

but these are of no avail if the benefit which they confer upon manufacturers and the people generally is offset by the high price of land. Another burden which the manufacturer has to carry, whether he is located in the East or the West, is the burden of taxation. Many of the raw materials used by manufacturers are allowed to enter Canada free of duty, and in this respect the manufacturer has an advantage over the farmer, but nevertheless he is compelled to pay out a great deal of money in duties upon the cement, lumber, steel, bricks and other materials which go into his building, upon the machinery which goes into his plant, and the coal which supplies the motive power. Then the employees of the Canadian manufacturer must live in homes, wear clothes and eat food whose cost is increased by the protective tariff, and necessarily they must be paid higher wages than they would require if the cost of living was lower. All this increases the cost of manufacturing in Canada and places the Canadian manufacturer at a disadvantage compared with his rivals in Great Britain, where Free Trade reduces the cost of production to a minimum. It is true that the Canadian manufacturer is enabled to charge a higher price for his product because of Protection, but the advantage which he secures by the protection of his own industry, is more than counterbalanced by the injury which he suffers from the high cost of production caused by the protection of other industries. It may be argued that the manufacturers who should know their own business best, do not agree with the above statement, but, as a matter of fact many manufacturers do, and The Guide has on several occasions published letters from Canadian manufacturers stating that they would welcome Free Trade. Moreover it may be pointed out that British manufacturers probably know their business and know world conditions just as well as Canadian manufacturers, and the great majority of British manufacturers are Free Traders, realizing that the worst thing that could happen to them would be the adoption of Protection by Great Britain and of Free Trade by Canada and the other overseas Dominions. If such a reversal of policy should occur the cost of production would be increased in Britain and decreased in the Dominions, and the export trade of Britain would receive a tremendous blow. The way to encourage Canadian industries, and particularly western industries, is to remove the tariff so that the cost of production may be reduced, to prevent the monopolization by private interests of water powers, coal mines, natural gas, oil and other sources of power, and to prevent land being held out of use by speculators. At first sight the elimination of the speculator seems to be the most difficult of these remedies, but if customs duties, and all taxes upon homes and industry, were removed, and the revenues raised by a tax on unimproved land values (the term land including all natural resources) the speculator would soon be taxed out of business and compelled either to use the land himself or sell it at a reasonable price to someone else.

IMPORTANT PRINCIPLE RECOGNIZED

Free Traders generally have maintained that industries which look to the State for aid in the shape of a protective tariff should give the public a full and complete statement of their financial condition. Industries that demand the right to levy a special tribute upon the public by means of the tariff should give some guarantee to the public that they are in need of such aid. If every manufacturing concern that demands tariff protection were forced to reveal its financial standing to the public there would be very much less demand for tariff protection. The protectionists, however, and the governments which they control, have always denied this information to the public,

and have insisted that their mere statement that they need protection is sufficient justification for the imposition of the protective tariff which they demand. The situation that has arisen in connection with the C.N.R., however, and the consequent arousal of public opinion has forced not only the Government but also the C.N.R. promoters to recognize the principle that the public are entitled to a knowledge of the financial position of the C.N.R. before extending further aid to that corporation. The C.N.R. promoters maintain that it is impossible for them to complete their railway without public aid, and therefore they are in the position of national mendicants. A manufacturing industry that claims public support for the same reason is in exactly the same position, and should be treated in the same manner. The Government and the C.N.R. promoters have realized clearly that the public are entitled to information before granting public aid, and the same principle should be recognized in connection with the protected manufacturers. It matters not whether a tax payer believes in protection or believes in Free Trade, he should make it his business to know whether the industry for which he is being taxed really needs the money or whether it is being used merely to enrich a handful of wealthy gentlemen who believe in living on the public.

AN EXAMPLE FOR FARMERS

We notice that both the Liberal and Conservative associations in Brantford have passed resolutions opposing reduction in the duties on farm implements, and have forwarded same to Ottawa. Could there be a better proof that Protection has no politics? When any of their privileges are in danger the Protectionists lay aside their Grit and Tory garb and stand shoulder to shoulder to protect their pocket book. That is the reason why Protection has ruled Canada for the past thirty years. If the farmers would also lay aside their Grit and Tory nonsense and stand together for the protection of themselves and their families the plundering of the rural population would cease. The trouble is that too many farmers are willing and glad to be plucked so long as it is done by their own party. Let the farmers follow the example of the Brantford Protectionists if they hope to secure those reforms they demand.

