

our manufactures, which would effect our revenue very materially, and consequently we thought it desirable to ask Parliament to reduce our duty on tobacco made from foreign leaf from 20 to 12 cents, and from Canadian leaf from 8 to 2 cents; and as the amount obtained from Canadian tobaccos is small, we propose to make the rules and regulations such as will be acceptable to those who are interested in that particular industry."

The above extract is interesting as shewing what a paternal interest our Finance Minister takes in tobacco and snuff factories, and speaks strongly for his kindness of heart, if not for his soundness of head. That there is the slightest danger of our tobacco factories being closed up on account of smuggled tobacco flooding this market we do not for one moment believe, but Mr. Tilley had to give some reason for reducing the excise duty on tobacco and snuff, and the above nonsensical one was probably better than none. We stated last month that tobacco was of little value compared with its bulk, and therefore not a likely article to be a favorite commodity for smugglers. As a rule these individuals prefer articles of small bulk and much value in preference to such goods as tobacco, sugar and cheap groceries. If the Minister of Finance's logic is good for tobacco how much better it would be for jewelry, a trade that everyone knows, who understands anything about it at all, that is having its vitals eaten out by this very crime of smuggling, a crime called into existence very much by the action of the present Minister of Finance, and kept alive almost entirely by his obstinacy in refusing to make the change desired by the trade. A box of tobacco weighing about ten pounds, and worth say ten dollars, if it was smuggled in could only net the smuggler a gain of say three dollars, the amount of the duty that the Government would levy on that particular quantity of the article. A parcel of jewelry however of the same bulk, and little or no more weight, and just as easily smuggled, would be worth at least one thousand dollars if plated, and two thousand dollars if gold goods. On these goods the duty would be from two hundred to four hundred dollars, as the case might be, and this amount would represent the gain the smuggler would stand to make if he carried the operation successfully through. Now does any sane person for one moment think that people

will attempt to smuggle such goods as tobacco through in order to save a paltry three dollars, when they can with no more risk turn their attention to goods which are much more easily manipulated and gain by the same efforts from two to four hundred dollars. The Finance Minister would have people believe that smugglers pursue their calling for the love of it. We certainly think this would be the case did they go in for smuggling tobaccos and such like goods in preference to jewelry.

As a rule people smuggle to make money. The higher the duty and the less bulky the goods the better it pays, and *vice versa*. Smugglers are not fools—they can gauge the risk more accurately than outsiders, and the gains equally as accurately. To say, as our Finance Minister virtually does, that these shrewd law-breakers will knowingly smuggle such goods as tobacco in preference to jewelry is, to say the least, the veriest nonsense. If Sir Leonard Tilley's argument is tenable at all, and the tobacco trade is in the slightest degree endangered by smuggling, how much more forcibly do all his arguments apply to the jewelry trade.

The jewelry trade is not only threatened by smuggling, but is almost ruined by it. It is not imaginary evil that may be reasonably looked forward to, but a present and incontrovertible fact. Jewelry smuggling exists not because of the "grace of God," but by the "grace of our Minister of Finance," for by refusing to lower the present high rate of duty on these goods, he makes it worth their while to pursue their dangerous trade.

While not a silent partner in their business, he is decidedly an accessory before the fact, for it is entirely by his refusing to lower the duty that they are enabled to make money by smuggling.

We suppose that we should be thankful for small favors in the direction we have indicated above. Last year it was slock springs on which the duty was reduced, this year it is precious stones *unset*, uncut they are admitted free, cut they have to pay ten per cent. instead of twenty as formerly.

Probably the Finance Minister fancied that the jewelry trade would not be able to stand a sudden reduction and consequent protection from smuggling all along the line at once, and therefore resolved to give it to them in homœopathic doses, if so he has succeeded admirably.

If not, the sooner he awakes to the absurdity of his position and grants the trade the measure of relief it is entitled to, the better for the prospects of the jewelry business in this country. As matters stand at present probably not more than one-half of the jewelry brought into Canada pays duty. Of American goods this is notoriously the case, and as our jewelry manufactures are principally imitations of American goods, the present twenty per cent. tariff is worse than none at all.

If Sir Leonard Tilley would just substitute jewelry for tobacco and snuff in the extract we have made from his budget speech and tariff revision (leaving out the part where it stated that there would be a considerable loss to the revenue) he would not only state a business fact, but afford relief to a branch of business that has for years suffered more than any other from the injustice of the present tariff.

#### ENGLISH vs. AMERICAN PATENTS.

Probably no country in the world is so fruitful of inventions as the United States of America. Not that we think that the American people as a whole are any better or any smarter than other nations, but that their patent laws are so framed as to make it worth while to protect even the smallest inventions or improvements. In England it costs about \$775.00 to get out a patent, while in the United States the same thing is effected for the trifling sum of about \$95.00. The result of such a terrible discrepancy has been to discourage the patenting in England of all but great inventions that represent large sums of money, while in the States the effect has been to stimulate the invention, and introduce numberless small contrivances for household convenience, in addition to the more important inventions. Moreover the English inventor, even after paying the exorbitant sum demanded by the English patent laws, has still to take the patent at his own risk, and should it be found to be worthless owing to errors of description, or from the thing itself not being patentable, the fees cannot be returned.

We understand that the Society of Arts is trying to get the English patent law amended so as to bring them on a level with the Americans in this respect, and if this is done we are justly safe in predicting that very soon it will be found