

Division to extend the national reserves—those already made need enlargement, and others are required elsewhere, and there will be something yearly effected in this regard in Parliament until the whole proposed scheme is completed. The Superintendent was over the western ground last summer, as far and as completely as limited time would permit; he intends to return to the work of personal inspection next year. His zeal and enthusiasm should do much to evolve a proper and adequate system of administration.

Dr. Fernow, Forester for Ontario, and Professor of Forestry at the Toronto University, is co-operating heartily with Dr. Campbell, and his intellectual strength and wide experience must abundantly benefit the new national establishment. It is the intention of New Brunswick to arrange for a school of forestry at the University of that Province. It, too, should co-operate in developing the national plan. For provinces like ours, without any reserves, or any kind of reforestation system, we are glad to know that it is the intention of Mr. Campbell's Division to educate the people by means of competent teachers, and, also, to furnish trees for planting whenever possible. This will be a great boon. The publications of the Forestry Association, and the bulletins of the Division, must contribute greatly to the end in view. As we said before, then, the outlook for Canadian Forestry is reassuring.

A. E. BURKE.

TARIFF CONDITIONS ADVERSELY AFFECTING FARMERS.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

Much is being said and written regarding a change in our system of public-school education that will invest farming and rural life with a new and higher interest, tending to retain, instead of drive to the professions and shops of the town, the flower of our country youth; and, while these efforts are laudable in their way, we may well impress the authorities with the fact that no system will ever accomplish this object which does not enthuse the members of the teaching profession with such a love for the farm and farm life that they will delight to urge and inspire their pupils along agricultural lines—an enthusiasm which, generally speaking, we may say is almost entirely absent from the minds of those who are engaged in the teaching profession at present. While efforts are being put forth to accomplish this desired end, agriculturists might well bestir themselves and endeavor to realize their true condition, with a view towards removing some of the economic handicaps which at present are a burden upon their requirements and the products of their energy. If they take to heart the effusions of manufacturers, managers of railway and transportation companies, leading directors of various industrial associations, and, as well, many of our Legislators, they would indeed be touched with the spirit of deep solicitude which these all feign to manifest in the farmer's behalf. These manifestations are becoming so current on the part of many engaged in other lines, that I am almost wont to exclaim, "Lord help the farmers." They are indeed the great silent class, and yet revelations are continually being made which emphasize the fact that their interests and the interests of the great consuming public do require effective representation. As was then said, the evidence given before the Tariff Commission was extremely moderate, and showed that, under existing conditions in Ontario, it is impossible for the better class of farmers to make much more than a fair living; that it is impossible for those less fortunately situated to make more than a bare one; and that the tariff, as it stood before the revision, did little or nothing for them, while it imposed quite heavy and unavoidable burdens. The tariff has been revised, and although that revision was accepted, it was only as a compromise, as a first instalment of what every student of agricultural requirements must know is their due. The question now is, why should this country require that any degree of burden should be placed upon its great foundation industry, the very mainspring of its national existence, for the benefit of any other class in the land; and this more particularly so when the great problem is to endeavor to hold the flower of our country youth on the farm, where they ought to be? The future welfare of the industry itself and the rights of posterity both demand that agriculturists awaken themselves to realize the gravity of the situation.

The Members of the House of Commons have again assembled. The manufacturers, through their president, have taken their stand. They are ready to beat at the doors of Parliament. They are after more blood; another vein (an artery, if possible) in the loins of agriculture, mining, lumbering, or other self-supporting industry, is to be opened. Although the census of manufactures, taken last year, shows that the capital invested in those lines has increased from \$446,000,000 in 1900, to \$834,000,000 in 1905, an increase of \$387,000,000, and the value of products was \$706,446,000, an increase of \$225,393,000, yet the manufacturers are not satisfied,

because they say that the great consuming public of Canada have so far escaped from their clutches, that they have succeeded in obtaining so much better value for their money elsewhere; that, with all this increase in trade, the manufacturers have not materially strengthened their hold on the Canadian home market. "That, while the capital, the wage bill and the output of Canadian manufacturers had increased, their share in the home market had remained practically at a standstill," and now they are after a tariff in which minimum protection would be high enough to reserve the home market for the Canadian manufacturer, and give a preference to the British Empire on articles that could not be produced at home. How does this further demand compare with the evidence given before the Tariff Commission? Let one reference suffice: On November 16th, 1905, the merchant tailors, representing 167 tailors in and out of Toronto, opposed the demands of the woollen manufacturers by saying that Canadian woollens had not the style and finish of the English article, and that tailors had to go to Britain for their best woollen goods; that they had asked the branches of their trade if, since the increase in the duty to 30 per cent., they had increased their use of Canadian woollens, and the invariable answer was no. Everyone versed in the trade knows that, possibly with the exception of one Canadian factory or so, notably the Caldwell Woollen Factory, in Lanark, where not a pound of shoddy is used, this showing of the tailors is so. Then, why should agriculturists and consumers generally be burdened by duties like these?

