

large number of men and the bringing of many millions of money annually into this country, from various foreign countries, but it has also been of the greatest possible benefit to the farmers of Canada through consequent reduction of the cost of implements. The largely increased output afforded by the foreign business has enabled the manufacturers to make implements for Canadians cheaper than would otherwise be possible, thereby giving to Canadian farmers not only better but also cheaper implements (excepting the United States) than in any other grain growing country in the world.

I say, without hesitation, that implements are cheaper in Canada today because of the local industries that have heretofore been established in Canada because of very high tariffs, than would have been the case under a low tariff or free trade, without local industries and dependent only upon importing implements made in foreign countries. The history of business throughout the world proves that local competition between manufacturers is the factor that secures the lowest price to the consumer. I am not now, nor have I ever been, a high tariff advocate, but I am bound to say that, from my intimate knowledge of the business in Canada, it must be admitted that the very high duties placed upon implements many years since resulted in the establishment of a large number of manufacturers in Canada, for the purpose of building Binders, Mowers, etc. At one time (influenced by the high duty) over thirty Canadian factories came quickly into existence and were turning out these implements. The competition was, however, so keen that they as quickly began to fail and diminish in number and it was not very long after until but four or five were left in the business. In recent years, I believe, there have been but three of the original Canadian makers continuing. There has, however, one large institution come into Canada in this particular line, viz., the International Harvester Company who have spent millions in plant, equipment, etc., in Canada, and other large foreign makers are building and preparing to manufacture here in Canada.

You speak glibly of "legalized robbery," "extorted millions," etc. I ask you, can you name any manufacturer of the thirty odd who were building Binders, Mowers, etc., some years since, and who have since ceased to exist, who have made any money or have retired from business to live on what they have saved? Further, I say you cannot now name a manufacturer in Canada in this line who has made money (unless such manufacturer has, in addition to their Canadian trade, a large foreign trade).

Surely if in a country so young as Canada in any line of manufacturing industries we have reached a position where we can furnish to the people of our own country our own manufactures equal to and better than that of any other country in the world and as cheap, and cheaper, than the average price in all other countries in the world, we have done reasonably well. Further, if we can go into other countries and build up a large business, enabling us to employ thousands of men in Canada who otherwise would not be employed, and, incidentally becoming, through the words "Made in Canada" stencilled on the hundreds of thousands of implements sold abroad during the past twenty years, the best immigration agency and advertising medium Canada has ever had, and furnishing very considerable additional traffic to Canadian Railways and Steamship lines, and further, if the profits of this foreign business have come to Canada and are being expended here, should not those who have done something towards accomplishing this be entitled to at least receive fair treatment from their own fellow countrymen?

There were times when the business could fairly be said to be highly protected but that cannot be said of the present or the past fifteen years. The tariff on implements, naturally and properly, because of the predominating interests of the farmers of Canada, has been more than any other section of the tariff under frequent, almost continuous, discussion and sometimes, I believe, for the reason that it has been politically advantageous for politicians to show their special interest in the farming community. The tariff on implements has been reduced at each revision of the general tariff: first from 35 per cent. down to 20 per cent. in 1894, and later, on Binders, Mowers and Reapers, from 20 per cent. down to 17½ per cent. The present rate is surely not higher than a revenue basis.

In Canada, indirect taxation by customs duties has been accepted by the people as the better means of producing the necessary revenue. No person can doubt the necessity of a large revenue for the present, and for a considerable time to come, if this new country is to be developed as rapidly as it ought to be, and as every Canadian hopes it will be. No section of the country is more largely interested than Western Canada in the revenues, because one of the principal expenditures, of necessity, must be for the improvement of our transportation facilities. What a farmer absolutely requires for success is—first of all, productive land; second, good climate; third, farm implements as good and as cheap as farmers in foreign countries with whom he must compete in the world's markets, and, fourth, as good and as cheap transportation facilities as have the countries who are his competitors. The three first I contend the Canadian farmer now has. More, I do not think that in any country in the world can these three requisites be coupled where they equal the opportunities that we have in Canada. The last, or fourth, requirement is being rapidly improved but is still not what it needs to be to give, especially to farmers in Western Canada, the advantages they need to reach the world's markets as cheaply as possible, and, therefore, compete even more advantageously with other countries.

If revenue is to be produced by Custom's duties, surely it is wise to so arrange these duties, within reason, on such articles as will afford some measure of advantage to existing industries, and industries that should, with great advantage, grow up in our own country.

