

figures, \$173,660,000 worth of goods subject to duty were imported into Canada and the amount paid in duties on these imports was \$45,671,000. This was at the rate of nearly 27 per cent. In other words the first cost of a dollar's worth of goods was increased to \$1.27 by the tariff. By the time the profits of the wholesale and retail merchants were added, the cost was at least \$1.40. And this is not all. By reason of the protection afforded home manufacturers the latter were put in a position to add a proportionate amount to the selling price of \$748,000,000 worth of manufactured goods produced in this country. Still in the face of all this manufacturers are seeking to secure an addition to the protection now enjoyed by them. They are endeavoring to obtain this by working through both the great political parties. It is up to farmers to use the same means to compel a reduction rather than an increase in the burdens imposed.

Our brethren in Michigan some years ago carried on a similar campaign in the matter of railway taxation. They made use of their connection with both political parties in that state to urge the fair taxation of rail-

ways and as a result railways in Michigan today pay about \$400 per mile in taxation as against \$100 here. By following the example so well set we may secure the reforms herein advocated.

J. G. LETHBRIDGE, Master.

W. F. W. FISHER, Secretary.

Toronto, Sept. 8, 1908.

Here's a half dozen for the West:

- (1) Government Ownership of Terminals.
- (2) Special binning in same throughout the year.
- (3) Government Ownership and operation of the Hudson's Bay Railway.
- (4) The employment of the natural resources in the hands of the crown to build and equip and operate it such as timber, cement and coal.
- (5) The retention of the town sites along the line to be sold or leased by the Crown to those who build thereon.
- (6) The sale of land contiguous to the railway at prices based on the value of the several parcels due to characteristics and distance from station.

THE PUBLIC OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS

I. STATE RAILWAYS AS EMPLOYERS

An important question in connection with the success attained by existing State railways is the condition of the employees. Of course the wages paid are not as high as the wages in the United States, but if State railway employment is compared with private employment in the same country, or in countries of similar conditions, it will be found that the employees of the public railway systems are as a rule better satisfied and a higher class of men, than can be found elsewhere. It is true that some countries, notably Italy and Rumania, have had troubles with their railway employees, but, while these cases are exceptions in regard to publicly owned railways, there are hardly any private roads anywhere, which have not, at some time or other, had troubles with employees who have been dissatisfied with their treatment. We have previously compared German State railways with English private railroads in certain respects. It may be profitable for us to complete our comparison by a reference to the manner in which each system handles its employees. Private monopoly in England has made itself subject to the same charge as American railroads, that of working the railway employees unreasonably long hours, although it must be admitted that such extreme cases as were brought forth in this country during the investigations connected with some of our most terrible railway accidents about a year ago, have not been heard of in England. In Germany, however, the hours of duty are strictly limited. The working hours of 70 per cent of the locomotive and trainmen is less than 10 hours a day and does not exceed 11 hours, except in emergency cases, for any trainmen. In the State railway shop the working time is limited to 9 hours.

On the Swedish State railways no general rules have been laid down as to the length of the working day. The principle of rendering the service of the train staff as easy as possible, is, however, applied as far as possible. With regard to Sunday labor, reductions have been made in connection with the freight traffic. Neither receiving or delivering of freight takes place on that day, and a number of freight trains regularly run on week days are not run on Sundays. It is also the practice on all the government lines to provide for one Sunday off every third week for all employees, and they also have fifteen days' leave of absence yearly with full pay. The minimum compensation paid to the cheapest class of

employees is \$318 a year, including compensation for clothing. The average minimum compensation on American roads is \$1.32 per day, or \$440 a year for 333 working days, this number being the number of working days on the Swedish State railroads for each employee. Considering the average cost of living, this comparison is most favorable to the publicly owned systems considered.

On all the larger publicly owned systems the employees are retired with a pension at a certain age, their employment is steady, and they need fear the future far less than the employees on many of our railroads, where the first pinch of depression in trade throws thousands out of employment.

2. WORKING EXPENSES.

It has been charged, and with very plausible reasons, that government administration of railroads would be a far more expensive business venture, considered merely as such, than results from private management. Few people even the most ardent advocates of government ownership, would feel justified in arguing on this subject, unless supported by actual figures from practical results.

There are also a great many people who believe in government ownership in principle, and who would be willing to support its application in practice, if they were confident that the cost of administration would not be out of all proportion to the cost of private management. Of course it is true that logically the railways should be owned by the government, no matter what the cost of administration, because the railways to-day constitute our most important public highways, and we have outgrown the time of toll-roads, and highway franchises. We do not need, however, to argue this matter against any such odds as would be necessary if we advocated something that would be commercially unprofitable. We have already shown that State railroads have always been self-supporting, and that they also, as a rule, have paid a fair, and sometimes, a high per cent of interest on the capital invested. Surprising as it may seem to the superficial observer, even the cost of the administration proper is in general not higher for government railroads than for private roads. This we shall immediately show by figures which were a few years ago collected by English authorities.

The proper basis for a comparison between the administration cost of government and private railroads is obviously to compare State roads and private roads in

the same
ways in
figures
working
ment at
European

Germany
Austria-F
Belgium
Denmark
France
Italy
Norway
Holland
Rumania
Russia

From
France al
considerab
difference
other han
Italy, Hol
cost of th
proportion
the private
is really o
so small a
8 and 9 pe
that, there
means an
publicly ow
these reaso
expense for
management
able if we
come so us
be conduct
enterprise,
information
we remembe
need to kee
they do not
not need an
of the word
political ass
way work, t
fat salaries
we remembe
stantly prov
private railw
when it com
ernments hav
equally cheap
is no good
licated in A
American ra
legislation.
our forty-six
capitol. Thir
our United S
tors in railw
proceedings;
by our electe
Conceive of t
dent, wholly
"dead waste,
owned system
Having m
let us now p
to the perman