

dreary story," it says, "casts a sad reflection on Free Trade Britain, and we begin to understand the steady flow of population to Canada and other Protectionist countries." The Guide believes that the ills of the British Isles go deeper than tariffs and are rooted in the land question. It is not because Canada is Protectionist that there is a steady influx from Britain, but because ours is a new and expanding country, with so much development work to be done, new areas to be occupied and new communities to be built up. Labor is in demand and wages are comparatively high in new countries. Are the workers of Britain not better off than those in Protectionist countries of Europe? If it is Free Trade they want to escape, why are the Englishmen, Scotchmen and Irishmen not pouring into Germany and France? And if it is Free Trade that is driving them across the Atlantic, what is driving Germans, Italians, Russians and every race of Continental Europe into America? There is a screw loose somewhere in the News' logic. As for Britain, Free Trade continues to prove wonderfully satisfactory. Premier Asquith is on record as saying that the nation's adherence to Free Trade is due not to theories or shibboleths, but to the needs of British commerce, manufacturing and shipping as seen by practical men. The last six months' trade figures have smashed more records. Indeed this has become so habitual of late years that little interest is created. In the six months ending June, 1913, the imports of the United Kingdom were £378,760,000, as compared with £353,899,773 in the corresponding period of 1912, and £334,122,976 in the corresponding period of 1911. The exports were £257,000,000, as compared with £223,668,297 in the corresponding period of 1911. Between 1903 and 1912 the imports increased from £542,600,000 to £744,896,000, and the exports from £360,373,000 to £599,271,000.

How do other countries compare with this showing, in particular those Protectionist countries to which the News is everlastingly pointing for inspiration and example? Great Britain increased both her imports and exports three times as much as her nearest competitor during the four months of 1913 for which comparative figures are available. The increases in imports amounted to: In Great Britain, \$53,000,000; in Germany, \$17,900,000; in the United States, \$17,000,000; in France, \$14,500,000. In exports the increases were: Great Britain, \$91,300,000; France, \$29,000,000; Germany, \$26,800,000; United States, \$19,400,000. Yet the Toronto News had the hardihood to uphold the Canadian Manufacturers' Association's opposition to increasing the British preference by saying, "We cannot afford to assist the mother country to maintain the ruinous policy of Free Trade while other nations have high tariffs." That "ruinous" is a fine touch, worthy of Punch. England sticks to Free Trade, not because Cobden's theories sound well, but because Free Trade pays.

DIRECT LEGISLATION IN PRACTICE

In the discussion of any proposed reform which has not been given the test of experience, its advocates and its opponents are alike prone to exercise their imaginations in picturing the effects and results which are to be expected to follow upon its adoption. The question of Direct Legislation, which is very much to the front just now because of the popular vote will be taken in Saskatchewan on November 27, to decide whether or not the principle shall be adopted, provides a case in point. There are those who declare that Direct Legislation "won't work." They say that if the people have power to initiate legislation by petition to the legislature, all kinds of cranks will be bringing forward all kinds of foolish and impractical schemes and getting them adopted. It is said that legislation to be sound must be drawn up by experts such as are found in the legislatures, and that the people are too ignorant to decide what measures are good for them. Fortunately,

however, while there is no experience in Western Canada to indicate what results might be expected from Direct Legislation, we have several years' experience in the neighboring state of Oregon to aid us and to take the place of unrestrained imagination. On page 7 will be found an article entitled, "What is Direct Legislation?" written by W. G. Eggleston, of Portland, Ore. Mr. Eggleston, in that article, tells how Direct Legislation has worked and what it has accomplished in Oregon, where he has lived for several years and where he is well known as an advocate of progress and democracy. Mr. Eggleston shows that Direct Legislation has been used by the people of Oregon, not to promote the impractical schemes of cranks and faddists, but to secure good legislation which the people have demanded but which the legislature would not enact on its own initiative, and also to prevent the passage of legislation which would have been detrimental to the people's interests. With the aid of Direct Legislation, the people of Oregon have broken the power of the corrupt political machine, which formerly dominated state politics, they have given their cities and towns "Home Rule," they have adopted Woman Suffrage, they have passed an employers' liability act, they have provided for the dismissal of incompetent or dishonest public officials, and they have passed a number of other beneficial measures. We commend Mr. Eggleston's article to the careful study of our readers, and especially those residing in the province of Saskatchewan who will be called upon to pronounce upon the question at the polls on November 27.

THE TELEGRAM FOR FREE TRADE

Congratulations are due to the Winnipeg Telegram on a recent editorial under the heading "The Municipal Bonus Unsound." The Guide, on more than one occasion has pointed out the folly of cities which tax themselves to support manufacturers, and we are glad to find that for once The Telegram agrees with us. We hope that the editor of The Telegram will continue to use his reasoning faculties and apply his logic a little further. If he does we shall soon be reading Free Trade articles in our contemporary, instead of apologies for Protection. The Telegram says:

"Let us suppose, in a certain city, one man is engaged in making shoes, and another in making hats. Mr. Shoe has free water, free light, free power and no taxes. Mr. Hat has none of these favors. It is mathematically certain then, that the hat industry pays the tax bill of the shoe industry, and is weakened to precisely the same extent as the shoe industry is strengthened. The value of a steadfast gaze upon first principles is sometimes astonishing."

