

INFORMATION

FOR RESEARCH

NO. 4

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2009 with funding from  
Ontario Council of University Libraries

[1907] Cons

# Information for Electors.

No. 4.

3F

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

FREE TRADE AS IN ENGLAND. . . . .	1	WHAT DUTIES ARE PAID BY FARMERS. . . . .	10
A JUG-HANDLED ARRANGEMENT. . . . .	4	DUTIES ON LUXURIES. . . . .	11
PROTECTION FOR FARMERS. . . . .	5	PROTECTION TO MANUFACTURERS HAS NOT INCREASED THE PRICE OF FARM IMPLEMENTS. . . . .	11
PRODUCTS OF FARM AND ORCHARD UNDER N. P. . . . .	6	THE SCHEDULING OF CANADIAN CATTLE NOT JUSTIFIED. . . . .	13
FARMERS' HOMEMARKET ENLARGED BY N. P. . . . .	7		

## FREE TRADE AS IN ENGLAND.

Now that we are told that "free trade such as it is in England" is the goal at which the Liberal party is aiming and towards which it will aspire, it is of the greatest importance to the people of Canada that they should make themselves acquainted with the system and incidence of taxation in the United Kingdom.

### TAXATION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM.

The net receipts of the United Kingdom from taxation in 1894-5 were as follows:—

Customs... ..	£20,115,000	\$ 97,893,000
Excise.... ..	26,050,000	126,776,667
Stamps (excluding fee stamps).. . .	14,440,000	70,274,667
Land tax.... ..	1,015,000	4,939,606
House duty..... .	1,485,000	6,083,667
Property and income tax..... .	15,600,000	75,820,000
Local taxation accounts... ..	7,018,542	34,132,571
<b>Total taxation:</b>	<b>£80,668,542</b>	<b>\$410,829,233</b>

The customs duties on beer and ale, wines and spirits amounted to \$26,938,815, and on tobacco, manufactured and unmanufactured, including cigars and snuff, \$50,687,010. The other imports subject to duties are tea, \$17,459,809; coffee, raw, roasted or ground, \$827,450; coffee and chicory mixed; cocoa and husks and shells; cocoa or chocolate, ground or in any way manufactured; chicory, raw, roasted or ground; dried fruits, \$1,930,130, including raisins, currants, figs and fig cake, plums (French) and pruneloes, plums dried or preserved and prunes; playing cards; iodide of ethyl; naphtha, purified so as to be portable; chloral hydrate; chloroform; colloidal; ether; soap, transparent, in the manufacture of which spirits has been used; perfumed spirits and varnish containing alcohol.

The excise duties were chiefly derived from beer and spirits, amounting to \$128,947,341. Under this head there also came \$1,268,710 from the railways. Excise also includes a number of petty duties; carriage for two horses, \$10.22 a year; for one horse, \$5.11; with two wheels, \$3.65; playing cards, 6 cents; armorial bearings,

\$5.11 a year; if on carriage, \$10.22; dogs, \$1.33 a year, sheep and cattle dogs and blind men's dogs excepted; carrying gun or pistol, \$2.43 a year; game and shooting license, \$14.60 a year; male servants, \$3.65 a year; retailers of candy, \$6.08.

The receipts from stamps came chiefly from deaths, probate, legacy and succession duties, in all \$42,412,718; other stamps on cheques, bills of exchange and promissory notes, insurance policies, deeds and receipts for payment, amounting to \$28,578,214. The items land tax, house duty, property and income tax speak for themselves.

The local taxation accounts include additional customs and excise duties, licenses and moiety of probate duty.

Besides these amounts raised by taxation, there were the following items of revenue of the nature of payments for services or receipts from property:—

Post office... ..	£ 10,760,000	\$ 52,365,833
Telegraph service	2,580,000	12,556,000
Crown lands.. ..	410,000	1,995,833
Suez Canal shares		
Interest.. ..	894,905	1,922,309
Miscellaneous.. ..	1,883,767	9,167,666
<b>Total.. ..</b>	<b>£ 16,028,762</b>	<b>\$ 78,006,641</b>
<b>Total taxation as above.. ..</b>	<b>85,068,542</b>	<b>416,920,238</b>
<b>Total net revenue.. ..</b>	<b>£101,697,304</b>	<b>\$494,926,879</b>

#### THE GOAL AT WHICH THE LIBERAL PARTY AIM.

Having thus considered the system of taxation in the United Kingdom, the different heads under which it is paid and the amounts collected under each, the results in Canada, if the Liberals were given power to carry out their policy of approximating to that goal, may be estimated with a close approach to accuracy.

Assuming the amount to be raised by taxation to be \$28,221,415, the average of the last five years, customs and excise duties on tobacco and intoxicating liquors would be called upon to contribute \$14,111,000.

Customs duties on tea, coffee, cocoa and chocolate would have to yield \$1,282,800. This was and still is a fav-

ourite tax of Sir Richard Cartwright, because, as we do not produce these articles, the whole duty must be paid by the consumer, without any reduction of price through domestic competition, and without aiding any Canadian industry. Every family in the land would have to contribute to this amount, but not equally, for it is notorious that the largest consumers of these beverages are among the poorer people.

Customs duties on dried fruit, raisins, currants, &c., would be called upon for \$141,000. These articles are in much the same position as tea and coffee, and the tax would be similarly oppressive.

Among the excise duties would be a payment by railways to the amount of \$94,000, which would assuredly be collected by the companies from their customers in increased fares and freights.

The death duties—probate, legacy and succession—would be expected to produce \$2,822,000. The widow or daughter to whom a thoughtful father had left a legacy to afford aid he could no longer give, would have to yield up a share of it. Every farmer's son succeeding to his father's farm, would have to begin his career by a considerable payment on his acres, probably raised by a mortgage on the farm for that purpose.

Other stamp duties would have to contribute \$1,881,500 to the revenue. Every insurance policy taken out, whether life or fire, every deed given, every cheque or promissory note drawn, every receipt signed would require its stamps, and the money for it, a constant annoyance, especially to business men, who would, however, whenever possible, recoup themselves from their customers.

