of the House. He is connected with a company engaged in the construction of a paper mill and had asked for quotations on a large quantity of steel. All of the steel required had not been ordered when the new tariff became effective and the steel companies immediately increased their price on the extra steel required to the amount of the additional protection they had received from the Finance Minister. The extra cost of the steel required in the construction of the factory can only be provided for by an addition to the cost of the paper manufactured in the mill, and the additional cost of the paper will be paid for by the consumer. If the paper is used for publishing purposes, either the subscription price of the paper must be increased or the price charged for advertisements must be increased. If the subscription price is increased the consumer pays the bill directly. If the advertising charges are increased the bill goes back to the advertiser and is added on to the price which he charges for his product to the consumer. If the paper in question is used for printing catalogs for manufacturing firms the additional cost is charged up in the cost of the farm implements, or whatever it is that is being advertised. Thus it is that in the last analysis the farmer or the city consumer pays for the protection which the Finance Minister hands out to the privileged classes. A protective tariff is always, and will always be nothing more nor less than a robbery of the common people for the benefit of a privileged few. The new steel graft is merely typical of the other special grafts enjoyed by the protected interests and they always take all they can get.

BUDGET COMPARISONS

When David Lloyd George, Chancellor of the Exchequer, introduced his annual budget in the British House of Commons last week he announced that on the coming year's business the country had to meet an estimated deficit of $26,650,000 out of a total revenue of over $1,000,000,000. To meet this and other increased expenditures he has provided for new taxes which it is estimated will amount to nearly $100,000,000 and a part of this money will be used for insurance and maternity benefits and to improve sanitary conditions in the poorer districts. In searching for this new revenue the British Chancellor decided that the wealthy and privileged classes of Great Britain who have been permitted by law for centuries to plunder the poorer people should contribute the additional revenue necessary. A great deal of the new revenue will be secured by a revision of the income tax by which the millionaires and land owners with immense incomes will pay a larger proportion of them than ever before into the public treasury. It is coming to be realized in Great Britain that the policy of taxing the poor for the benefit of the rich is a disastrous one and that the result has been to develop a large and increasing number of paupers who are not only a burden upon the public treasury but a menace to society. Under the new regime an attempt is being made to withdraw the privileges from the rich and restore to the poor some of the opportunities which have been filched from them in ages past. A comparison of the British fiscal system with the Canadian shows Canada in a most unenviable light. The fiscal policy of our governments has been to bestow special privileges upon the rich and to plunder the common people for the benefit of the privileged classes. Mr. White, finance minister, last month, in his budget address, adhered to the time honored Canadian policy of handing out privileges to those who are already wealthy and permitting them to plunder those who have already been plundered. The Canadian fiscal policy is bound to develop the same conditions as exist in Great Britain if continued. We have a small but very rich privileged class in Canada and year by year they are securing more and more privileges from our governments, until they have practically developed into a ruling class. It is patent to everyone that the only means by which this ruling class can become very wealthy is by exacting from the masses a large proportion of the honest product of their toil. The fiscal system which prevails in Canada is that which has for many years been discarded by Great Britain. But in Canada our government still remains very largely as the legislative branch of the organization of Special Privilege.

TRUTH TO THE FRONT

To secure the best arguments in favor of free trade it is only necessary to read Protectionist literature. Here is an editorial that appeared, not in a Free Trade journal but in the March number of Industrial Canada, the official organ of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association:—

> "Right among the members of the C.M.A. itself, are men who may be seen driving an imported car to a meeting where the sale of 'Made in Canada' goods is to be boosted. 'Consistency, thou art a jewel!' Everybody who is producing or manufacturing in this country is willing to be helped by the 'Made-in-Canada' slogan so far as selling his own goods is concerned, but how few, oh, how very few, allow it to influence them in their every-day buying! Trade statistics show that we sleep in imported beds, we shave and wash ourselves with imported soaps (and never happy till we get them), dress ourselves in Scotch woolens and United States boots, breakfast off cereals prepared in Michigan and bacon cured in Chicago, drive to the office in a foreign made car, write our letters with a United States typewriter on English bond, go to a baseball match where the home team are practically all Yankees, tickle our dinner appetite with Worcester sauce, French peas, Spanish wine and Swiss cheese, and after lighting a Havana cigar, settle down to a quiet evening's reading from a New York magazine!"