This is a sound argument—so sound, in fact, that we will adopt it without any change in reasoning and only a slight change in wording. Compare this with the above:

Let us suppose in a certain country, one man is engaged in making shoes and another in growing wheat for export. Mr. Shoe has the protection of a tariff which enables him to import his raw materials free of duty and to raise the price of his finished product by 35 per cent. Mr. Wheat must pay duty on all his raw materials, but the tariff does not raise the price of his product by one cent. It is mathematically certain, then, that the wheat industry pays tribute to the shoe industry and is weakened precisely to the same extent as the shoe industry is strengthened. The value of a steadfast gaze upon first principles is sometimes astonishing."

The Telegram further says:

"Far be it from The Telegram to decry public spirit, or to dampen the splendid optimism of the growing cities of the West. All that is meant is that the use of public money to put up glass houses, in order that we may establish the banana industry in our midst, is not practical municipal economics."

To which we would add:

Far be it from The Guide to decry public spirit or to dampen the splendid optimism of Canada. All that is meant is that the taxation of the people to raise the cost of living, to establish trusts and combines and to enable

the payment of dividends on watered stock is not practical national finance.

The Telegram frequently gets its economics badly twisted, nevertheless it often gets a glimmering of the truth, when it lays its partizan spectacles aside for awhile.

WEST DEMANDS PUBLIC DOMAIN

The promise made by Mr. Borden, prior to the last general election, that one of the first acts of his party on being placed in power would be to hand over to the Western Provinces the control of their natural resources, is causing the Premier considerable embarrassment. The press of the party opposed to the government of course takes care that Mr. Borden's promise is not forgotten, while the government newspapers frequently assure the public that the transfer will be made all in good time, and that there is no need of impatience. The "unkindest cut of all," however, occurred recently. When the Premiers of the three Western Provinces, Sir R. P. Roblin, Hon. Walter Scott, and Hon. A. L. Sifton, waited upon Mr. Borden, reminded him of his promise, and asked him to carry it out without further delay. What reply Mr. Borden gave has not been made public, but the action of the Provincial Premiers, representing both political parties, has brought the question to a stage where Premier Borden will be compelled to state his position publicly and definitely. There are many reasons why the public domain of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta should be handed over to the provinces. The fact that Mr. Borden, in his appeal to the people of the West for support, made a solemn promise that this should be done, is one very good reason. Another is that it would place the Prairie Provinces on an equality with other portions of the Dominion. The other provinces control their own public domain. In the Prairie Provinces all water-powers, timber, minerals, fish, and crown lands (except swamp lands in Manitoba) are the property of the whole Dominion, and are controlled and administered from Ottawa. Timber dues, mining royalties, fishing licence fees, and money received from the sale of lands go from the three Prairie Provinces to Ottawa, and belong as much to Ontario and Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island as they do to Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. If another Cobalt or a new Klondyke is discovered in Northern Manitoba, the mining royalties will go to the Dominion, and the mines will be subject to Dominion regulations, but the province will be called upon to build roads, preserve the public health and maintain law and order. This is not justice, and Premier Borden will find that it is not even good politics to make promises to the West and then neglect to carry them out.

The long tomato season and an abundant crop has caused the canneries to lower their prices 17½ cents per dozen cans. Will the consumers benefit? Not much. Reduced prices are seldom passed along to the consumers—nothing but increases. Under a proper system of co-operation consumers would profit by every reduction.

As the Grain Growers have always been opposed to monopoly, they have consistently stood against the monopoly of the franchise. In other words the organized farmers are strongly in favor of Woman Suffrage.

Sir Melvin Jones predicts that co-operation in agricultural credit and in purchasing will prove disastrous. Yes—to the Triple Alliance.

Fourteen million dollars from the public treasury in one year for military purposes. Ten million dollars in ten years for agriculture. Thus is agriculture encouraged.

Direct and B
chine
but a
may t
side u
public
the pe
in the
The
Refere
represe
but an
sentati
as the
it indic
mined
ment.
by whic
selves c
if their
men ch
It is i
Legislat
nor is it
elective
fere wit
tional fur
nor does
by the
legislation
election
does not
Anyone v
legislative
perts are

Oregon

Previous
one of the
the Unite
was largel
political
public ser
holders of
dom did tl
penetrate
lation. T
were ignor
that condit
by Direct
true that t
been made
and it prob
representat
are elected
sentation; l
has given tl
powerful v
ment of the
has enable
wise and vi
to enact ne
legislature
Yet in no re
lature been
charge of its
cant that ur
of Direct
effects in O
people nor
perts" in
tionary new
formerly h
power beca
the politica
poration lav
able to dir
These forces
they could
unpopular, t
effective; an
to do all in t
and to decei
have, as a ri
that the pec
ignorant and
zen" takes a
public busine
What have
to show that
and be trust
gislative aff
neglects its
needs of the
which the pe
machine rule