Last, but not least, comes direct taxation—the house, land, property, and income taxes—required to produce \$5,926,500. Every farmer would have his broad acres lying open to the tax collector, every thrifty mechanic having, as many have, a little home of his own, would have to pay his quota, every business or professional man would be subject to this inquisitorial and most odious of all taxes.

There would remain other customs and excise duties and miscellaneous small taxes to yield the required \$1.

962,600. A yearly tax upon your carriage, upon your dog (unless you are a shepherd or cattle drover or blind man), upon playing cards, for selling candy, for using a crest or arms, for carrying a gun or pistol, for employing a man servant, for shooting game. Such are a few of these multifarious petty demands from the tax collector.

This is the system of taxation which Mr. Laurier aims to establish in Canada, and to which he intends to approximate as rapidly as possible, if the people give him the opportunity.

Put in tabular form it would be as follows:—

Customs and excise duties on tobacco and intoxicating liquors... ..	\$14,111,000
Customs duties on tea, coffee and cocoa..... ..	1,282,800
Customs duties on dried fruits...	141,000
Excise duty, railways... ..	94,000
Death duties—probate, legacy and succession... ..	2,822,000
Stamp duties on insurance, cheques, receipts, etc.....	1,881,500
Direct taxation—land, house, property and income... ..	5,926,500
Miscellaneous duties and taxes..	1,962,600
	<hr/>
	\$28,221,400

In this calculation the duties on tobacco and intoxicating liquors have been taken as bearing the same proportion to the total taxation as in the United Kingdom, but at present they yield only \$10,000,000. It will hardly be suggested that the consumption should be increased, and the duties could not be raised materially without inducing a great amount of smuggling. If under these circumstances the revenue from this source could not be augmented and had to be distributed among the others, the modified table would stand as follows:—

Customs and excise duties on tobacco and intoxicating liquors.....	\$10,000,000
Customs duties on tea, coffee and cocoa..... ..	1,646,400
Customs duties on dried fruits..	181,000
Excise duty—railways..... ..	120,600
Death duties—probate, legacy and succession..... ..	3,622,000
Stamp duties on insurance, cheques, receipts, etc....	2,414,900
Direct taxation—land, house property and income.....	7,606,500
Miscellaneous duties and taxes.	2,630,000
	<hr/>
	\$28,221,400

It might be found that some of these sources of revenue belong to the Provinces rather than the Dominion, and some from the different circumstances might not yield so well as in the old country. The British Chancellor of the Exchequer when in a difficulty puts another penny on the income tax, and no doubt Sir Richard Cartwright would gladly, in a similar manner, have recourse to increased direct taxation.

Sometimes when at a loss to say how they will raise the necessary taxation, the Opposition suggest vaguely that they may reduce expenditure and so require less taxes. The Liberal leaders, under the same financial authority, were given a trial in the Dominion, and they did not reduce expenditure and taxation. Their friends are, or have been, in power in every Province except British Columbia. In none of them have they decreased expenditure or taxation; in every one of them they have increased expenditure and taxation. Nothing better could be expected from them if they were in power at Ottawa.

The fact is the taxation is not excessive nor greater than is required for the service of the country and its people. The taxation in the United Kingdom is \$9.78 a head, in France it is \$11.92, in Germany \$6.32, in Austria-Hungary \$6.67, in Australasia it is \$12.49, while in Canada it is only \$5.01. In the United States it is \$4.26, but to this has to be added the States' direct taxation to take the place of our Federal subsidies, not granted in the neighboring republic.

The revenue must be raised, and the Liberals propose to raise it, as soon as they can, in the manner above shown.

## A JUG-HANDLED ARRANGEMENT.

With free trade as it is in England the tariff relations between the United States and Canada would so far as the ordinary agricultural productions are concerned be as follows:

	The Canadian duty would be.	The U. S. duty would be.
Wheat... ..	Free.	20 per cent.
Barley... ..	Free.	30 per cent.
Barley, malted... ..	Free.	40 per cent.
Rye... ..	Free.	20 per cent.
Oats... ..	Free.	20 per cent.
Corn... ..	Free.	20 per cent.
Flour... ..	Free.	20 per cent.
Potatoes... ..	Free.	15c. per bush.
Horses... ..	Free.	20 per cent.
Cattle... ..	Free.	20 per cent.
Beef... ..	Free.	20 per cent.
Pork... ..	Free.	20 per cent.
Cheese... ..	Free.	4c. per lb.
Butter... ..	Free.	4c. per lb.
Hay... ..	Free.	\$2 per ton.
Apples... ..	Free.	20 per cent.
Eggs... ..	Free.	3c. per doz.
Poultry... ..	Free.	Dressed 3c. per lb.

How would our Canadian farmers like such an arrangement as this, an arrangement by which our neighbors across the border could place their farm products on the Canadian market free, while the Canadian farmer would have to pay a duty or tax of from 20 to 40 per cent. for the privilege of placing the produce of the farm on the markets of the United States?

This is the policy which is being advocated by the Liberal party to-day—**FREE TRADE AS IT IS IN ENGLAND.** Previous to the introduction of the National Policy in 1879, the tariff relations between the two countries were somewhat similar to what is shown on the foregoing table.

Many of the older farmers will remember how disastrously it operated against Canada. In 1878, petition after petition was sent to Parliament, signed by upwards of 100,000 of them praying to be relieved from the terrible effects of that one-sided policy.

In their petitions they said, among other things, as practical farmers, we cannot but view with regret our markets filled with American produce free of duty, while Canadian farm produce is heavily taxed when sent into the United States markets.

They wished such protection as would secure the home market for the home producer, or that the same rate of duty be levied on all agricultural products coming into the Dominion from foreign countries, that is imposed by said foreign countries upon our produce.

