

is in favor of the "other fellow" paying that revenue as the above table shows that he wants the government to refund his company any tariff that they had to pay on the material they used to conduct their business. We would like Senator Jones to show why the farmer should be compelled by the government to pay a duty for revenue purposes on all the material the farmer uses in the production of his commodity, while he (Senator Jones) as a producer, insists on the government returning to him the duty paid on all the material he uses in the manufacture of the commodity he produces. As a revenue producer the tariff on farming implements is a complete failure. For the year 1909 the government collected on importations of farm machinery, \$350,061.93. Of that they returned to the four companies enumerated above, as drawbacks, \$207,458.99, leaving a net revenue of \$142,602.94 derived from duty on agricultural implements. In his letter, Senator Jones does not attempt to deny that the purchaser of farm implements pays the duty. He tacitly admits as a result of the duty manufacturers of farm implements secure a higher price than they otherwise would if left in competition with foreign manufacturers. The contention that the foreigner pays the duty seems to have been abandoned. The only argument now set forth is the revenue argument. According to the census of 1906, the manufacture of agricultural implements in Canada amount to \$12,835,748, of which there was exported, \$2,499,104, leaving for home consumption in Canada, \$10,336,644. We think that it is safe to state the increase in the manufacture of farm implements from 1905 to 1908 would at least be 25 per cent. and that the production of farm implements in Canada for home consumption that year would not be much less than \$12,000,000. If the manufacturers were able, due to the imposition of a 20 per cent. duty, to add 20 per cent. to the selling price of their products, (which is now conceded) Senator Jones can figure out the tribute that must have been levied on the Canadian Grain Growers in order to produce the insignificant net revenue of \$142,600.

In 1894 Sir Wilfrid Laurier made the following statement:—

"We stand for freedom. I denounce the policy of protection as bondage. Yes bondage. I refer to bondage in the same manner as American slavery was bondage. Not in the same degree perhaps, but in the same manner. In the same manner the people of Canada, the inhabitants of Winnipeg especially, are toiling for a machine which takes away, not every cent of profits, but a very large percentage, a very large portion of your earnings for which you sweat and toil."

When Sir Wilfrid made that statement the actual duty on farm implements was less than it is to-day. A farmer at that time, and somewhat later, paid \$16 duty on his binder. Today, for the same class of binder he pays \$18.81 and if he wants a binder of the same quality, to cut a wider swath, he pays \$19.25. The same proportion applies, as far as we can make out, to almost all other farm implements.

Mr. Evans, in his letter to Senator Jones states:—"Protection is legalized robbery." We cannot see where the difference comes in between the meaning of Sir Wilfrid's statement in 1894 and Mr. Evans' statement in 1910. It is simply expressing the same thing in different terms. The epithets which Senator Jones applied to Mr. Evans for using the above statement is equally applicable to Sir Wilfrid Laurier for using similar expressions. Senator Jones perhaps might explain why he would apply it to the one and not to the other. We want it to be understood that the epithet and its application is Senator Jones', not ours.

TERMINAL ELEVATOR REMEDY

An Ottawa dispatch, on another page, fixes the meeting of parliament for November 17. Certain legislation is also foreshadowed which is of paramount interest to Western Canada. It is stated that the remedy which Sir Wilfrid Laurier promised in the terminal elevator situation will be along the line of that now in

force in the State of Minnesota. This means that there will be no government ownership of the terminal elevators. This statement will not be favorably received in Western Canada and will not allay the present agitation nor the suspicions which the farmers have against the present system of operating the terminals. Everything conceivable has already been tried, but the men who operate the terminals can "drive a coach and four" through any law the Dominion parliament can enact short of government ownership and operation. There has never been a single argument advanced against government ownership and operation except that Sir Wilfrid himself stated that he was opposed to the principle. Sir Wilfrid does not know as much about the terminal elevators, and has not suffered as much through their operation as have the Western farmers. If he is not prepared to make the terminal elevators satisfactory by making them government owned and operated then he might as well not bother with the legislation suggested along the line of the Minnesota Act, because it will prove ineffective. The Minnesota Act merely provides more inspection, and more registration, and more red tape generally, with heavier penalties. Under government ownership and operation the cost will be reduced greatly and the farmers will again have confidence in the terminal elevators which nothing else can give them.

