corn this year in some such way. There are a few persons already working along the lines suggested, and there is room for their numbers being greatly multiplied.

If the seedsmen do not take this matter up, it would be well for the grower and buyer to get closer together. T. G. RAYNOR.

## The Tariff Commission in London.

### FARMERS AGAIN HEARD FROM.

The Tariff Commission, consisting of Hon. W. S. Fielding, Hon. Wm. Patterson, and Hon. L. P. Brodeur, met in the Board of Trade Building, London, on Monday and Tuesday, 20th and 21st inst. On Monday afternoon Thos. McMillan, Huron Co., and Thos. Baty, James A. Glen and T. B. Scott, of Middlesex, who appeared on behalf of the farmers, were heard. These gentlemen had made no pre-arrangement with each other, and had come, each fearing that he might be the only representative of the farmers present. They were very kindly received by the Commission.

Mr. McMillan, in opening, said he came in the interests of no organization, but felt that the farmers' side of the case ought to be presented. I have some knowledge of the financial circumstances of farmers, and although we do not come to present any wail of distress, yet we wish to say on behalf of agriculturists, that we believe the limit of taxation has been reached, and we are not in a mood to bear any further burden for the benefit of other industries in our land.

We cheerfully acknowledge that, in common with other classes in this Province, we are, in a general way, more prosperous than a few years ago, and if we investigate, the source of that increased prosperity is not far to seek.

Taking the report of the Bureau of Industries, 1903, we find that during the last six years, 1897-03, the value of our live stock sold and slaughtered has increased by $29,577,332; increased value of dairy products (factory made), $6,312,378; increased value of field crops, $30,000,000 (one-third counted as extra receipt), $10,000,000, the balance being used as raw material for stock food; and we have from these sources increased receipts of nearly $46,000,000.

Forty-six millions is a large sum, and if we distributed this amount extra per annum amongst the people of this Province for a few years, we begin to realize that the source of our increased prosperity lies not in our towns and cities, but depends upon the farms of our Province; and if farmers experience an untoward season, or any conditions arise which seriously reduce the volume of the receipts, the merchants of our towns and villages very soon begin to stand at their shop-window with a longing eye for custom, and this condition reflects unfavorably upon every class and industry in our land.

While this report is still in my hand, let me recall to your notice the representations made before the Commission in Toronto, more particularly the statement of Mr. Drury, of the receipts and the expense of a 200-acre farm in Simcoe County, and I can assure you that is a showing far above what the average farmer of our Province can make.

I can give you the particulars of the business of one or more most progressive and wide-awake stock farmers in Huron County for 1903.

Mr. Fielding.—We wish to have it. A 200-acre farm—20 acres bush, 70 acres field crop, balance pasture; investment of $14,000.

| Receipts. | | Expense. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cattle sold | $4,351.50 | Wages paid | $ 305.00 |
| Hogs sold | 285.14 | Threshing and preparing fodder | 50.00 |
| Horses sold | 261.00 | Taxes and road-work | 80.90 |
| Dairy products | 105.00 | Insurance | 10.00 |
| Eggs and fowl | 29.00 | Stock cattle purchased | 2,673.50 |
| | | Grass seeds, etc. | 50.00 |
| | | Feedstuffs | 223.00 |
| | | Running expenses | 128.50 |
| | | Implements | 37.00 |
| | | Household Exp. | 478.60 |
| | | Interest upon mortgage | 200.00 |
| | | Net receipts | 795.14 |
| | $5,031.64 | | $5,031.64 |

This, also, is a showing away and above the return of the average farmer, although no wages are allowed the farmer and his family, and no interest upon investment. Although I cannot give the details, yet I am sufficiently conversant with the circumstances of at least a score of farmers to know that during the past half dozen years they have only been able to mark time. Men wide-awake in their business, very careful, industrious and economical, and yet only able to made ends meet from year to year. Let us again consult this report, and from it we get a very fair idea of the gross annual receipts of the average farmer of the Province:

GROSS ANNUAL RECEIPTS OF ONTARIO FARMERS.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Value of live stock sold | | | $60,000,000 |
| Value of dairy products (factory made) | | | 16,800,000 |
| (The portion of field crops sold and consumed is an estimate of my own.) | | | |
| Field Crops. | Sold. | Consumed. | |
| Hay crop | $10,000,000 | $24,432,302 | |
| Mangels | | 3,341,459 | |
| Turnips | | 6,931,634 | |
| Potatoes | 2,354,313 | 5,000,000 | |
| Carrots | | 326,597 | |
| Silage | | 5,128,800 | |
| Corn | 6,000,000 | 4,807,230 | |
| Rye | 1,443,793 | | |
| Buckwheat | 907,782 | | |
| Barley | 2,263,482 | 8,000,000 | |
| Oats | 20,000,000 | 12,193,097 | |
| Fall and spring wheat | 16,460,000 | | |
| | $59,429,370 | $70,161,119 | |
| Value field crops sold in round numbers | | | $60,000,000 |
| Gross return, 185,000 Ontario farmers | | | $136,800,000 |
| Gross return, each Ontario farmer | | | $738.00 |

This showing does not set forth the returns from orchard and garden, or dairy products of home make sold, but with this additional, I believe I am well within the mark in saying that the gross revenue of the average Ontario farmer is less than $1,000 per year, and out of this sum we have to pay interest upon mortgage or investment, as the case may be, buy implements and machinery, pay running expenses, keep up wear and tear, educate our families, and live. This, gentlemen, is the condition of the great industry upon which the progress and prosperity of this country depends. So you can see, there is no immediate danger of us rapidly becoming millionaires.