I believe that Canadian agriculturists generally appreciate the value to the country of large manufacturing centres to give us a well rounded country and a population large enough to provide a larger home market for what the farmers produce.

As I have already said, I have never been a high tariff advocate but I am entirely in favor of raising the necessary revenue by indirect taxation or tariff, rather than by direct taxation, and of providing sufficient revenue to carry on, reasonably quickly, the necessary expenditure to improve our transportation facilities and make other necessary improvements, and, at the same time, using this necessity to protect, to a reasonable degree, existing manufacturing interests and to build up others within our own country.

Much has been said recently of the fact that the United States tariff for the past few years has had several implements placed on their 15 per cent. list. A number, however, of important implements are higher still than the Canadian tariff, and, more important than all, as stated above, extra parts still bear a duty of 45 per cent., which practically makes the tariff prohibitive. If reciprocity as talked of with the United States is to mean equality, then there can be no such thing as reciprocity in agricultural implements. Free Trade would not mean reciprocity. If there were no duty on agricultural implements into the United States there would still be practically no importations from Canada, and if any Canadian Company desired successfully to enter the United States market, even if there were Free Trade between the two countries, they would undoubtedly go to the United States to build their factories for that purpose. More than 70 per cent. of the Steel and Iron material going into the Canadian implements is imported from the United States and no company could afford to pay the freight on material into Canada and then freight on the finished articles back again and expect to compete with a Company located in the centre of the raw material district. It is generally supposed by the people of Canada that Canadian manufacturers have an advantage over manufacturers of the United States in lumber, if not in other material. As a matter of fact, 50 per cent. of all the lumber used in implements made in Canada is imported from the United States, so that, even in this material, the manufacturers in the United States have the advantage in freight.

The point I wish to make is that the United States has nothing to offer to Canadian manufacturers of agricultural implements in the way of tariff concession, as it is immaterial to them whether they have a high tariff, a low tariff, or no tariff at all. Any apparent concession would be characteristic of most of our

Continued on Page 12

Warm Farm Buildings

CABOT'S QUILT

This will do more toward making a satisfactory building than any other material. See a Sample. Read the literature.

"MIKADO" Ready Roofing

The covering of the High Grade Wool Felt is such that neither Heat, Cold, nor Exposure affect "MIKADO." Did you ever see a Roofing like this? See Sample and Booklet

DUNN BROTHERS WINNIPEG REGINA ::

Are You Going to Build?



Every year since 1898 the U.S. Government has bought Neponset Paroid Roofing—often a million square feet at a time—for use at home—in Alaska—Panama—the Philippines—in the coldest as well as the hottest climates.

Do you need stronger proof of the wearing qualities, economy, and the satisfaction that NEPONSET Paroid Roofing affords?

Do you want proof nearer home? We will give it to you. We will tell you where you can see a NEPONSET Paroid Roof. See how it looks, learn how long it has been on, and hear what the owner has to say about it.

NEPONSET PAROID Roofing

is sold on proof, not promises.

NEPONSET PAROID Roofing for the roofs and sides of barns, stables, poultry buildings. Stain in color. Costs less than shingles. Resists fire.

For broader houses, sheds and temporary buildings that require low-cost roofing, use NEPONSET RED-ROPE Roofing. For superior in every respect to tarred felt. It has been the standard low-cost roofing for twenty five years.

NEPONSET PROSLATE Roofing, for roofs and sides of residences and all buildings calling for artistic roofs and siding. Looks like shingles, wears like slate.

NEPONSET WATERPROOF Building Paper for use under clapboards and shingles, in walls of residences, etc. Keeps out dampness, cold and draughts. Cuts fuel bill one-third every winter.

Consult Our Building Counsel Department. Tell us what kind of building you want to build and we will send you illustrated suggestions for different types of buildings, or give you expert advice on any building question.

Send Neponset dealers everywhere. If you do not know the one in your locality, ask us.

F. W. BIRD & SON, 513 Lottridge Street, Hamilton, Ontario

Established 1786—Originators of Complete Ready Roofing and Waterproof Building Paper

WINNIPEG, 121 Bennett Street MONTREAL, ST. JOHN, 144 Union Street VANCOUVER, B.C.

Salt Water, Mass. New York Washington Chicago Portland, Ore. 1902

STEEL WAGON TANK

Water, Oil or Gasoline



RED RIVER METAL CO., 51-53 Aikins St., Winnipeg, Man.

When Writing to Advertisers, Please mention The Guide