From Bad to Worse.

While face to face with the above schedule of duties the position of the Canadian farmer was discouraging, but with the late changes in the United States Tarifi, under the operation of the McKinley Bill, his condition is seriously imperilled. The harvest was not a bountiful one in 1889, yet if the Canadian farmer sends his products in 1891 to the United States the natural market—to the same extent as in 1889, he will be taxed in the following manner :—

	Quantity.	Rate of duty.	To be paid.
Barley	9,934,500 bush	els, 30 cts. bush	\$2,980,350
Beans	302,000 "	40 cts. "	120,800
Pease	332,000 "	40 cts. "	
Potatoes		25 cts. "	179.415
Нау	82,300 tons,	\$4 ton	
Horses		{ \$30 each if valued at "les than \$150	010 010
Cattle	\$488,260	\$10 each if more than one year	old. 373,600
Sheep		\$1.50 each if one year old 75 cts. if less than year old]
Poultry, dressed Eggs1	\$51,732 4,011,000 doz.,	5 cts. per lb 5 cts. dozen	38,740

Total amount that will be taken from the pockets

of the Canadian Farmers in one year \$5,820,000

If the Farmers desire the removal of the enormous Barriers that have been placed between them and their natural market by the above schedule of duties, they have the Remedy in their Own Hands—by Supporting the Liberal Party the Leaders of which have shown their Earnestness in advocating a broad measure of Unrestricted Reciprocity with the United States, the desired change can be effected.

Who Pays the Duty ?

The question of who pays the duty on these products when exported from Canada to the United States, has been answered by notable Canadian Statesmen. Sir John Macdonald said (See House of Commons Debates, 1878, page 861):---

"I find that the farmers of West Canada and East Canada could not understand there was anything in their barley, for instance, being obliged to pay a duty of 15 per cent, upon going into the United States, whereas the produce of the **Hensican** farmers was allowed to be brought into this country free. It is said the consumers pays the duty; and that the farmer does not suffer anything. That is the statement, but, when I put a simple case, which I have done frequently, I can get no arswer. Suppose a man has 100 acres on the Canadian side of the line and 100 acres on the American side of the line. Suppose he grows 1,000 bushels of barley on each of his farms. He takes his 1,000 American bushels to the American market and gets one dollar a bushel for it. He takes his 1,000 bushels of Canadian barley to the American market and gets but 85c. per bushel, because he has to pay 15 per cent. for taking it across that imaginary line. How can it, in this case, be said that the consumer pays the duty ? It comes out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers."

Sir David Macpherson announced his views on that subject at Walkerton, in 1878, in the following language :---

"If we produce that which our neighbors have not, and which they must buy from us, we can put our own price upon it, and leave them to pay the duty imposed by their government. In that case the consumer unquestionably pays the duty. But our neighbors and ourselves produce similar commodities, and our producers have to compete with their producers. On their way to the American market our producers have to pass through the American custom house and pay the American duty, and when they reach the market they can obtain no more for their commodities than the American producer who pays no duty. . . . Suppose a farmer in this country takes five horses valued at \$100 each to Detroit to pay before he can enter the Detroit market. That is he must pay \$20 for each horse, and on his five horses \$100, or the value of one horse at the United States custom house before he can take them to the market. Then he will get no more than a Michigan farmer will each get \$500 for his horses. The American takes his \$500 home in his pocket ; while the Canadian takes home only \$400."

ereof pevoted of the s from se me n all appen

er the an be

found

it is er Sir of the icher go to rings gland

f the hews ates.