industries of former years have now become fully grown, and would suggest a gradual and judicious reduction in tariff rates, being confident from past experience that such a policy will not be injurious to our now thriving industries, and will ultimately ensure self-reliance and success, and prevent the ever present danger of a series of threatening combinations.

I beg to present the following short memorandum :

1.—Agricultural Implements.—That the duty must not be raised, as these are a most important raw material to the farmer. We could bear a slight reduction.

2.—Extra Parts or Repairs to Agricultural Implements.—That the request of the Massey-Harris Co. for an increase in the duty on these from 20% to 45% be not granted, as this would be equivalent to imposing a prohibitory duty on the manufactured article. It is more particularly upon our repairs to implements that we are now being bled to the vitals by those manufacturers.

3.—Woollens and Cottons.—A slight reduction should be made. The increase in the duty on woollens recently made is giving the manufacturer a greater margin, is burdensome upon the consumer, and as the manufacturer puts the price up just to the limit at which imported goods may enter, thus putting the margin down his own pocket, we consider the present margin too great for old-established industries.

4.—Sugar Refined.—Sugar is an article of general diet. It is not a luxury, but a necessity, used by the rich and poor alike. We believe in the principle that the burden of taxation should be imposed according to our ability to pay, and it would be better to pension the 1,200-odd hands employed, and somewhat reduce the duty on refined sugar.

5.—Wire for Fencing.—Is a large item with the farmer, and should be given him as cheaply as possible.

6.—General Hardware and Builders' Hardware.—Should, if possible, be reduced in duty.

I would like, in closing, to analyze the reasons given by manufacturers of agricultural implements as to why an increase in their duties would be a benefit to Canada :

Reason No. 1.—" It would be advantageous to the consumer, because an exportable surplus would be reached sooner, and lower prices would follow larger production."

That expression is anomalous. Higher duties tend towards greater burdens to the consumer, combines among manufacturers, and ultimate ruin to the instigators themselves.

No. 2.—" To the revenue, because the imports are decreasing, and the growing needs of the country require larger revenue."

Higher duties would still further decrease the revenue, by curtailing importations, and enable the manufacturers to stick the higher margin down their own pockets.

No. 3.—"To the artisan, by giving him a longer period of employment, steady and secure."

Higher duties will ultimately crush the artisan, by placing him under the iron heel of monopoly.

No. 4.—" To the farmer, because it would increase the home consumption of his goods, and create an opening for his sons in other avocations than that of tilling the soil."

Let the trade returns of our country bear witness to the fact that while in 1890 we had to find a market abroad for $37,000,000 of farm products, the volume has gradually grown, till in 1904 the value of our farm products exported amounted to $114,000,000, showing that the home market is now, and for a time must continue to be, but a drop in the bucket. But the most unkind thrust of all is when the manufacturer becomes so unfeignedly solicitous of our welfare that he first seeks to cripple our industry and then entice our boys away.

If there is one industry in our land which now lacks within itself a sufficiency of suitable help to secure its full development, it is the great agricultural industry. To such an extent has it been burdened in the past, that even in our banner agricultural counties, such as Middlesex, Oxford, Perth, Wellington, Bruce, Huron and Lambton, the rural population is less to-day than it was ten or twenty years ago. This being so, it is our earnest desire that conditions be not thrust upon us which may cause these sections to repeat the experience of further depopulation, as exhibited by some portions of the New England States in days gone by.

Mr. Thomas Baty, of Middlesex Co., in addressing the Commission, started by saying that the prices of our products, of which we had a surplus for export, were governed by the price obtained abroad. This was illustrated by a reference to Toronto cattle market reports, from which we learn that prices of stock there rise and fall in unison with prices current in the British market. This rule obtains in regard to hogs, cheese, grain, etc. No import duty that is placed or might be placed on such productions, though raised to a prohibitive point, would have any effect on the market price here. An itemized account of a Middlesex farmer's receipts for the past ten months was here given. This contained the amounts received for every article sold, and the list included in order of value, fat cattle, hogs, cheese, butter, wood, eggs and poultry, apples, other fruit, potatoes and seed corn, receipts in full being $1,552.82.