It should never be forgotten that a tariff, although a necessity for revenue purposes in Canada, is an instrument whereby the protected interests can collect unduly high prices for their wares. Take the following list of articles, and the customs duty thereon, all of which affect and are to a greater or less degree a burden on the farmer and other consumers. Upon the basis of importations during the year 1905, being the latest returns I have to hand, and corresponding with the census of 1905:

ARTICLE.	Imports from U. S.	Imports from Britain.	Total Imports.	Preferential Tariff %.	General Tariff %.
Wearing apparel, ready-made clothing, composed wholly or in part of wool, wool and mfres. of	Dut. \$ 524,066 Free 305,670	Dut. \$13,153,729 Free 1,134,112	\$17,529,415	22½ to 30	30 to 35
Cotton and mfres. of.....	Dut. \$1,864,548 Free 6,079,522	Dut. \$ 5,782,676 Free 363,860	\$14,853,048	25	35
Agr. implements ..	\$1,571,474	\$ 21,265	\$ 1,598,914	12½ to 17½	17½ to 25
Buggies and carriages	\$ 97,019	\$ 2,806	\$ 98,825	22½	35
Paints and colors	Dut. \$ 706,089 Free 121,667	Dut. \$ 260,910 Free - 76,008	\$ 1,498,691	10 to 30	15 to 37½
Spades and shovels	\$ 24,885	None	\$ 38,718	20	32½
Stoves.....	\$ 403,047	None	\$ 410,672	15	25
Windmills	\$ 37,939	None	\$ 38,083	12½	20
Nails, spikes, screws and general hardware				17½ to 22½	20 to 35
Boots and shoes	\$1,112,736	\$ 60,499	\$ 1,178,118	17 to 20	25 to 30
Harness and saddlery	\$ 64,354	None	\$ 83,924	20	30
Oilcloths—floor, shelf and table.....	\$ 154,469	\$ 598,910	\$ 771,443	25	35
Biscuits and confectionery				15 to 22½	25 to 35
Drugs in crude form, free; in preparation, 20 to 25 per cent.					

This table is given to show the extent of duty imposed, and, in some instances, what a small percentage of the total consumption is imported, thus allowing manufacturers the whole benefit of the tariff.

A resume of some of these lines will show what degree of protection our manufacturers have:

1. Agricultural Implements.—Value of Canadian output in 1905, \$28,409,806. As there is no competition from Britain, the general tariff, from 17½ to 25 per cent., prevails, and puts into the pockets of the manufacturers \$5,700,000.

2. Boots and Shoes.—Value of Canadian output, 1905, \$11,819,165. As only \$60,000 comes from Britain, the U. S. is the great competitor, and a general tariff of 25 per cent. gives them a margin of \$3,000,000.

3. Bread, biscuits and confectionery, \$10,387,797. No competition from Britain. General tariff gives 25 to 35 per cent. protection.

4. Carriages and Wagons.—Output of \$9,654,926. No competition from Britain, and, with a general tariff of 25 per cent. on wagons and 35 per cent. on carriages, the manufacturers have a margin of \$3,200,000 annually to pay duties on raw material and put in their pocket.

5. Harness and Saddlery.—Canadian output, 1905, \$4,085,223. Nothing in this line comes from Britain, and a tariff of 30 per cent. gives them a margin over foreign goods of \$1,200,000 annually.

6. Cottons.—Canadian production, 1905, \$21,-

938,823. With preferential duty of 25 per cent., they have a margin to themselves of over \$5,000,000 annually.

7. As the Canadian production of woollen goods has diminished from \$10,486,198 in 1900, to \$6,938,683 in 1905, a duty of from 22½ to 30 and 35 per cent. does not seem to stimulate the production, why longer burden the consumer with such duties?—although there is one redeeming feature in favor of the heavy importations, the margin goes into the treasury of the country.

8. Leather, tanned.—Production in 1905, \$11,193,851. Tariff, 12½ to 17½ per cent. As the bulk of imports are from the United States, an average duty of 15 per cent. gives the manufacturers an annual protection of \$1,650,000.

9. Along with these lines, we might mention men's and women's custom and factory clothing, with an annual output of over \$18,000,000, which, with a duty of from 20 to 35 per cent., gives a substantial margin; and yet, with margins such as these, is it not pitiable to behold the continual wail of our manufacturers?

There seems to be something in human nature that makes dependents, whether individuals or classes, perpetually discontented, and prompts the recipients of favors continually to demand more. In free-trade England, where the manufacturers enjoy no favors at the expense of the general public, and are obliged to give full value in goods for the prices they receive, they are never heard to complain of their treatment. Their success continually depends on their ability to give their customers better bargains than can be obtained from any other part of the world, yet such a thing as an organized demand for better treatment is unknown. To find complaint, discontent and peremptory demands for favors in their worst and most unreasonable form, we must look to the United States, where taxation is levied without even the pretence of raising revenue, and is designed to allow manufacturers to exact all the way from 25 to 100 per cent. above the market price of their goods. Canadian manufacturers, in their further declarations regarding the tariff, illustrate the natural tendency to regard as rights,

favors long enjoyed. They seem to feel that they have a right to the protection accorded them at the expense of agriculture, mining, lumbering, and other self-supporting industries, and that they are merely seeking their own in asking greater favors.

What is and has been the result of these protection duties? Let the judges on the bench, in the law courts of our country, give the answer! The revelations which have come to light in the case of the plumbers, tack manufacturers, wholesale grocers and druggist combines have proven that, to a great degree, through the action, combination and forms of agreements in existence, almost every article used in Canadian homes to-day is augmented in price beyond its legitimate value, and the great consuming masses in the land have to bear the unjust burden. Let us recall the words of Mr. Justice Clute, in delivering judgment upon a certain druggist case, in June of 1906. This was an action brought by a wholesale druggist firm in Montreal to compel a firm of retail druggists to stick to an agreement regarding prices. The case was dismissed, on the ground that the agreement was an unlawful conspiracy interfering with the freedom of trade, and, in delivering judgment, he stated that this form of agreement was used not simply in this class of commodities, but it was the form adopted by the committees representing a great part of the wholesale and retail trade of Canada, and it meant that almost every article in common use was subjected to a hard-and-fast contract which set the