The Liberals were in power in 1878, and would pay no attention to this protest against the jug-handled free trade that allowed the entry of foreigners' product to compete with ours, but could give no advantage to Canadian products in other countries.

This is the kind of free trade Mr. Laurier would restore.

But bad as the one-sided arrangement was for our farmers previous to 1878, it would be still worse now. The Western States have been producing more and more from year to year, so that the competition would be much keener now than then.

Even with a tariff duty as it is now, ranging from 20 to 60 per cent., there was imported for home consumption into Canada of farm products to the amount of upwards of \$5,000,000 in 1895, depriving the Canadian farmer of his home market to that amount.

9,862,205 bushels of grain came into Canada for home consumption in 1878—nearly 18,000,000 pounds of meats. What would be the importations to-day with free trade in farm products as it was then?

Farmers of Canada, are you prepared to have a return to the old policy, or, **FREE TRADE AS IT IS IN ENGLAND.**

# PROTECTION FOR FARMERS.

The following protective duties by the tariff of 1894 are levied on the products of the farm, including the

stock yard, the dairy and the orchard, in comparison with the tariff of 1878:—

Articles	The Grit tariff (1878) on farm articles.	The Conservative tariff (1896) on farm articles.
Animals, living, N. E. S.	10 per cent.	20 per cent.
Live hogs, per pound	10 per cent.	1½ cents per lb.
Bacon and hams	1 cent per lb.	2 cents per lb.
Meats, N. E. S. (in barrel), per pound	1 cent per lb.	2 cents per lb.
Meats, fresh	1 cent per lb.	3 cents per lb.
Canned meats, etc.	17½ per cent.	25 per cent.
Mutton and lamb, fresh	1 cent per lb.	35 per cent.
Poultry and game	1 cent per lb.	20 per cent.
Lard and compounds, per pound	1 cent per lb.	2 cents per lb.
Tallow	1 cent per lb.	20 per cent.
Feathers, undressed	17½ per cent.	20 per cent.
Eggs, per dozen	Free	5 cents per doz.
Butter, per pound	4 cents per lb.	4 cents per lb.
Cheese, per pound	3 cents per lb.	3 cents per lb.
Condensed milk, per pound	17½ per cent.	3 cents per lb.
Apples, per barrel	10 per cent.	40 cents per bbl.
Beans, per bushel	Free	15 cents per bush
Buckwheat, per bushel	Free	10 cents per bush
Pease, per bushel	Free	10 cents per bush
Potatoes, per bushel	10 per cent.	15 cents per bush
Rye, per bushel	Free	10 cents per bush
Rye flour, per barrel	Free	50 cents per bbl.
Hay, per ton	10 per cent.	\$2 per ton
Vegetables, fresh or dry salted	10 per cent.	25 per cent.
Barley, per bushel	Free	30 per cent.
Indian corn, per bushel	Free	7½ cents per bush
Buckwheat meal, per pound	Free	¾ cent per lb.
Cornmeal, per barrel	Free	40 cents per bbl.
Oats, per bushel	Free	10 cents per bush
Oatmeal, per pound	Free	20 per cent.
Wheat, per bushel	Free	15 cents per bush
Wheat flour, per barrel	Free	75 cents per bbl.
Seeds, garden, field, etc., large packages	10 per cent.	10 per cent.
Seeds, garden, field, etc., small packages	10 per cent.	25 per cent.
Tomatoes, fresh, per bushel	10 per cent.	20 cents.
Tomatoes, corn, beans, etc., in cans, per pound	17½ per cent.	11½ cents.
Malt, per bushel	2½ cents per bush.	15 cents per bush
Hops, per pound	5 cents per lb.	6 cents per lb.
Trees, fruit, each	10 per cent.	3 cents each.
Grape vines, gooseberry bushes, etc.	10 per cent.	20 per cent.
Small fruits, N. E. S., per pound	10 per cent.	2 cents per lb.
Cranberries, plums and quinces, per bushel	10 per cent.	25 per cent.
Apples, dried, etc.	10 per cent.	25 per cent.
Grapes, per pound	10 per cent.	2 cents per lb.
Peaches, per pound	10 per cent.	1 cent per lb.
Fruit, in cans, per pound	10 per cent.	2¼ cents per lb.
Fruit, preserved in spirits, per gallon	17½ per cent.	\$1.90 per gal.
Jellies, jams, etc., per pound	17½ per cent.	3¼ cents per lb.
Honey, per pound	17½ per cent.	3 cents per lb.
Maple sugar	17½ per cent.	20 per cent.
Cider, not clarified or refined, per gallon	17½ per cent.	5 cents per gal.
Cider, clarified or refined, per gallon	17½ per cent.	10 cents per gal.

The following goods are at the present time prohibited absolutely:—

- Oleomargarine.
- Butterine.

Similar substitutes for butter.

The farmers have the further protection of having the following articles used in their business admitted free:—

**ON FREE LIST.**

- Animals—Horses, cattle, sheep, swine and hogs for improving stock.
- Bees.
- Bones, crude.
- Blast furnace slag.
- Domestic fowls to improve stock.
- Guano, bone dust and other animal and vegetable manures.
- Indian corn for ensilage.
- Oil cake and similar feeds.
- Rennet, raw or prepared.
- Sawn lumber, not dressed or on one side only.
- Laths, palings, fence posts, etc.
- Seedling stock for grafting.

Seeds—Beet, carrot, flax, turnip, mangolds, etc.

Locust beans and meal, for feed.

There are also on the free list articles so largely consumed by the farmers and their families as tea and coffee. Sugar up to No. 16 Dutch standard is only subject to a duty of half a cent a pound, while refined sugar is subject to a duty of one and fourteen hundredths of a cent.

Duties on other articles largely used by farmers were also considerably reduced by the tariff of 1894, among them being agricultural implements, mowing machines, self-binding harvesters, harvesters without binders, binding attachments, reapers, sulky and walking ploughs, harrows, cultivators, seed drills and horse rakes from 25 to 20 per cent. ad valorem; binding twine from 25 to 12½ per cent., and rove for making such twine, from 17½ to 10 per cent., and barbed wire to ¼ cent per pound.