WHO PAYS THE TARIFF

The Toronto Sun has asked the Ontario farmers for their opinion on reciprocity with the United States. On Oct. 5th, letters from 19 farmers representative of different parts of the province were published in the Sun. The sentiment expressed was unanimously in favor of Free Trade with United States in natural products as well as manufactured. There is no longer any reason to state that Canadian farmers are protectionists. The articulate voice of farmers all over Canada is for tariff reduction and Free Trade just as soon as possible. As the Sun points out, the manufacturers have the benefit of the tariff in every way, because no matter how high the tariff is made they increase the price of their products accordingly. The farmer is in a different box. He simply digs into his pockets for the amount of the tariff and that is the end of it. The manufacturers do not pay the tariff nor any part of it, even on the dutiable goods which they use themselves, because it is all charged back to the consumer plus interest and profit. E. C. Drury, Master of the Dominion Grange, estimates that the present tariff costs the average Canadian farmer \$200 per year either directly or indirectly. This is a moderate estimate and figuring the average family at five, it shows the cost of the tariff to be \$40 per head each year. The customs tariff revenue for 1909 was \$48,000,000 or about \$7.00 per head for the people of Canada. If the tariff cost the farmers and their families \$40 per head and costs all Canada only \$7.00 per head, it is not very hard to figure out who pays the biggest share of the Canadian tariff revenue. Those protectionists who say that direct taxation is the only alternative to tariff need not fear that the farmers will object to direct taxation because if there was direct taxation in Canada to-day and no tariff every farmer would be money in pocket.

HOW IT WORKS NOW

Thousands of farmers throughout Western Canada who have had stock killed by the railways and have presented claims to the railway companies for damages, will be able to appreciate the sentiment in the following extract from an American paper:—

Up in Minnesota Mr. Olsen had a cow killed by a railroad train. In due season the claims agent for the railroad called.

"We understand, of course, that the deceased was a very docile and valuable animal," said the claims agent in his most persuasive claims-agent-

manly manner, "and we sympathize with you and your family in your loss. But, Mr. Olsen, you must remember this: Your cow had no business being upon our tracks. Those tracks are our private property and when she invaded them she became a trespasser. Technically speaking, you, as her owner, became a trespasser also. But we have no desire to carry the issue into court and possibly give you trouble. Now then, what would you regard as a fair settlement between you and the railroad company?"

"Vall," said Mr. Olsen slowly, "Ay bane poor Swede farmer, but Ay shall give you two dollars."

This covers the situation so completely that it seems hardly necessary to add further comment. If the farmers of the West ever hope to make the railways give them a square deal in the settlement of claims for stock killed, there is only one way to do it. They must get together and insist upon an amendment to the Railway Act. Organization is the only remedy, individually the farmers are helpless.

WHO ARE THE PEOPLE?

In a cable dispatch from London, England, under date of October 10th, the following item appeared in the daily papers of Canada:—

Sir R. Perks, interviewed at Liverpool, said there was no disposition whatever in the direction of free trade except in a small section of the far West. There was a disposition for a lower tariff in favor of Great Britain, but this policy seems only to apply to manufactures which will not come in competition with Canadian manufactures. The manufacturers and bankers with whom Sir Robert Perks spoke in regard to the question of reciprocity with the United States regard this policy with very great concern, but Sir Robert doubts very much if it will form part of the commercial policy of the Dominion.

Sir Robert Perks is one of the greatest engineering contractors in the world and counts his wealth in hundreds of millions. He has been over to Canada to endeavor to arrange with the Dominion government to build the Georgian Bay Canal. While he was over here he secured the views in the above dispatch from interviews with "The People". Sir Robert and men of his millions when they come over to Canada to secure the views of "The People" usually begin by visiting the presidents of the railways; the presidents of the banks; the heads of the big manufacturing concerns and of the Dominion government. These are the people whom the English capitalist meets in the palatial club rooms of large Canadian cities. Thus the special privileged class of England meet the special privileged class of Canada, and then the English capitalist goes back home and tells his people that the people of Canada do not want Free Trade, excepting "a small section of the far West," and that he does not think that reciprocity with the United States will ever amount to anything. Who are The People? This is a good subject for the farmers to think over.

A dispatch from Ottawa to the Winnipeg Free Press, says there will be a general election following the next session of parliament. This is what we expected, although Sir Wilfrid Laurier, on his Western tour, said that an election would not be held until the constitutional time. The farmers of Western Canada should make up their minds right now and henceforth that not a single candidate for either party will be nominated unless he is absolutely pledged to the support of the farming interests, and then there will be some little assurance that the interests of the farmers of Western Canada will receive attention at Ottawa.

The article on "Dry Farming" by Hon. W. R. Motherwell, in this issue stamps him as a minister of agriculture who is familiar with the productive problems of his province. The conservation of moisture where the rainfall is not sufficient for the best wheat yield must ever be a vital problem. Every farmer who owns and tills land owes it to himself and his country to make that land produce its best. One problem is to produce the best and the next is to secure for the producer a fair return. Both demand every farmer's attention.