When we look further afield, when we look abroad over this Dominion (for we realize that in the framing of a tariff it does not do to be sectional), study the conditions of our people the requirements of the different industries of our country, and note the statistics of its trade and commerce, the more we realize the commanding importance of agriculture.

And as, according to Mr. Fielding's own words, there seems to be a battle royal before this Commission between the farmers and manufacturers, there being a constant demand from the latter for higher duties, if you will bear with me I would like to compare, first, the relative degree of importance to our country of those two industries; and, second, their relative degree of prosperity, as this will show whether they are entitled to further favors at the expense of agriculture:

| | Mfg. Industries. | Agriculture. |
|---|---|---|
| Capital invested, census 1901 | $447,000,000 | $1,787,000,000 |
| Number of hands employed | 344,000 | *1,000,000 |
| Wages paid | $102,984,668 | ‡$275,000,000 |
| Estimating a fair wage for farmer and his family, as I believe nine-tenths of work of farm is done by them. | | |
| Value of products | $481,053,375 | $363,126,384 |
| Cost of raw material | $266,527,858 | |
| Net value of product | $214,525,517 | |

*Nearly. ‡Estimate.

In the above figures it would be interesting to know just what percentage of this $266,000,000, comprising the cost of manufacturers' raw material, comes from the soil. We know from the last census, under "Manufacturers' Returns":

| | |
|---|---|
| Value of log products comes first, with an output of | $50,805,084 |
| Flouring mill products comes second, with an output of | 31,835,879 |
| *Dairy products comes third, with an output of | 29,731,922 |
| Meat packing and slaughtering products comes fourth, with an output of | 22,217,984 |

*Not counted as manufactures.

And the raw material of these three latter industries are entirely the product of agriculture, and amount to 85 per cent. of the finished article. Then, take other departments of manufacture, such as agricultural implements, carriage making, harness and saddlery, woollen mills, other vegetable food manufactures, breweries and distilleries, tanneries; tallow, glue and soap factories; saw, planing and paper mills; furniture manufacturing establishments, organ and piano shops—all these establishments are, to a large extent, dependent upon agriculture for their supply of raw material.

To sum up, we find there is not only four times the amount of wealth invested in agriculture that is invested in our manufactures, but I believe I am under the mark in saying that agriculture supplies manufacturers with from 70 to 75 per cent. of their raw material. In fact, the more we study these figures and the statistics of our trade returns, the more we realize that success in agriculture underlies success in manufactures and also success in trade and commerce. Not only does agriculture sup[illegible]rge portion of their raw material, but agriculturists are the largest purchasers of their finished products.

Then, there is the additional fact, which in the framing of a tariff we should bear in mind, that these other industries do not go into a country first. Agriculture is the pioneer industry, and when once agriculture in its various forms begins to become developed, it sets in operation those other industries which hinge and depend upon it.

Are we not, then, most reasonable in our request, that, although those engaged in other lines may continue to feed upon our products, they be not further allowed to prey upon ourselves.

Next, as to the relative degree of prosperity. Those figures tell us that, although the agricultural industry has four times the investment, employs three times the number of hands (and, counting a fair wage for the farmer and his family who perform nine-tenths of the work of the farm), pays two and one-half times the wage, yet, deducting nothing in either case for wages paid, and nothing in the case of agriculture for raw material, it only pays one and two-thirds times as much, showing conclusively that to-day manufacturing is much more profitable than agriculture; and to make their showing still better, ex-President George, of the Manufacturers' Association, has stated that last year their total output amounted to $650,000,600.

In the face of such a showing, can our manufacturing industries possibly continue to assume the role of infants, wishing still to be pap-fed? The evidence being presented to your Commission shows plainly that new conditions, unforseen difficulties, and fresh opposition, is constantly cropping up, which it is the duty of their managers to grapple with, study out and overcome by the ingenuity of their own resource. If, however, our Government continues to fondle, nurse and feed them, they will never become self-reliant, but in time come to prey, like vultures, upon the great consuming public (as witness the revelations recently made in Toronto).

On the other hand, when we recognize the commanding position of agriculture, and the fact that its returns are barely remunerative to those whose energy it engages, have we not a right to expect serious and favorable consideration to a moderate request, before presenting which I desire to make the following observations:

1. We recognize the present necessity of a tariff for revenue purposes.

2. We strongly approve of the preferential tariff in favor of British goods, and would like to see the duties on clothing, more particularly woollens and cotton goods, reduced to the lowest practical limit.

3. We realize that in the way of a customs tariff, very, very little protection can be given the general farmer.

4. We believe the time has come when, under the fostering care of a favorable customs tariff, the infant