OCEAN FREIGHTS LOWER

We recently published the average freight rates on wheat per bushel from New York to Liverpool as taken from the report of the Grain Markets Commission of Saskatchewan. The figures were supplied to the Saskatchewan Commission by Messrs. Munn and Jenkins, leading freight brokers of New York. Thru the courtesy of the same firm we have secured these figures up to date, and publish them herewith:

	Liverpool	London	Hull	Antwerp	Hamburg
1913	cents	cents	cents	cents	cents
Jan.	7-9	8-10	10-11	9-10	11-78-12 14
Feb.	6-7	7-8	8-9	8-9	10-11 42
Mar.	6-7	7-8	8-9	7-9	8-57-9 28
April	6-7	6-6 3/4	7-8	8-9	8-57-9 28
May	7-8	6-7	7-8	8-9	8-92-9 28
June	4-6	4-6	5-7	5-7	5-71-8 37
July	5	5	5-7	6-9	6-07-7 14
Aug.	5	5-5 1/2	5-6	6-10	5-35-7 14
Sep.	4-6	5-5 1/2	5-6	4-5 1/2	4-28-5 35
Oct.	4-5	5-5 1/2	6-7	6-6 1/2	5-71
Nov.	4-4 1/2	4-5	5-6	5-5 1/2	3-92-5 71
Dec.	4	4 1/2	5 1/2	5	4-28-4 64
1914					
Jan.	4-20 1/2	4-77	6-30-5 1/2	4-77-4 20	4-64-5
Feb.	3-15-4 20	4-20	5-4-20 1/2	4-20	4-30
Mar.	3-15	4-20-3 15	5-4-20 1/2	4-20-3 67	3-93
April	4 1/2	3-15	4-20-3 15	3-15	3-93

These figures indicate that freight rates are coming down and approaching the basis of 1910 and 1911, which averaged 3 and 4 cents per bushel respectively for the calendar years. Those were the freight charges before the combine was organized and became effective. Then came the bonanza years of the combine, but it will be seen from the above figure that 1914 freight rates are

very much lower, and if these low rates continue it will mean a big saving to the farmers of Western Canada.

PATRONIZING THE WEST

A few weeks ago we dealt at length with the lamentable failure of The Family Herald and Weekly Star, of Montreal, to fulfill the solemn and definite promises which it made to the farmers of Canada in order to induce them to vote against reciprocity. The Family Herald, it will be remembered, promised that if reciprocity was defeated it would press the policy of free agricultural implements week in and week out on the new government. It was also declared that if Mr. Borden betrayed the farmers he would "find an implacable foe in The Family Herald," and that a sum of \$10,000 would be given to start a campaign fund for a National Farmers' Party. The Family Herald, having accomplished its object of hoodwinking the farmers into defeating Reciprocity, completely turned its back on its promises, as we have shown. Now The Family Herald is adopting a patronizing tone towards the West and is suggesting that some sops should be given the farmers, and attempts made to cultivate protectionist sentiment by establishing manufactures in the West. In its issue of April 22, The Family Herald says:

"We cannot afford to leave the Westerner permanently under a sense of grievance. If he gets the idea that he is being exploited for the benefit of the plethoric East, a dangerous condition may arise in the Dominion which will not make for harmony or progress. We should imagine ourselves that his demand for cheaper agricultural implements might be more generously met. Then, surely government guidance and assistance could be directed toward leading the West into 'mixed farming,' which is the only natural condition for an agricultural country and the only one which promises permanent prosperity. Again, cannot the government exercise some benevolent paternalism with a view to establishing industries in the West? The German government would certainly take some such step. If the Western towns were garrisoned with industries, we should hear less about Protection being a selfish policy for the sole benefit of the East. It was the spread of American industrialism into the Southern States which modified the attitude of that section of the American Union toward Protection. The West is under the impression today that it wants less government interference. It wants fewer duties, for instance. The logical reply to this is not an offensive refusal to remove what they deem a burden; but an intelligent effort to carry to them more of the benefits of government, and so to make them see that the burdens bring blessings in their train."

If our readers will contrast this sickly stuff with the bold boasting of the same paper before the last election they will see how much The Family Herald is to be relied upon. That paper should certainly be asked for an explanation of its betrayal of its readers.

We are informed that there are several companies at the present time engaged in selling stock to farmers on the representation that they are building up an institution which will sell to farmers their necessities at a lower price than ordinarily. Some of these companies we are informed are claiming that their stock selling scheme has the approval of The Grain Growers' Guide, because the advertisement of their goods is published in The Guide. We wish to make it very clear that there is no company whose stock selling proposition has been approved by The Grain Growers' Guide and we are not prepared to say whether their scheme is a sound one or not. On general principles farmers should be very careful before purchasing stock in any company, as in a great many cases it is just so much money wasted. The only companies that are connected officially with the organized farmers and which have been endorsed by them are The Grain Growers' Grain Company, the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company and the Alberta Farmers' Co-operative Elevator Company.