

The Drainage Bill case can be stated in equally brief form. What is called for here is that the same privilege of draining across railway lands shall be granted as is now conceded in draining across private lands. As it is now, railways have power to practically prevent draining across their property, and when they do concede this privilege they charge an outrageous price for it. A case was reported in Enniskillen Township, where \$400 was charged for a culvert across a railway to furnish an outlet for two farms.

The Association emphatically protests against any increase in the tariff.

This is another resolution passed at the first annual convention of the Farmers' Association.

The tariff is a party question, you say? That is true only when the question is discussed by farmers. When it is discussed by manufacturers it is a business question, and is discussed from the business standpoint of the manufacturers, and from that only. Why should not farmers, who bear the chief burden of the tariff, discuss the question from a business standpoint also—from the point of view of a man who wants to know how much the tariff is costing him, and who desires to keep the burden at the lowest possible figure?

Let us state a few facts.

The total sum collected under the tariff last year, in Customs duties, or goods imported into this country, was, in round figures, thirty-two and a half million dollars. This was over twelve millions in excess of the sum collected in '96. (See Trade and Navigation Returns, 1902.)

The total amount of dutiable goods—that is, goods subjected to taxation—imported in 1902 was, in round figures, \$128,000,000. The average rate of duty on taxable goods was, therefore, 25 per cent.

In some cases it was a good deal more than this. On \$976,453 worth of ready-made clothing imported the tax was \$294,422, or over 30 per cent. On \$246,400 worth of sewing machines imported the tax was \$73,589—30 per cent.

On \$102,692 worth of scales, etc., the duty was \$30,697—30 per cent. On \$878,087 worth of coal oil, etc., the duty was \$545,819—well over 60 per cent.

Innumerable other like cases might be cited, but these will serve as examples. Suffice it to state that the cost to consumers of \$128,000,000 worth of imported goods brought into Canada in 1902 was increased to the extent of 25 per cent. by reason of the tariff imposed. The increase was really more than this, because the importers who paid the tax in the first instance, added a percentage for profit, not only to the first cost of the goods, but on the amount paid in Customs taxation as well.

And this is not all. All home-made articles, similar to the imported ones, were made artificially dearer because the home manufacturers, by reason of the protection against foreign competition, were enabled to combine and increase their prices. But in this latter case the increase in the cost of the article did not go to the public revenues; it went to further enrich the protected home manufacturers.

And still manufacturers are not satisfied. They are demanding more protection. They have announced that the leading hotel of Ottawa is to be filled this session with lobbyists, who will devote their whole time to an effort to stampede Parliament into a further increase in the tariff.

The Farmers' Association has declared this effort should not succeed—that it should be opposed. In this case, again, is it not true that the Association is supporting the interests of all farmers?

There is one phase of this tariff question that is deserving of special attention. The manufacturers are demanding that something like a prohibitive tariff shall be erected against the Americans. Would that be wise? Why did the farmers of this country buy about a million dollars' worth of machinery and im-