

Canadian manufacturers no exception whatever is made—not one exception; and naturally in our desire to learn who this “pampered and spoilt” gang are, as *The Mining Review* very politely calls them, we turned up the advertising pages of that most excellent journal and discovered the names of some of the most respectable and reliable manufacturers in Canada—manufacturers who contribute quite extensively to the support of *The Mining Review* and enable it to denounce them in a most scurrilous manner. Why, the very first advertisement in *The Review* is that of the Canadian Rand Drill Company, who have extensive and well equipped shops at Sherbrooke, Que., and who are manufacturers of as effective mining machinery as can be produced anywhere in the world. We find there, too, the advertisements of the Jenckes Machine Company, of Sherbrooke, who are also manufacturers of most excellent mining machinery; J. Matheson & Co., of New Glasgow, N. S.; Bertram Engine Works Company, Toronto; Truro Foundry and Machine Company, Truro, N. S.; Alex. Fleck, Ottawa; Garth & Co., Montreal; Carrier, Laine & Co., Levis, Que.; John Bertram & Sons, Dundas, Ont.; B. Greening Wire Company, Hamilton, Ont.; Butterfield & Co., Rock Island, Que.; Canada Explosives Company, Halifax, N. S.; Robin & Sadler, Montreal; M. Beatty & Sons, Welland, Ont.; the Northey Manufacturing Company, Toronto; Ottawa Powder Company, Ottawa; Canadian Mineral Wool Company, Toronto; Dominion Wire Rope Company, Miller Bros. and Toms, and Hamilton Powder Company, Montreal; Robb Engineering Company, Amherst, N. S., and others. Mrs. Malaprop declared that comparisons were “odorous”, and really the effluvia arising from some of the comparisons made by *The Mining Review* between the products of some of our most respectable manufacturers—the Northey Manufacturing Company and the Canadian Rand Drill Company, for instance—and some foreign concerns, is not in accordance with the ethics of true Canadian journalism.

IT IS NOT A FARCE.

In its recent screed against Canadian manufacturers of mining machinery because they ask for a more just construction of the tariff affecting the importation of such machinery, *The Mining Review*, in denouncing what the manufacturers ask for, asks:—

“Is the mining industry to be denied the right of its own judgment and free choice, in favor of a specially protected industry? If so, the whole trade system of the Dominion is a farce, and in the abstract goes far to show the inherent economic weakness of a protective policy, the bolstering up of one class at the expense of another, as long as the latter will submit to it.”

It is exceedingly to be regretted that “the official organ” of several most respectable Canadian mining associations should attempt to array in hostility towards each other two such important and closely related elements of Canada’s greatness as she engaged in the mining industry and the manufacturers of mining machinery. To do so is to commit a mistake that reaches the importance of a political crime. There should be no antagonism of this character. To give every possible encouragement to the mining industry the Government saw proper to allow certain kinds of mining machinery to be imported into Canada free of duty. The wording of the law is vague

and leads and has led to misunderstandings which should have been avoided. The law says that mining machinery which is, at the time of its importation, of a “class or kind” not manufactured in Canada, may be imported duty free. *The Mining Review* and some of the miners contend that under this law any mining machinery may be admitted duty free provided it does not bear the name of any Canadian manufacturer of such machinery; while the manufacturers contend that the meaning of the law is that foreign machinery performing the same functions in substantially the same manner should be included in the meaning of the words “class or kind”; and that there be a declaration by Parliament to this effect. The question is a simple one which ought to be settled without the interjection of such unpleasant features as *The Mining Review* forces into prominence. The law is vague, and it should be made plain. It was intended to be formed along the lines of the National Policy, and, if it is not intended to abandon that policy, the vagueness of the law which is now interpreted along free trade lines should be made plain by an amendment which should quiet the dispute. Ever since the law was passed in 1890 amicable relations have existed between the manufacturers and the miners, although each were anxious that their own interpretation should be accepted; and until this time it is not known that the miners have ever thought it necessary to their interests to denounce the manufacturers as a pack of harpies who were an incubus upon their industry. Nor does it appear now that they think thus, notwithstanding their proclaimed official organ, *The Mining Review*, has thought proper to say many unjust, unkind and disparaging things about the manufacturers, for which it will no doubt make ample apology when it recovers its equilibrium of good common sense. Abuse is not argument and should not be indulged in.

Of course *The Review* possesses a perfect right to entertain any opinion it desires regarding the principle of protection, and the policy of the Government in making laws conformable thereto; but its abuse of the manufacturers develops some singular weaknesses on the part of the miners, if what it says really expresses their views. Thus, *The Review*, while telling us that the manufacturers are “pampered and spoiled”, and that the mining industry “brings more foreign capital into the country, employs more labor, and results more than any other in general prosperity”, also tells us that it is “denied its equal right” because the manufacturers ask that no special and obnoxious law be permitted in their favor more than in the favor of any other class or element of Canadian industry. We do not underestimate the importance of the mining industry; but we fail to see why it should be specially favored by the free admission of such machinery as can be and is made in this country, while other equally important industries are not thus favored. If the miners must have free machinery, why not the lumbermen, the farmers, the tanners and all other classes who are using machinery? And if the miners must be thus favored, what is it more or less than making them the “spoilt and petted” coddlings of the Government? “What the miners claim as their right,” *The Review* tells us, “is that they shall have that class or kind of machinery which they want, and which is not manufactured in this country, duty free.” If this is a