**FARMERS, WHICH TARIFF DO YOU WANT?**

**Products of the Farm and Orchard Under N. P.**

The effect of the National Policy upon imports and exports of products of the farm and orchard has been very great, as shown in the following table:—

**IMPORTS AND EXPORTS OF FARM PRODUCTS.**

Imports home consumption, 1877. \$20,464,174	Imports home consumption, 1895. \$ 9,270,953
Exports home produce, 1877. .... 27,587,236	Exports home produce, 1895. .... 48,531,344
Balance in favor of Canadian farmer. .... \$ 7,123,062	Balance in favor of Canadian farmer. .... \$39,260,391

Difference in favor of N. P. .... \$32,137,327

**DETAILS OF ABOVE.**

Articles.	Exports, Domestic.		Imports Home Consumption.	
	1877.	1895.	1877	1895.
Animals, living. ....	\$ 2,318,106	\$10,111,496	\$ 705,264	\$ 164,891
Animal products. ....	10,759,754	22,496,995	3,741,069	3,756,151
Grain, flour and meal of all kinds. ....	11,882,085	9,881,912	13,866,799	1,360,399
Fruits, all kinds. ....	194,942	2,329,324	331,654	235,837
Tobacco, raw. ....			902,497	1,362,985
Other agricultural products. ....	2,612,349	3,711,617	916,891	2,390,690
<b>Totals. ....</b>	<b>\$27,587,236</b>	<b>\$48,531,344</b>	<b>\$20,464,174</b>	<b>\$9,270,953</b>



In the imports the value of animals for improvement of stock is not included

The farmer has prospered under the tariff in two ways. He finds, first—Less competition from outside for the home market—\$9,270,953 in 1895, against \$20,464,174 in 1877—a gain in one year for him of \$11,193,221; 2nd—Larger field outside—\$48,531,344 in 1895, against \$27,587,236 in 1877; the tariff has not prevented him obtaining a larger export trade; while it has given him a better home market. He has just as good a chance to sell his products outside of Canada as he ever had, and he has less competition from outside than he used to have.

The import in 1877 was equal to \$5.10 per head of the population.

In 1895 it was equal to \$1.82 per head of the population. The farmer has gained, therefore, \$3.28 per head of the population. Had the per head rate of 1877 under the tariff then in force been the rate in 1895, the imports of farm produce coming directly in competition with our farmers would have been \$25,925,462 instead of what it really was, \$9,270,953.

The gain, therefore, to the farmers of Canada is really \$16,654,510 in the home market.

This is vastly better than being forced to send \$16,650,000 to outside countries.

## FARMERS' HOME MARKET ENLARGED BY THE N. P.

The beneficial effect of the protection afforded to the farmers of Canada by the National Policy tariff is

shown in a marked manner by comparing certain classes of imports entered for consumption in 1878 and 1895.

### HOGS AND HOG PRODUCTS.

Articles.	1878.		1895.	
	Quantity. pounds.	Value.	Quantity. pounds.	Value.
Swine.....	2,227,000	\$ 116,922	34,935	\$ 1,483
Pork.....	10,248,020	640,696	3,203,023	203,809
Bacon and hams.....	2,825,169	220,045	826,882	85,871
Lard.....	2,345,807	213,603	190,921	14,756
Swine products, other... ..	71,632	4,774	3,936	244
Totals.....	17,717,628	\$1,196,940	4,259,697	\$311,163

It will be seen that the imports of hogs and hog products for consumption in 1895 were 13,457,931 less than in 1878, which means that in the year Canadian instead of foreign farmers supplied Canadian consumers with that additional quantity,

the value at the average prices of the year being \$969,153. And this does not take into account the increase of consumption in the eighteen years, the supply of which was also preserved to our farmers by the National Policy tariff.

## GRAIN, FLOUR AND MEAL.

Articles.	1878.		1895.	
	Quantity. bushels.	Value.	Quantity. bushels.	Value.
Wheat.....	1,519,703	\$1,755,682	499,722	\$ 826,412
Barley.....	26,204	11,908	10,539	3,475
Oats.....	2,071,513	624,099	220,059	69,152
Rye.....	110,228	58,106	1,170	561
Indian corn.....	3,400,562	1,627,469	1,485,980	751,233
Peas and beans.....	9,447	18,428	17,881	23,899
Other grain.....	703	587	222	145
Oatmeal....	15,025	22,669	4,700	2,977
Cornmeal....	1,132,860	618,492	116,010	63,320
Flour, wheat and rye.....	1,567,945	1,849,221	216,720	120,331
Other meals.....	8,075	4,904	1,120	1,115
Totals.....	9,862,265	\$6,591,565	2,574,123	\$1,362,620

Thus the imports for consumption of grains, flour and meal were 7,288,142 bushels less in 1895 than in 1878; that is during the year Canadian instead of foreign farmers supplied Canadian consumers with that additional quantity, the value at the average prices of the year being \$3,858,342. This, as in the case of hog products, does not take into account the increase of consumption during eighteen years, also supplied by the farmers of Canada.

If, instead of comparing the years 1878 and 1894, we take the whole importation in periods of six years, the first of them immediately before the N. P. was adopted, the results are as follows:—

Imports of grains, flour and meal.	Total bushels.	Average bushels.
Six years, July, 1873, to June, 1879..	55,084,175	9,180,696
Six years, July, 1879, to June, 1885..	26,409,222	4,401,537
Six years, July, 1885 to June, 1891..	24,904,000	4,150,667
Four years, July, 1891, to June, 1895..	9,765,866	2,441,466

It appears that the National Policy tariff immediately took effect, reducing the average importations to little more than half of what they had been previously, and this de-

crease was maintained for the third six year period. For the last four years the importation again decreased enormously, which was largely due to the raising of the duty on wheat flour from 50 cents to 75 cents a barrel in the Customs Tariff Act of 1890. This secured to our wheat growing farmers the home market in the Maritime Provinces, which had previously been supplied by the millers and farmers of the United States, as was also partially the case with the Province of Quebec.