With the possible exception of wood, which has ceased to be sold from most Ontario farms, and which amounted to $44.90, potatoes, fruit other than apples, and seed corn, and amounting in all to $60.95, every article mentioned is exported largely, and therefore the price received was uninfluenced by tariff. It is doubtful if these that are excepted returned any enhanced price on account of import duty, but no other could, and these amounted to less than four per cent. of the total sales. Another Middlesex farmer's account of sales for a year was read, which amounted to $2,125.85, and, in the order named, was received for fat cattle, hogs, oats, apples, butter, barley, eggs and fowls, peas, and sundries, every one of which is on our export list except sundries which sold for $6.97.

Mr. Fielding.—How about hogs and hog products ? Are not these duties of great value to the farmer ?

Mr. Baty.—I do not believe they are of any use to the farmer. Hogs are converted into hog products right here in London, and these are exported at once to England. The prices received there, so the packers tell us (a slight smile was observed to pass over the faces of the Commissioners), determine prices here.

Mr. Brodeur.—The lumbermen complain of the duty they have to pay on pork. How is it that they have to import ?

Mr. McMillan.—We do not raise thick, fat hogs here ; our feeds are not suitable, and the bacon hog pays better.

Mr. Fielding.—You do not consider that this means a displacing of your pork by foreign products ?

Mr. Baty.—No.

Resuming his address, Mr. Baty said that, in regard to articles of consumption of which we have to import any considerable quantity, prices are determined by the cost of such articles abroad, plus duty and freight. The slightest reflection will convince anyone of this. We sometimes, in our business transactions, without the trouble of thinking, get this fact impressed upon us. No. 9 wire to-day costs, per hundred pounds, $2.50 ; No. 12, $2.65, while for No. 10 we have to pay $3.50 per cwt. Why ? No. 9 and No. 12 come in free, but on No. 10 duty is charged. Farmers, forming 70 per cent. of our population, are the greatest consuming class in our country, and on them the burden of the tariff necessarily falls. They are not unwilling to bear their fair share of the expense of Government, but the feeling is growing among them that they are being unjustly burdened. This growing discontent is not confined to Liberals, but is spreading among Conservatives as well. It is high time for tariff revision, but it should be in the direction of a decided and general lowering of duties. Our " infant " industries seem loth to leave babyhood behind. Their attitude reminded the speaker of the farmer who was raising a calf, and, wanting to be good to it, was giving it all the milk it would drink ; " but," said the farmer, " the more milk I gave it, the bigger a calf it got." The home market for our products which was promised us seems farther off than ever. Since protective duties were first put on, many farm products which were then all consumed in this country have been added to our export list, as, for instance, fowls, eggs, and even milk, in its condensed form.

Mr. Patterson.—The position you take in regard to exportable surplus is no doubt sound. In a general way, of course, there are exceptions ; prices of such products are fixed by the price received outside. But some of our manufacturers tell us that they have reached the limit of the home demand and must export. Will that rule apply to manufactured goods as it does to farm products ? Will the price of manufactures be determined by the outside market ?

Mr. Baty.—I have no doubt that it will, unless manufacturers combine to hold up prices here.

Mr. Patterson.—Which farmers cannot do.

Mr. Baty.—Not very well.

Proceeding, he said, we would have preferred to base our claim for consideration, not on the interests of farmers alone, but on that of the general good. Seeing that so large a proportion of our people are farmers, and that in their prosperity everyone prospered, it might be said that we had done so. One great evil of the protective system was that it appealed to the selfish and stimulated the selfish in us.

Summing up, he said the protective tariff did not help the farmer, but it cost him a good deal.

