

either a Canadian or a British navy. The present situation savors very strongly of autocratic government, and even if there is a general election held on the naval question the situation will not be improved.

The Labor members of the British Parliament and the Socialist members of the German Parliament have united in a resolution expressing the utmost good feeling between the two nations and declared for an end of the naval preparations of both nations. The common people of both nations are opposed to war and they are the ones who will have to pay the price, both in money and blood.

The only just method to settle the naval question is by a referendum where every voter can declare which policy he favors or whether he is opposed to both. It is time the people of Canada had some control over the men they send to Parliament. This miserable game of uncontrolled "peanut party politics" is becoming far too expensive. There are tens of thousands of voters who want a referendum on the naval question but they have not a single representative in Parliament with the courage to voice their views.

NEWS EDITOR "HONORED"

John Stephen Willison, editor of the Toronto News, was one of those who received a New Years "honor" and is now entitled to have "Sir" prefixed to the name which his parents gave him. Sir Hugh Graham, proprietor of the Montreal Star, is the only other Canadian journalist who has been thus "honored." Hurrah for Sir John. He is a gallant knight. Perhaps he will now have the courage to reply to The Guide's challenge to debate the tariff. We do not know whether Mr. Borden or the Duke of Connaught is responsible for getting Mr. Willison his new "title." Apparently the road to titledom in journalism is to stand in with the Triple Alliance. At the present rate of progress these tin-pot titles in Canada will soon be such a joke that no self-respecting man will wear them. They may be all right in Great Britain, where the social fabric is founded on titles, but they have no place in a country like Canada. We extend our congratulations to Mr. Borden that neither he nor any of his cabinet have yet succumbed to the charm of titles. Mr. Borden has the control of title distribution in Canada, and if he does not think it worth while to take one for himself it seems a doubtful compliment to pass them along to others.

THE TAX ON CLOTHING

If there is one thing more than another that ought to be made as cheap as possible in this country of rigorous climate, it is warm woollen clothing. To those who are warmly clad and well fed the Canadian winter is a healthful, happy season. The air, purified by frost and sunshine is invigorating and delicious, and snow and ice are the friends of country dwellers, enabling them to do work and enjoy pleasures impossible during the summer months. But to face a Canadian winter poorly clad is to endure misery and to risk the loss of members and even of life itself. To prosperous city dwellers who wear furs and live and work in steam heated homes and offices, the cost of woollen clothing is not, perhaps, a very serious item, but to the outdoor worker, the teamster and laborer in the city, the lumber jack and the farmer in the country, the yearly expenditure for blankets, underwear, socks, mitts, shirts and other woollen garments, is a considerable item. Yet woollen and flannel goods are among the things which are especially dear in Canada compared with other countries. They are especially dear, moreover, not from any natural cause, but because of the especially high import duties. Their cost is artificially raised by the tariff. Ready-made clothing bears a duty of 35 per cent. under the general tariff, and 30 per cent. under the

British Preferential tariff; socks and stockings pay a duty of 35 per cent under the general tariff and 25 per cent under the British Preference, while the duty on underwear, gloves and mitts is 35 per cent under the general tariff and 22½ per cent. under the British Preference. Most of the raw materials which enter into the manufacture of these articles are admitted to Canada free of duty, and the remainder are subject to only a nominal tariff, so that the manufacturers of clothing are enabled to buy their wool and cotton at the minimum price and to sell the finished article with the maximum of profit. There seems to be no limit, however, to the greed of manufacturers who have become accustomed to exploiting the people under the protection of tariff walls, and an attempt is now being made by the manufacturers to have the duties raised still higher, as the following news dispatch, clipped from the daily press shows:

Ottawa, Dec. 11.—A number of woollen manufacturers from Quebec and Ontario have been in the capital for the past few days impressing upon the government the need of greater protection for the woollen, flannel and clothing manufacturers of Canada. They are also taking the precaution of entering an early protest against any proposal to increase the British preference, which in case of woollens gives them a protection of 30 per cent. which they claim to be insufficient.

If it is not profitable to manufacture woollen goods in Canada with a protective tariff of 25 and 35 per cent., it would be better to have no woollen industry in Canada at all. If our woollen manufacturers are not making any money, they will not lose anything by shutting down their mills, whereas everyone who wears woollen clothes, and that includes most of us, would benefit considerably by being able to buy that clothing at a reduction of 25 per cent. on present prices. The consumer surely has a right to be considered as well as the manufacturer.