In the sixteen years under the N. P. these importations amounted to 61,079,088 bushels, being 96,717,152 bushels less than they would have been if the average of 1878 had been maintained, and consequently that quantity was added to the home market of our farmers, the value, even calculated at the average prices of 1895, when breadstuffs all over the world were low, being over \$50,000,000.

Other articles of farm produce were similarly affected, but these two classes, hog products and breadstuffs, are salient examples of the benefit derived by our farmers from the N. P. In the one year 1895 Canadian farmers had an additional home market of 13,457,931 lbs. of hog products and 7,288,142 bushels of grain, flour and meal, the value being close on \$5,000,000 for the year, and this was directly due to our present tariff.



The preceding table gives particulars of the meat imports of Canada for home consumption, quantity, value and duty, for the years 1887-8-9, being for three years previous to the time when the duty was increased on meat products—fresh meats from 1 cent to 3 cents per pound, and salted meat from 1 cent to 2 cents, excepting mutton, from 1 cent per pound to 25 per cent., and also for the three last fiscal years. The totals and averages for the two groups of three years are also given, making it plain that no exceptional favorable year has been chosen for the comparison.

This table of comparison shows conclusively that protection benefits the farmers of Canada, as by the increase of duty in 1890 it lessened importation, securing to them an additional home market for fifteen and a half million pounds yearly of the meats formerly supplied by United States farmers, the annual value being a million dollars.

A glance at the table for separate years, just before the increase of duty came into effect, shows that the importations of pork, beef and mutton were all increasing with growing and portentous rapidity. Our neighbors were evidently taking possession of our markets, and it was certainly time that the interests of our farmers should be protected, as was done most effectively.

It may be observed that though the imports of meats have fallen to little more than a third of the previous quantity, the duty collected remains about half the former amount. The increased duty has secured this enlarged market for our farmers, and even in the comparatively few cases when it does not have this result it adds in large proportion to the public revenue, making foreigners pay for the use of our market.

It was owing to the great and improved facilities which the Armour and Swifts, of Chicago, had attained through their refrigerator car system of placing the meat products of the great corn-growing sections of the South-western States fresh upon the Canadian markets, thereby destroying the farmers' home market for his butcher cattle and other fresh meats in our cities and towns, that the Government placed the increased duty in 1890, viz., from 1 cent per pound on fresh meats to 3 cents, and on salted meats from 1 cent to 2 cents per pound.

The Armour and Swifts, of Chicago, control the greater part of the fresh meat trade in the New England States in their cities and towns, to the detriment of the farmers in these States, but the increased duty in Canada has had the effect of retaining the greater part of the Canadian market for our own farmers.

---

## WHAT DUTIES ARE PAID BY FARMERS.

Under the present tariff the farmers have no duty to pay on tea or coffee, while unrefined sugar is subject to a duty of only half a cent, and refined sugar to a duty of only one and fourteen hundredths of a cent per pound. There was a large amount of duty collected on these articles under the Mackenzie Administration, and they are now much cheaper.

If the farmer (or other person) drinks wine, spirits or beer, or smokes or otherwise uses tobacco, he contributes to the customs revenue. These articles of voluntary use and luxuries pay a quarter of the customs

duties, besides paying nearly the whole of the excise duties.

As to other articles in general use, such as clothing, if the farmer (or any other person) contents himself with Canadian woollens, cottons, knitted goods, boots, &c., there is no duty to be paid on them to the Government. Neither is the duty paid indirectly by being added to the price, for these articles are cheaper than formerly, and are either not at all or little dearer than in other countries.

The farmer or other person need pay hardly any duties, if he does not voluntarily tax himself by the use of spirituous or fermented liquors, of tobacco, of luxuries or of superfine goods imported from abroad.

## DUTIES ON LUXURIES.

"Articles of voluntary use and luxuries" include spirits, wine and beer, tobaccos and cigars, silks, jewelry, gold and silverware, &c., and in the following statements are so classed on the basis of the divisions adapted by the historian Hume, and now used by the authorities of the United Kingdom and the United States.

The total imports by Canada in 1895 (home consumption) amounted to \$100,675,891, and the duties to \$17,887,269.

The articles of voluntary use and luxuries imported were \$8,584,136, and the duties on them were \$4,338,867.

Thus these luxuries, though only about a twelfth part of the total imports, paid very nearly a quarter of the total duties.

The average rate of duty on the total imports was 16.99 per cent.; on the luxuries it was 52.88 per cent.

The following is a comparison of the last three years of the present ad-

ministration with the last three years under the Mackenzie tariff, in regard to the duties on luxuries:—

### REFORM TARIFF.

Year.	Total imports. Average duty.	Total dutiable imports. Average duty.	ARTICLES OF VOLUNTARY USE AND LUXURIES.		
			Average duty.	Per cent. of total duty.	Per cent. of total imports.
1877	13.03	20.55	34.53	19.46	7.54
1878	14.03	21.41	33.70	18.58	7.84
1879	16.10	23.33	38.04	19.63	8.61

### PRESENT ADMINISTRATION.

1893	17.38	30.27	50.08	23.23	8.97
1894	17.13	30.87	52.69	24.65	8.85
1895	16.99	30.54	52.88	24.26	8.53

## Protection to Manufacturers Has Not Increased the Price of Farm Implements.

The effect of the tariff policy of the Conservative Administration upon the prices of agricultural implements and vehicles has been very beneficial to the farmers of Canada, as may be seen by the following comparison:—

	1878.	1896.
Mowers.....	\$ 80.....	\$ 46
Reapers... ..	120.....	65
Binders... ..	275.....	110-\$115
Horse rakes... ..	33.....	22
Leather-top phaetons.	175.....	125
Rubber-top phaetons.	150.....	90
Leather-top buggy...	150.....	90
Rubber-top buggy... ..	125.....	75
Open top buggy... ..	100.....	65
Lumber wagon... ..	90.....	60
Democrat wagon... ..	115.....	75
Road cart... ..	35.....	25
Plough... ..	18-\$20....	10-\$12

