-free American ports through American territory, with all her foreign business, exports and imports free of duty, for five months in the year, when her own ports are ice-bound. As a matter of fact, the privilege is used all the year round. In 1902 the Canadian Dominion shipped through American ports 28,546,000 bushels of breadstuffs. The number of hushels shipped in the twelvemonth named through Canadian ports we are unable to state, but as the total value of Canadian foodstuffs exported to Britain in 1902 was only \$22,471,000, it is evident that a large portion of her shipments of breadstuffs reached Britain over American territory and through American ports. The simple withdrawal of this bonding privilege, which American public opinion would unquestionably demand, would suffice to convince the British people that in offering a preference to Canadian breadstuffs they had committed an act of folly. Negotiations for a restoration of the bonding privilege would soon begin, and the favor so foolishly forfeited would ultimately be regained. The bitterness, however, engendered between the two countries by discrimination and reprisal might retard for years a revival of the present cordial relations.

This means that should Great Britain give tariff preference to Canada and not to the United States, Canada is to be punished therefor. It would be superfluous for the United States, we are told, to commit an act of war against Canada, with gunpowder and things—but it is obvious that to interrupt railway communication between the seaboard and the grain-growing sections of Canada would be but child's play for the military power of our neighbor. That sort of warfare would not be undertaken at first, but the President would at once cancel the bonding privilege now so generously (?) granted to Canada. That would fix it, and Canada would at once be suffocated in the coils of the great American anaconda.

Harper's Weekly does not seem to be familiar with the question it discusses. It does not seem to comprehend that Canada bears similar relation to Great Britain that Maine or Oregon bears to Ohio or Texas—that the British Empire is as much bound to protect and defend the integrity of Canada as the United States is bound to protect and defend the integrity of any state of the Union. It tells us that the American tariff does not discriminate against any particular foreign country, and therefore Great Britain should not discriminate against