WHY THIS DUTY?

Absurdities are as thick as blue-berries in the garden patch of Protection, but one of the most outlandish features in our Canadian tariff is the duty of \$500 or \$600 on every traction ditching machine brought into the country. In the older provinces the almost incessant rain last summer made thousands of farmers realize that tile drainage was one of their chief needs. Ditching by hand, as all who have tried it agree, is hard work and painfully slow. Without hired help it is out of the question, and even if a farmer is fortunate enough to get the required help the wage bill makes the undertaking an expensive one. The only solution in sight is the traction ditching machine, but as if with the intention of keeping out these outfits as undesirable, our Government imposes the almost prohibitive duty of \$500 or more on each machine. For whose benefit is this "adequate protection" of 20 per cent imposed? Not the Canadian manufacturers, for, as the London, Ont., Farmer's Advocate points out, none of this class of machine is made in Canada. Not only so, but the Canadian Manufacturers' association offers no objection to the removal of this duty, since it is unlikely that ditching machines will ever be made in this country on account of the limited number required. The Canadian Manufacturers' association has never been known to agree to tariff reduction if there was one chance in a thousand that they might lose any profit thereby. The approval of the manufacturers, accordingly, ought to be "proof as strong as Holy Writ." Why should our legislators not put traction ditchers on the free list? The only explanation that suggests itself why this anomaly is allowed to stand on our tariff schedule despite the protests of all affected, and despite the fact that all would gain and nobody lose by its removal, is the fear our protectionists in Parliament may have that

if this item of our protective tariff is removed simply because it outrages logic and common sense, there would soon be little if any tariff left.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR ADVERTISEMENTS

Several weeks ago we received an order to publish a half page of advertising for the Empire Oil company in our Christmas Number, December 4. The advertising would have been worth about \$50 to us, but we refused to publish it until we investigated it, as we doubted its reliability. We wrote to that company for references but received no reply. Since then we have been informed by the Winnipeg Post Office that the man who sent out these advertisements has been arrested in the United States and charged with using the mails to defraud. All the mail addressed to the company at Winnipeg has been seized by the postal authorities, so it is not likely that those who answered it will lose their money. We notice that several other Winnipeg papers published the advertisement, apparently without investigating it. We have also refused to publish an advertisement for a real estate concern promising huge profits to purchasers of land in Florida. We are not sure that the advertisement is unreliable, but will not take the risk of publishing it. We have refused a large number of advertisements for the same reason. We endeavor to see that every one of our advertisers is reliable. We cannot always guarantee it, but we believe it is our duty to protect our readers in every possible way, and we have prevented a considerable number of fakirs from imposing on the public through our columns. The fact that a man may get into a dispute with an advertiser does not stamp the advertiser as unreliable. We endeavor to find out both sides of the question in such a case and assist to an equitable solution. We have assisted in adjusting a great many such difficulties.

The expected has happened—the Dominion Cannery, Limited, known to the consuming public as the formidable Cannery's Combine, has declared a 6 per cent. dividend on its common stock. The dividend, although just announced, will be paid on the whole year just closed, and will continue at least at the same rate in 1913. What this common stock contains except water would not take long to tell. These dividends will be squeezed into the trust coffers between the nether millstone of low prices to the farmer selling his tomatoes, peas, corn and beans and the upper millstone of high prices to the whole consuming population of Canada the year round. "The only question considered" at the directors meeting, we read, "was that of dividends." One of these days the consumers will get tired of paying tribute to food trusts and protecting their despoilers behind tariff walls. Then there will be more than the "one question of dividends" for the trust magnates to bother their heads about.

If a farmer has an automobile it is considered wonderful, but grain exchange men and all sorts of speculators and manufacturers are expected to have automobiles, trips to Europe and more money than they can spend. Why is this so?

If a navy is necessary for Canada why is the aerial part overlooked. All the European powers are investing largely in airships and it is predicted that their use will soon render Dreadnoughts useless. Our warrior statesmen should rectify this error.

We find that through an error the issue of The Guide of January 31, 1912, is missing from our files. If any reader can send us this missing number it will be greatly appreciated.