In the smaller implements, tools, &c., used by farmers there is also a large decrease in price, as follows:—

	1878.	1896.
		c. c.
Scythes, each... ..	\$ 90	45-60
Scythe snaths, each...	75-\$1 00	30-60
Hay fork, three prong- ed... ..	60	40
Manure forks... ..	1 25	85
Wood hay rakes... ..	15	12½
Reaping hooks... ..	60- 70	30-50
Garden hoes, with soc- kets... ..	60	40
Garden hoes, common.	50	35
Good axes... ..	1 25	90
D. handle shovel... ..	1 25- 1 50	60-90
Lawn mowers... ..	8 00-10 00	\$4-\$6
Barbed wire, per lb... ..	6	3
Cut nails, 10d., per 100 lbs. keg... ..	3 25	\$2 60

And every other article or implement not enumerated that the farmers use has been decreased in price from 25 to 50 per cent.

Our farmers are also in a more favorable position in this respect than the farmers of the United States. In 1893 Mr. George Taylor, M. P. for South Leeds, with a number of influential farmers from his constituency visited New York State for purposes of investigation and comparison, and these experts found the following differences in the prices of agricultural imports in the two countries:—

	Canada.	United States
Binders... ..	\$100-\$110.	\$120-\$135
Reapers... ..	60- 65..	60- 65
Mowers.... ..	40- 45..	42- 48
Horse rakes... ..	22.....	25
Seeders... ..	48.....	50
Ten-hoe drill... ..	60.....	65
Randall disk harrow..	22.....	23
Plough, Frost & Wood, or Wilkinson.... ..	13.....	16
Binder twine, standard	9¼c....	11c.
Binder twine, manilla.	10¼c....	12½c.

The home market for the farmer exists wherever there is a factory or an employment which depends in any way upon manufacturing; and, so, whatever encourages manufacturing enlarges the home market for farm produce. The Canadian National Policy encourages manufacturing enterprise, and the employment of home labor. It, therefore, increases the home consumption of Canadian farm products, and at the same time, as has been shown, does not increase the price of the farm implements he has to buy.

#### WHAT PROTECTION DOES AND FREE TRADE DOESN'T DO.

Protection can and does secure to the Canadian producer, whether in field or factory, and to the Canadian workman, the benefit of the Canadian market. It thus gives to the laborer the means to buy, and to the merchant a customer.

Free trade secures to the Canadian producer or merchant no market whatever. Free trade does not reduce the tariff that other countries maintain against Canadian and other goods for the protection of their own people.

Free trade can build no factories in Canada; it may close some.

Free trade can open no mine; it may shut some down.

Free trade will increase the population of no city or town, or village; it may reduce that of some.

Free trade cannot raise the price of a bushel of wheat or oats, or a pound of butter or cheese, or of a horse, or a cow, or a sheep, or a pig, or a chicken. It may in some cases reduce them. It often happens that there is a local scarcity in Canada of some articles of farm produce which can easily be supplied from the United States. It happened in the summer of 1895, in the matter of wheat, and may happen in any other year in the matter of some other article. The Canadian farmer would not have been benefited in 1895 by free trade in wheat, nor can he be benefited in any year by the free admission into Canada of articles of farm produce raised in other countries.

The Liberal free trade policy is altogether for the benefit of the foreign manufacturers and producers. It proposes to give them advantages in Canada, which their governments will make no return for to the Canadian manufacturers and producers.

It is like a jug—the handle is all on one side.

It was the recognition of this fact that led the farmers in 1873 to petition for protection for farmers.

The Liberals' policy in opposition to the National Policy of the Conservative party may be thus summarized:—

Free trade as they have it in England; reciprocity as they give it in the United States; depression as we had in 1877-8.

## The Scheduling of Canadian Cattle not Justified by Circumstances or Facts.

For nearly fifty years the herds and flocks of Great Britain had been decimated by contagious disease; first contagious pleuro-pneumonia and foot and mouth disease, and in 1862 rinderpest spread like a fire over the country, bringing ruin to thousands of stock raisers.

The commencement and rapid development of shipment of live stock for food purposes both from the United States and Canada removed whatever hope remained, and drove the British farmer to despair, and created a desire on the part of land-owners and stockbreeders to urge unceasingly on the Government the desirability of relieving them in some way by affording them protection from the transatlantic competition. Yielding to their importunities the initial step in this direction was taken by the introduction of a Bill, by the Duke of Richmond, for the prevention of the importation of contagious disease from abroad; providing, among other things, that in the case of any country in which contagious disease was discovered to exist, such country would be scheduled, an embargo being placed on their cattle at British ports preventing them from leaving the port at which they arrived, alive. Whereas cattle from countries in which it could be shown that contagious disease did not exist would be free to enter and be carried to any market or feeding or breeding farm in Britain. Owing to contagious pleuro-pneumonia existing in some of the Atlantic seaboard States, that country was scheduled. No contagious disease having been found in Canada, cattle from this country were free to be conveyed to any market in Britain—an advantage which it was claimed was equal to about \$10 per head. This privilege was granted owing to the healthfulness of Canadian cattle and the excellency of the quarantine regulations.

The efficiency of these regulations was proved by the following facts, viz. — Contagious pleuro-pneumonia for many years existed in several of the United States, as far west as Illinois; yet it was prevented from entering Canada at any point.

In 1886 it was imported from Scotland to the quarantine at Point

Levis; yet it was so effectually dealt with there that it did not spread beyond the limits of the quarantine. Foot and mouth disease had also on one occasion been imported at the Point Levis quarantine, but was confined to the herd which conveyed it there.

Canada to-day is the only large cattle country in the world that has not suffered losses from the above mentioned cattle plagues.

