

dam miller, but at the same time operates injuriously to the wheat growing interests of the country. Should the meeting see fit to place me on the delegation to Ottawa, I shall make a point of going and doing what I can to secure such a re-adjustment of the tariff as the interests of the country demand. As a representative of the smaller mills only I might not have much weight, but at the same time it might be well for the Government to see the movement was not one simply in the interests of the large dealers. Wishing the meeting every success, I am,

Yours truly,

A. GROVES.

LINDSAY, Feb. 17th, 1889.

MESSRS STARK BROS., TORONTO.

GENTLEMEN, We regret exceedingly that we are unable to attend the millers' meeting on Tuesday. Our Mr. Flavelle fully intended being there, but owing to family trouble of our Mr. Dundas, we will not be represented at the meeting. It cannot be too strongly pressed on the Government the necessity of advancing the duty on flour imported from the United States. As it is now, the National Policy (which was adopted largely for the purpose of fostering manufacturing industries) is legislating against the largest manufacturing industry in the Dominion, inasmuch as the duty on the raw material is largely in excess of the duty on the manufactured article. We trust you will have a large representative meeting, and that you will go to the Government as a united body. If so, the millers throughout the Dominion should be strong enough to insist upon justice being done them.

Yours very truly,

SADLER, DUNDAS & CO.

THE MILLERS' APPEAL.

THE import duty on flour coming into Canada is 50 cents per barrel. The import duty on the quantity of wheat required to make a barrel of flour is 67½ cents. (In this comparison I take the quantity of wheat—4½ bushels—required to make a barrel of flour in the best mills, handled in the best and most careful way. The average quantity of wheat actually used in the mills of either Canada or the United States is not under 4 bushels 45 lbs., on which quantity the duty the Canadian miller has to pay is 71¼ cents, or 21¼ cents over the duty paid by the American miller who sends in flour).

The American miller pays freight on 196 lbs. (Flour.)

The Canadian miller pays freight on 270 lbs. to 285 lbs. (Wheat.)

The American has a further advantage over the Canadian miller in the bran and shorts, for while the former sells his in the Eastern States markets, free of duty of course, the Canadian has to sell much of his in the same market, paying the United States Customs duty of 20 per cent.

Our position so far as the present Canadian Customs duties on the raw material, and on the manufactured article are concerned, is illustrated by the following case:

The American miller sends into Canada one thousand barrels of flour, and stores it in bond. The Canadian miller brings in enough American wheat to make one thousand barrels of flour, grinds it in bond and stores it in the same warehouse in which the American miller has his thousand barrels stored. The two men, or their agents, go to the Customs to pay their duty. The American miller has to pay \$500; the Canadian miller has to pay \$567.

That such laws could ever have been made by a Government whose existence was and is due to their adoption of the policy of protection to home industry, seems impossible. Yet it was done by them, but done in error, an error that has never been attempted in Parliament or out of Parliament to justify. The appeal of the millers is that this error be corrected.

Not only have we a right to demand that the protection now given by the Canadian tariff to American millers should be removed, but we have a right to demand also, under our system of protection to home industry, that some protection should be given to us as against foreign millers, in the same way that protection to Canadian as against American manufacturers is given by our tariff, in all other lines of manufacture.

It has been said that the request of the millers that the duty be made \$1 per barrel would, if complied with, increase the cost of flour to the consumer. But the contention of the framers of and the believers in the National Policy, was and is, that protection does not increase the cost to the consumer. The milling capacity of Canada is largely in excess of what is required to make all the flour that is consumed in the Dominion. The mills are scattered all over the country, and are owned by more than 2,000 different owners. This being the case, there is no human possibility of the millers advancing the price of flour. As well might the farmers be suspected of an intention to combine to raise the price of wheat. The competition in either case is too great, and the interests too wide-spread. The consumers of Canada will not have to pay either more or less for their bread by such a correction of the tariff as will make it possible to grind the flour that it is made

from in Canada instead of in the United States, while the Canadian mill owners, their employees, and others amongst us, in a less direct way will benefit by the cost of manufacturing, which benefit is now enjoyed instead by the corresponding classes in the United States.

There are at this moment stored in Montreal about 70,000 barrels of American flour, while few if any mills in Canada, are running enough to make expenses.

No one who gives our case a little consideration will confound our appeal with the requests of those manufacturers who are asking for "increased protection." We have no protection. The American miller has the protection, and has it by the Canadian Tariff of Customs.

