

direct taxation of the masses in Canada whilst the masses in the United States were exempt, coupled with a general closing of Canadian factories through an unfair because wholly one-sided competition, would render this country more prosperous or the people more contented.

Industries which have been protected for seventy years in a large home market are naturally stronger and more specialised than industries which have been protected for only fifteen years in a much smaller market. The Americans likewise possess an advantage in the vast aggregations of working capital behind their industries, as compared with the modest amounts possessed by Canadian manufacturers. In some respects they have the whip hand of the Ontario farmer. With their low railroad rates from the West they could swamp his local market for wheat, pork, flour and meats if protection were withdrawn from him, while the Wilson duties would prevent him from getting any considerable foothold in theirs. These and other considerations of the same sort plead eloquently for a "temperate reform" of the N.P. Any other would result in widespread disturbance and disaster, and just now the commercial, industrial and agricultural world in Canada and elsewhere has trouble enough. A so-called revenue tariff would land us precisely where we were in 1874-78—exposed to a destructive competition from the surplus wares of American farms and factories without having the power to invade their market and make good our losses there—with this difference, that unless direct taxation were resorted to, the deficits which occurred then would occur again on a vastly increased scale because of the growth of our national obligations, ordinary expenditure having risen from \$24,000,000 in 1878 to \$37,000,000 in 1892. A temperate reform along the lines of protection is safest on every ground that appeals to common sense, and we believe the great majority of the people will be satisfied with it.

THE MINING REVIEW AND THE MANUFACTURERS OF MINING MACHINERY.

In a recent issue of this journal we discussed the question of mining machinery, basing our remarks upon what we thought a wrong conception on the part of Government officials and others of the meaning of item 983 of the tariff which recites as follows:—

"Mining machinery imported within three years after the passage of this Act which is, at the time of its importation, of a class or kind not manufactured in Canada, free."

We showed that under this Act, as generally construed by the Customs authorities, large quantities of mining machinery were being imported into Canada, duty free. What we consider a misconception of the law is in interpreting the meaning of the words "class or kind" so as to admit duty free any article of mining machinery, as for instance a Blake pump, not because equally good pumps are not made in Canada, but simply because Blake pumps are not made here. Then, steam pumps are essential in mining operations, and they are usually known by the names of the makers of them; and it is a generally admitted fact that steam pumps made in Canada, and bearing the name of their Canadian makers, are equal in any and all respects to any similar pumps made in any other country. Indeed the difference between certain Canadian pumps and certain

foreign pumps consists chiefly in the names engraved upon them. Under this improper construction of the law, while the importer admits that he cannot bring in, duty free, a foreign pump bearing a Canadian name, simply because it is of a "class or kind", meaning name, made in Canada, he claims that he has a right to bring in a precisely similar pump, because it is of a "class or kind", meaning name, not manufactured in Canada. This is a most ridiculous and mischievous construction of the law, and one that works very serious injustice to Canadian manufacturers. An absurd result of the general application of this contention would be seen in the fact that if a foreign pump of a certain "class or kind" finding much favor in Canada, and which could be brought in duty free, should become the product of any Canadian manufacturer, then and from that time on no such pump could be imported into Canada without payment of duty. What is said regarding pumps has equal force regarding any other mining machinery.

Considering the selfishness of human nature, particularly as developed in this question, it is not surprising that the users of mining machinery should desire to be favored to the utmost extent in tariff matters, and have the privilege of obtaining their supplies any where in the country or out of it without being subject to just such restrictions as environ all other industrial classes in the community. It is surprising, however, to observe that such a respectable journal as *The Canadian Mining Review* should become so sadly afflicted with free trade rabies as is evidenced in its January issue in criticizing our previous editorial.

In alluding to our article on Mining Machinery *The Mining Review* most conveniently avoids anything like argument or discussion, and without preamble gets down to abuse and innuendo, which it keeps up to the end of its chapter. Thus, in speaking of Canadian manufacturers of mining machinery, who only ask that they be accorded the same measure of tariff protection given to other manufacturers, and that a fair and reasonable construction of the law relating to this matter be declared, it does not pretend to show any impropriety or unreasonableness in this request, but berates the manufacturers as "spoilt and petted"; that "the Act in question was passed in order to give some measure of protection to the promising industry of mining—not protection from the honest tonic of competition, but protection from the short-sighted greed of one class of manufacturers (those of mining machinery), who ask their fostering Government to legislate for them only, and compel another and much more important native industry (that of mining) to use antiquated, ill-adapted machinery at exorbitant prices, merely because it is manufactured here." Surely the Canadian manufacturers of mining machinery are a bad lot in the eyes of *The Mining Review*. And hear how it goes for them again. "And this great industry," it says, alluding to that of mining, "this robust, masterful son of a new country, which asks so little (?), is to be denied its equal rights, is to be handicapped, forsooth, that one of its feeble, rickety brethren, represented by the manufacturers of one pump, one stone breaker, or one rock drill, may flourish without effort and without wholesome spur of competition, which they evidently need to bring them up to the level of merit of the high class manufacturers of other countries."

It will be observed that in this wholesale slaughtering of