What has been the result?

An extensive and valuable commercial industry in live stock and live stock products has been built up; not only has the numbers of domestic animals been increased, but owing to improved breeding and a better system of feeding, their value has been very largely increased, 25 per cent. at least. Not only was the actual cash value of the live stock increased, but the larger numbers produced yielded more manure with which the land has been enriched, increased acreage had to be put under cultivation, and the condition of the farms and farmers greatly improved thereby.

With the growth of the trade from both Canada and the United States there arose a demand for extended facilities for transportation. Owing to the United States being scheduled by Great Britain, in order to maintain Canada's privilege of their open market, a quarantine of ninety days had to be established against United States cattle entering Canada; this necessitated negotiations being entered into with the Imperial Government, whereby permission was granted under certain restrictions to carry United States cattle from Chicago, via Detroit, across Canada to other United States ports, as many as an average of say 14,000 head annually being so carried under the most stringent protective regulations.

Quarantines were also established in Manitoba and the North-west Territories, where cattle are detained for ninety days, and are tested for tuberculosis before being allowed to leave the quarantine or obtain pratique in Canada.

Notwithstanding the importations from Great Britain and the large numbers of transit animals crossing

Canada, not one single case of contagious disease has been allowed to be introduced into Canada.

As a natural result of the growth of United States and Canadian competition in Great Britain, their market for home-bred animals was seriously interfered with, leading to widespread agricultural depression. This competition was felt mostly by Irish cattle breeders, as owing to the better breeding of Canadian stockers, they gradually drove the inferior Irish store cattle out of the market; thus engendering a spirit of opposition and a desire on their part to check this trade on one pretext or another. Sixteen years went past, during which 1,172,546 head of Canadian cattle had been carried and distributed over British farms, without a trace of contagious disease being found in one of them. This one fact ought to be a sufficient answer to the charges made by opponents of the Government, both in and out of the House, that the quarantine regulations have been carelessly administered. Occasional animals exhibited signs of fatigue and illness arising from stress of weather and rough usage at sea, but they were dealt with in a common-sense manner by the Imperial veterinary staff, and the sickness was attributed to the proper cause. But the farmers continuing to complain, and that justly, of the foreign competition, brought all possible pressure to bear on the British Government to schedule Canada. That Government was induced to take advantage of the first occurrence of a case of pneumonia in a Canadian animal to declare such a case contagious, whilst they had been for years passing such cases as non-contagious pneumonia, and notwithstanding the fact of thousands of cattle annually having been imported and mingled with the home herds without contagion being discovered from a single instance.

In every case in which Canadian cattle have been suspected of disease, they have been traced by competent veterinarians direct to the farms in Canada whence they had been shipped without a suspicion of disease being found.

In 1893 the Minister of Agriculture for Canada forwarded copies of reports and precis of reports of all cases of animal diseases reported to his Department from 1880 to 1893, inclusive, in fact, during the existence of quarantine, in not one of

which is to be found even a suspicion of contagious pleuro-pneumonia.

During the last year mentioned, it was claimed that a steer from Howe Island, near Kingston, Ont., and an ox from Pilot Mound, Manitoba, were found suffering from contagious pleuro-pneumonia. The most searching investigations of both localities and the special herds whence they came, conducted by Dr. McEachran, F. R. C., V. S., the Chief Inspector, in person, failed to discover any disease or even suspicion of disease.

Portions of both lungs were sent to Canada, and were examined by Professor Adams, Pathologist, and Professor McEachran, of the Faculty of Comparative Medicine, both of McGill University, Montreal. Their reports were to the effect that it was not contagious pleuro-pneumonia, but a sporadic pleuro-pneumonia engendered by rough usage en route, and to which the name of transit pneumonia would be more applicable.

Similar reports and precis were again forwarded in 1894, showing that no information had reached the Department leading even to a suspicion of contagious pleuro-pneumonia in any part of the Dominion of Canada.

Owing to the variance in professional opinion as to the disease being actually contagious pleuro-pneumonia existing among British, Continental, American and Canadian veterinarians, the President of the Board of Agriculture called together a committee consisting of his own professional staff, together with a few well-known scientists and veterinarians, and Sir Henry (now Lord) James, as expert legal examiner, and Professor Burdon Sanderson, as expert scientific examiner. At that investigation Canada was not represented by the High Commissioner nor any one acting for him.

The finding of this committee that the disease was contagious pleuro-pneumonia was based entirely on the necroscopic evidences, ignoring the well-known and never-absent characteristics of contagious pleuro-pneumonia, viz.: its contagiousness; and the existence of encysted portions in the lungs of cattle slaughtered in infected herds.

No such disease has been discovered in Canada. No such disease exists in Canada; and not one single instance of such disease having been communicated by Canadian cattle to any of the thousands of herds with



which they have been commingled en route or on the farms in Great Britain, even the most bitter opponents of the Government dare not say that contagious pleuro-pneumonia exists in Canada.

It was urged by the British Board of Agriculture that the Canadian Government should follow the British example, and slaughter out the herds from which suspected cattle came. In the face of the fact that clinical examination showed no disease nor even suspicions of disease existing, the Chief Inspector found, as explained in the subjoined letter, that he could not under the circumstances proceed to arbitrarily slaughter any herds.

REPORT ON NON-SLAUGHTER OF ALLEGED CONTACT ANIMALS.

(By Professor McEachren, D. V. S., F. R. C. V. S., Dean of Faculty, of Comparative Medicine, McGill University.)

Office of the Inspector of Stock, Montreal, 26th July, 1894.

Sir,—In reply to yours of 24th instant, asking for a recital of "my reasons for the advice I have given recommending the non-slaughtering in Canada of herds from which cattle suspected of having pleuro-pneumonia contagiosa have been taken," I beg to say that under the "Animal Contagious Diseases Act" there is no provision for slaughtering cattle, other than that contained in section 12, namely:—

"The Governor-in-council may, from time to time, cause to be slaughtered animals suffering from infectious or contagious disease, and animals which are or have been in contact with or close proximity to a diseased animal or to an animal suspected of being affected by infectious or contagious disease."