We are asking to have an error rectified. We respectfully submit the above facts for the consideration of people who may not have had occasion to investigate the desperate condition to which the milling business of Canada is reduced.

M. McLAUGHLIN,

Chairman of the Millers' Delegation.

Toronto, Feb. 23, 1889.

Statement showing the quantity of wheat and flour imported into the Dominion of Canada from the United States and entered for consumption during the six months ending 31st December, 1888; also the quantity of flour remaining in bond in Canada on the 31st December, 1888:

Articles	Six Months Ending 31st December, 1888.		Remaining in Bond 31st Dec., 1888.
	Imported.	Entered for Consumption.	
Wheat, Bush.	1,484,819	9,705	6,784
Flour, Brls.	171,336	154,896	
Wheat	Entered for Consumption, 154,896 Barrels = 697,032 Bushels.		9,705 Bushels.
Flour	Entered for Consumption, 154,896 Barrels = 697,032 Bushels.		

J. JOHNSON, Commissioner of Customs. Ottawa, 14th Feb., 1889.

The petitions for a correction of the tariff bears the signatures of the following millers:

- Tew & Marshall, Plattsville.
- Plattsville Milling Co., "
- John Richardson, St. George.
- W. E. Dench, Chippewa.
- F. Tench, "
- Isaac Rutherford, Bruce.
- James Stark, Paisley.
- James Lacc, "
- Arch. Fisher & Son, Paisley.
- Will. Brown, Lockerbie.
- C. Macdonell, Collingwood.
- A. Melville, "
- Lavistock Milling Co., Tavistock.
- H. B. Schmidt, Thornhill.
- Walter Lawson, Stewarttown.
- Geo. S. Baldwin, Aurora.
- F. R. Wadsworth, Weston.
- C. & W. Wadsworth, "
- Walter Taylor, "
- J. L. Spink, Pickering.
- Howland & Elliott, Lambton.
- Stark Bros., Toronto.
- Spink Bros., "
- W. P. Howland & Co., Toronto.
- W. H. Howland, Toronto.
- W. D. Matthews, "
- Bennett & Lockerbie, Spencerville.
- J. G. Armstrong, Spencerville.
- John Wales, Oakville.
- W. Stewart, Mitchell.
- S. R. Stewart, "
- W. A. Stewart, "
- Peter J. Griffin, Mount Vernon.
- Peplow & McCabe, Port Hope.
- Harold Barrett, "
- Thos. H. Fee, "
- Alfred Lent, "
- J. G. Bechtel, Burford.
- A. Watts, Brantford.
- David Plewes, "
- Wm. Pearson, Singhampton.
- S. Ramage, Chesley.
- Alex. Wilson, "
- M. F. Ramage, "
- Hay Bros., Listowel.
- Hutton & Carr, Wingham.
- P. Kelly & Son, Blyth.
- H. S. Huber, Londonboro.
- Jas. Fair, Clinton.
- A. E. Banyard, Hensall.
- J. A. Williams & Co., Zurich.
- Jas. Pickard, Exeter.
- Cole & Lounsbury, Seaforth.
- Cullis & Fleming, Auburn.
- Robert Baird, Kincardine.
- Jacob L. Eild, Mildmay.
- R. B. Clement, Walkerton.
- J. Lee & Son, "
- Jacob Steinmiller, "
- John Hull, Lakefield.
- T. C. Edwards, "
- A. Snellgrove, "
- Geo. S. Podger, "
- D. McLean, "
- J. H. Maw, "
- Wm. Crane, "
- A. M. Bowen, "
- Thos. Foulds, Onondaga.
- R. Thompson, Lynden.
- Geo. Needler, Millbrook.

