

manufacturing advantage that would be sacrificed by a readjustment of the coal tariff." And, "The tariff is, at best, an expedient. As its crude necessities are outgrown and the distribution of Nature's favours is better understood, the courses of trade will find their natural channels, and Canada, handicapped at the beginning by the wider range of business possible to her southern neighbour, will come into her own."

Mr. Mann, however, is too wise to give any degree of finality to his utterance. He recognizes tacitly that the last word cannot yet be said. The whole situation requires thorough, deliberate, and wide consideration.

It is evident that what will suit the West will not meet the approval of the East, and vice versa. Each party is confident that its point of view best conserves the interests of Canada as a whole. Both cannot be right. Somewhere in between lies the most profitable course.

Will it not be possible for the conflicting interests to meet and attempt to evolve a *modus vivendi*? It is not unreasonable to suppose that eastern operators know their own business best. Similarly, western mine owners should be the most competent judges of their own requirements. Instead of clashing at Ottawa, would it not be well to meet peaceably at Winnipeg!

Meanwhile the day is fast approaching when Canada will determine for herself whether she desires or does not desire reciprocity. Every year strengthens her position and places her less and less in the posture of a suppliant.

GOWGANDA—ITS PROSPECTS AND ITS PERILS.

Anonymous destructive criticism and extravagant praise are two evils that threaten the silver mining regions of Northern Ontario. Of the two, the latter is immeasurably the more dangerous.

In its issue of July 17, *The Financial Post* of Canada, an enterprising weekly of somewhat nebulous convictions, devotes an editorial column to Gowganda. Quoting an anonymous "able mining engineer of undoubted authority," the *Post* accepts his statements and moralizes thereupon.

Before alluding to any of these statements, we wish to point out that our contemporary transgresses the rules of fair play and of editorial decorum in publishing such matter. The *Post's* strictures are based upon specific statements. They are directed against specific mining companies, the Mann, Bonsall, Bartlett, and Boyd-Gordon.

Disregarding the question as to whether these strictures are just or unjust, it is evident that the companies that are attacked are given no chance to defend themselves. The *Post* does not accept responsibility for its editorial, and the identity of the person whom they quote is carefully suppressed. As to his ability and standing, we must accept (or reject) the *Post's* warm asseverations. Hence our contemporary is in the posi-

tion of the small boy who puts pepper on the stove when no one is looking—and is prepared to sneeze with the rest.

If the *Post* feels called upon to attack mining companies and to dabble in mining generally, it must assuredly prepare also to speak and act for itself. Hiding behind the skirts of an unknown is neither sportsman-like nor edifying.

If the *Post's* informant is what the *Post* believes him to be, he was at least ill-advised to vent his opinions anonymously. But we believe that there is internal evidence to show that either the *Post* is misquoting its "expert," or, on the other hand, its "expert" is a broken reed.

One sentence from the editorial in question calls for comment: "That he [the expert] is conservative is," says the *Post*, "evidenced in his statement that the Cobalt mines have probably reached the climax of their high-grade production." Now, this is not conservatism; it is exactly the antithesis of conservatism. The conservative mining man does not draw a bow at a venture. He gathers his evidence systematically and carefully, and formulates his conclusions sanely from observed facts.

A conservative mining engineer might easily come to the conclusion that Cobalt had passed its zenith. An utterly incompetent person might also come to the same conclusion. Hence the conclusion has nothing to do with the case. Obviously the thing that counts is the method employed in reaching the conclusion. Our contemporary has fallen into the common error of confounding conservatism with pessimism. The most conservative mining engineer in the world would neither lose nor gain in conservatism by speaking highly or disparagingly of Cobalt or Gowganda.

The point made by the *Post* regarding the fact that practically no ore has yet been shipped from Gowganda is not well taken. There is ample time yet for this. Its reference to overequipment is fair. But the whole editorial loses meaning because of its dubious birth.

When next the *Post* wishes to instruct its readers in this direction, we suggest that it take time for meditation. The only straight course is to get your facts first-hand and tell the truth boldly off your own bat.

It is yet too early to jump to conclusions concerning Gowganda. Development has been slow. The silver-bearing veins have proved irregular. Transportation facilities are lacking. The camp has not settled down to efficient production. The effects of extravagant advertising and injudicious expenditure are apparent. These will handicap the camp for a long time. But, sooner or later, legitimate mining, conducted by efficient engineers, will determine the destiny of Gowganda. When that time arrives we shall know whether Gowganda is to be a second Cobalt or a flat disappointment. Neither subsidized eulogies nor the opinions of a thousand "experts" can alter by one milligram the silver contents of the new North.