Having in every instance in which exported animals have been reported from Canadian steamships at British ports, as being affected by an alleged contagious disease said to be pleuro-pneumonia contagiosa, either personally or through other qualified inspectors, had careful clinical examinations of the contact herds, to which they were traced, made, and finding no infectious nor contagious disease, nor animals which had been in contact with or close proximity to diseased animals, nor to animals suspected of being affected by infectious or contagious disease, I could find no justifi-

fication for advising the Minister to take an order for the slaughtering of any animals.

And furthermore, having examined portions of the lungs of the animals said to have been affected by contagious pleuro-pneumonia, I am convinced that such naming was an error, and that the disease which was found in the animals affected, was a non-contagious pneumonia. I was also aware that in no instance has the disease discovered at British ports in Canadian cattle spread to other cattle, as contagious pleuro-pneumonia is well known to do.

For these reasons I could not recommend the slaughter of healthy cattle and if I had been ordered by the Minister acting under Order-in-Council to do so, I should have been at a loss to know whose herds to slaughter, as a shipment of cattle might be collected from 150 farms, scattered over a large area of country.

Besides, it would not be necessary for any one to suggest an action of this kind, if the slightest grounds of suspicion existed. We should have followed our usual practice in such cases, and tested the herd by post-mortem examination.

As to the reasons why we do not slaughter cattle rejected at inspection, the answer is to the same effect, namely, no suspicion of infection. Nearly all the rejected animals are lamed or bruised, unfit to ship, occasionally a very old, worthless cow, cases of big-jaw, and now and again a tuberculous animal. But the greater part of the detained animals had suffered merely from fatigue or injuries en route, and were passed and sent on by a later steamer. Big-jawed or tuberculous animals are not knowingly allowed to go forward.

To carry out the suggestions of the Board of Agriculture in this connection would not only go beyond the provisions of the Act, but would lead to serious responsibility in unnecessarily destroying not only herds of cattle, but ruining the farmers whose herds would be thus arbitrarily selected for extermination, and I should not know where to begin.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant.

D. McEACHRAN.

JOHN LOWE.

Deputy Minister of Agriculture,  
Ottawa.

## EFFICIENCY OF THE QUARANTINE.

Cattle quarantines have been established at Halifax, N. S.; St. John, N. B.; Point Levis, P. Q.; Sarnia, Ont.; Windsor, Ont.; Emerson, Man.; Greta, Man., at various points along the frontier, the North-west Territories, and British Columbia. All animals before being allowed free movement in Canada have to undergo ninety days' close quarantine, and all settlers' cattle are subjected to tuberculin test before being allowed to leave the quarantine.

The Provincial quarantines are superintended by qualified veterinarians acting under the supervision of the Chief Inspector, who receives all instructions from the Minister of Agriculture, who is the responsible head. In the sparsely settled districts of Manitoba and the North-west Territories, the quarantine is carried out by veterinary officers of the North-west Mounted Police, a special officer being employed in the ranching district of Alberta, appointed by the Minister of Agriculture.

The Milk River quarantine, south of MacLeod, is conducted by a special detachment of police, as well as that at Coutts, south of Lethbridge.

The police patrol the boundary line, and no cattle can come into Canada there without quarantine.

The regulations of the cattle quarantines throughout Canada are enforced with a thoroughness which has not only established confidence in the minds of those who have looked into the matter, but with a result that leaves no room for doubt on the subject, viz., that notwithstanding the existence for years of contagious disease in the United States and Great Britain, with both of which countries we have had intimate commercial relations, none of these contagious diseases have been introduced to Canadian herds, and to-day we are in the proud position of being able to say without fear of contradiction, Canada from ocean to ocean is free from contagious disease in cattle, and more, such is the efficiency of the quarantine system that it will be impossible for such diseases now to be introduced.

The accusation that Canadian cattle have been scheduled because of an inadequate inspection and quarantine of United States cattle at Canadian frontier ports is sufficiently disproved by two well-known facts:—First, that no contagion to Canadian herds has ever resulted from this in transit trade in American cattle; and second-

ly, that the British Government has made its prohibition of importation of live cattle against all countries. If Canada was blameable for negligence in enforcing quarantine regulations, this country alone would have been scheduled.

## THE BRITISH BOARD OF AGRICULTURE TO THE CANADIAN MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE.

### FALSE CHARGES ABSOLUTELY REFUTED.

Indeed, the charge of carelessness and bad faith upon the part of the Canadian Government so freely made by certain parties has been for political effect only. No one can doubt this in the face of the evidence given below. The whole matter of the embargo is in the hands of the British Board of Agriculture, and when asked by the Canadian Minister of Agriculture, Hon. W. H. Montague, in an interview a few weeks ago, whether they had any fault to find with the manner in which the Canadian Government had carried out their part of the arrangement, the following statements were made in answer in a letter dated April 1st, 1896, signed by Arthur W. Anstruthers, Secretary, at the instance and dictation of the Right Honorable Walter Long, President of the Board of Agriculture:—

"(1) With reference to the enquiries which were made by you in the course of your interview with Mr. Long on the subject of the importation of Canadian cattle into the United Kingdom. Mr. Long desires me to say that the Board have no reason to believe that the arrangements under which cattle from the United States have been allowed to pass through Canada from the west to east in transit from one United States' port to another after inspection and subject to conditions for the purpose of securing the strict isolation of the animals has failed to accomplish the purpose for which it was devised.

"(2) So far as the Board are in a position to judge, the special provision for the transit of the animals in bond, which was inserted in the order of the 23rd of April, 1880, with the full concurrence of the Privy Council, has worked satisfactorily, and the Board are not aware that any reasonable cause for complaint has ever existed with respect to it."

In the face of this testimony of Mr. Long, it need not be remarked how flatly these charges fall to the ground.