- Hay & Harrison, Forest.
- A. W. Littleproud, "
- J. E. Robinson, "
- Dugald McPherson, "
- Jos. S. Green, "
- Thos. Birrel, Bradford.
- Samuel Lukes, "
- Robt. Vick, Orillia.
- Jas. Thompson, Orillia.
- Wm. Ritchie, "
- P. Ritchie, "
- J. E. Edmonson, "
- John Waddell, "
- Geo. Vick, "
- Meldrum, Davidson & Co. Peterboro.
- H. A. Mulhern, Peterboro.
- Cranston & Scrimgeour, Galt.
- J. Hilborn, Blair.
- Lewis Kribbs, Hespeler.
- Galt Milling Co., Galt.
- Wm. S. Skene, "
- E. A. Cherry, "
- Todd Milling Co., "
- John Cherry, "
- A. Marshall, "
- J. R. Hillock, "
- A. S. Detweiler, "
- J. M. Lott, Edgar.
- Norris Dight, Lucan.
- Geo. Moorehouse, "
- A. E. Stanley, "
- Geo. Adcock, "
- Thos. Dight, "
- Jas. Wells, Orangeville.
- Walter Puckenhams, Orangeville.
- D. Clarke, Ayr.
- J. Clarke, "
- D. Goldie, "
- Jas. Lawson, Thorold.
- W. A. Walker, "
- John Baird, "
- Wm. Downie, Merriton.
- Sylvester Neelon, St. Catharines.
- Jas. Norris, St. Catharines.
- H. King, "
- John Notman, "
- H. M. Helliwell, St. Catharines.
- R. Reynolds, "
- A. Groves, Fergus.
- T. Mutrie, "
- Hilborn Hambley & Co., Salem.
- J. C. Vanstone, Bowmanville.
- Geo. Pearson, "
- John W. Pettinger, Bowmanville.
- A. W. Carveth, Leaskard.
- S. A. Lazier, Belleville.
- W. H. Lingham, "
- R. B. Cooper, "
- W. D. Rolison, Carberry Man.
- Wm. Purdy, "
- Manitoba Milling & Brewing Co., Carberry.
- G. A. Thompson, Souris, Man.
- Geo. McCulloch, "
- Wm. Herriott, "
- C. S. Wright, Minnedosa, Man.
- R. J. Kerr, "
- W. F. Mann, "
- W. Murchison, "
- W. M. Alexander, Brandon.
- D. W. Russell, "
- J. S. Maxwell, "
- J. P. Humphreys, "
- G. Kelly, "

ARE FOUNDRY PATTERNS TOOLS?

WE have been asked if the word "tools," in the following form of policy upon a machine shop and foundry, would cover foundry patterns. The policy reads:—\$1,500 upon fixed and moveable machinery, engine, lathes and tools, and \$500 on stock, etc."

By a fire underwriter, the answer would at once be that foundry patterns were not covered under this form, because from the peculiar nature of this class of patterns and their status as to value, it has always been the usage to cover them specifically, and in fixed sums, usually not in excess of fifty per cent. of their value. They are also regarded by fire underwriters as of two kinds or classes, viz: those "in daily use," as stove patterns or some certain kinds of standard machines or machinery, which hence have a permanent value. Another class is those patterns made for some special temporary service, and after once using are laid aside until, perhaps, some other chance job may bring them or some portion of them into use again. These are held to have no insurable value, as they have been already paid for to their full value by the party calling them into use, hence they cost the foundry man nothing. In large shops, this class is found in large quantities, and they are usually held by their owners at their original valuation, especially if they are to be sold to an insurance company in consequence of a fire.

Furthermore, there can be no ambiguity in the word "tool," which is defined to be "an instrument of manual operation; particularly such as are used by artisans, mechanics and handicraftsmen."

"An implement of labor, as hammer, saw, plane and the like. An implement for some operation, commonly used by the hand of one man, in some manual labor."

A pattern is an original or model prepared for imitation, that which is to be copied or imitated, either in things or in actions; anything cut or formed into shape of something to be made after it. (Webster.)

Implements: Such things as are used or employed for a trade. Things of necessary use in any trade or mystery, with which the work cannot be performed. Whatever may supply wants, particularly when applied to "tools," utensils, vessels or instruments of labor, as implements of trade, husbandry, etc. (Webster.)

From the definitions of these several words, tools, implements, and patterns, it is evident that a "pattern" cannot be considered in the light of a "tool," because it is neither a hammer, a saw, a plane or anything of a similar or like nature in the matter of use, for it is never used by the hand of the operative, or manually, except merely to be placed in a position for the formation around it of the mould for the reception of the material of which the thing is to be composed. It is no more of a tool than type in a printing office, and types have been held by the Sup. Ind. Court of Massachusetts as not being included in the term "tool."

A pattern, so to speak, is but a passive implement, while the very nature of a "tool" is, on the contrary, an active one, when in use—as a saw or hammer—propelled by active manual labor, while forming the subject; and no practical mechanic would ever call a foundry pattern a tool. A pattern is an implement, but all implements are not necessarily "tools."

Nevertheless, to prevent any misunderstanding, when machine shop and foundry risks are to be covered by