James A. Glen, a man somewhat advanced in years, whose patriarchal beard, in this age of beardless men, gave him a distinguished appearance, spoke for the Grangers. He protested vigorously against any increase in the tariff. It is unfair that we should be caged in by a tariff wall, that the manufactueres might plunder at their will. Old Rob Roy robbed with his broadsword, but men nowadays rob under the law, and don't put their necks in danger. He spoke with scorn of the duties on cereals, ostensibly put on for the farmers' benefit. They are like the ourl on a pig's tail—more for ornament than for use. " Sweep them all off," said he, " they are no good." Asked if the duty on oats does not help the price here, he answered that oats in London weighing 34 pounds per bushel sold for 34 cents, while in Chicago a bushel of 32 pounds sold at the same price. The Americans are not going to carry their coals to Newcastle ; they don't ship grain here where it is cheaper than it is with them. He was perfectly willing to compete with the world in grain raising, and would like to see the manufacturers placed in the same position. If you would only get us a reciprocity treaty with the United States, it would be a very great benefit to the farmers of this country. If manufacturers could not then stand alone, they might be pensioned ; it would be cheaper. He had no objection to paying a little extra because of duty if it went to the Government, but he did object to its going into the pocket of the individual to make him rich. He took special objection to the duties on agricultural implements and sugar.

Mr. T. B. Scott claimed that we are sufficiently taxed already. If the Canadian Government increases the present tariff it will only give the United States Government an excuse to raise its tariff against Canada. That would make bad worse. We want, instead, free entry into Buffalo market ; then we would show the pork packers where they were at. The price of hogs is higher in Toronto than in Buffalo this season, but generally it is the other way, and in the case of cattle, butchers' cattle, particularly, the price is always higher there. If reciprocity were established between the two countries we know that buyers from the States would crowd over in order to secure our animal and grain products. Turning aside to the hog question again, on which he seemed to feel sore, he declared that packers fixed prices to suit themselves, and that, though always ready to tell farmers what style of hog to raise, they yet made no discrimination in price between the undesirable and the model types.

The delegation then retired, leaving the Commissioners in no doubt what the farmers, so far as they were represented by these men, thought on the tariff question.

About Consolidated Schools.

Having seen the several consolidated schools mentioned in the " Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine," I would like to ask a question or two about them. 1st.—Who has the power to consolidate the several rural school sections into one ? Is it the township, the county, or the people of the school sections ? 2nd.—Is there any Government grant to such a school ? 3rd.—Are there any such schools in operation other than those given by Sir William Macdonald ? If so, are they successful ? 4th.—What was the cost of the Guelph Consolidated School, and what are its running expenses ?

L. C. O.

Grey Co., Ont.

1st.—The power to consolidate two or more school sections is vested in the township council, on the request of the people of the sections. The trustees or inspector must call a meeting of the ratepayers in each school section wishing to be consolidated, and a vote taken on the question. If the majority of the ratepayers present vote for consolidation, the secretary is instructed to send a petition to the township council, asking them to pass a by-law to allow said section to enter the consolidated school section. Consult section 41 of the Public School Act, and the amendments of 1903.

2nd.—There is as yet no direct Government grant for consolidated schools, but there is a substantial one for manual training, domestic science and school gardens, and the consolidated schools make these possible.

3rd.—At Tryon, Prince Edward Island, a very successful consolidated school has been established. Here three school districts have been united, and, judging from the latest reports, it is proving a financial success. This is shown by comparing the cost per pupil under the old and new systems. Formerly the average attendance in the three schools was less than 70 pupils, each costing the ratepayers $11.84 per year. Now there is an average of 84, each costing $9.47 per annum, or a balance in favor of consolidation of $2.37 per pupil per year. Throughout Ohio over 80 per cent. of the consolidated schools show a decrease of expenditure per pupil under consolidation. We have only one one consolidated school in Ontario.

4th.—The Consolidated School at Guelph is a two story and a half red brick, with a basement full size of the building. It consists of six regular class-rooms, domestic-science room, manual-training room, nature-study laboratory, a large assembly room, and two teachers' rooms. The cost of this building was $22,000. It is hardly fair to judge what the cost of running a consolidated school will be by the school at Guelph. A fairer estimate of the cost can be obtained from the school at Tryon, P. E. I. The school at Guelph is an experiment, and experiments are always expensive, especially when someone else is paying for it. Although the running expenses at Guelph have been considerably increased, it should be borne in mind that there is a specialist in manual training and a specialist in domestic science, as well as the expense of keeping