This is the best exposure of the selfish spirit of Protection that could be found. The Protectionist believes in a protective tariff for only one purpose, namely, to put money into his own pocket. For the "other fellow," either in his own calling or another, he cares not a jot. The only reason the members of the C.M.A. stand for the principle is because each knows that if he doesn't help his fellow manufacturer to maintain his right to levy toll upon the public he will lose his own special privilege. But the "Made-in-Canada" principle is a different matter. The C.M.A. advocates buying "Made-in-Canada" goods, but human nature cannot be changed so easily. The protected manufacturer, like the Free Trade farmer, wants to buy where he can buy cheapest and sell where he can get the most, and he does so always. But he absolutely refuses to allow the farmer to do likewise. The manufacturer is an absolute Free Trader—in everything except the particular line of goods he is producing—and he would like a law passed compelling the public to buy his goods and no other. We would suggest that the Protectionist press bureau, that is spending so much money publishing articles in the rural press, publish the above article from Industrial Canada, and show the public that in moments of contemplation the truth will occasionally come to the front.

AN HISTORIC STRUGGLE

For several weeks before the C.N.R. deal was announced inspired press despatches told the people of Canada of a mighty struggle in progress between Mackenzie and Mann on the one side and the cabinet ministers on the other. Metaphorically speaking we could see clouds of dust rising above Parliament Hill and the air was heavy with the sounds of the titanic encounter, which shook the earth and made the towers tremble. With pleasure we pictured Premier Borden and his powerful supporters, Rogers, White and Meighen, with coats off, sleeves rolled up and perspiration pouring down their faces as they nobly battled to protect the people's money from the grasping hands of the two railway knights and their retainers. Day after day and far into the night the battle was waged and reports from the scene of battle in the inspired press told us of the courage of the people's champions and of the dogged persistence of the knightly cash hunters. During the later stages of the struggle we were given delightful mental pictures of the approaching triumph of the people. Finally we saw Mackenzie and Mann deserted by their retainers and themselves lying battered and bruised at the feet of their victors, who, tho weary "from the dreadful close" yet were able to summon a smile in response to the plaudits of the delighted populace. And next we saw dire punishment meted out to the vanquished knights. On pain of further damage to their anatomy they were compelled to dip their arms into the public credit up to the shoulders and lift therefrom $45,000,000 in hard cash and carry it away and spend it. Deep must have been the flush of shame on the brows of the conquered knights as they were subjected to this ignominious treatment. Loth will they be to encounter again the valiant champions of the people. Such punishment is severe and as "the quality of mercy is not strained" let us hope it will be reserved for extreme cases. And now there remains only to crown the victors with a laurel wreath and another chapter in our national history is closed.

The formal application of Mackenzie and Mann for a bond guarantee was made to the Government on March 5, 1914, and is addressed to Premier Borden as follows:

> "It is essential that the company should receive further government aid. The amount required is forty-two million dollars. Recognizing the difficulty in the way of a cash loan, I beg to apply for a guarantee of securities to the extent of forty-five million dollars par value. The discount on the disposal of these securities would probably reduce the proceeds below the forty-two million. I have the honor to be, your obedient servant.
>
> (Signed) "WM. MACKENZIE,
> "President."

Sir William's letter is brief and right to the point and it has been remarkably successful in producing the goods. We merely publish this letter to show our readers in what manner they should make their applications when they wish to dip into the public treasury. Any farmer who is short of money should prepare a letter along the same lines and address it to Premier Borden and see if he will get like results.

A concern using the name "Grain Growers' Lumber Company," of Vancouver, is advertising itself to local Grain Growers' associations thruout the three provinces. We have pointed out before that this company has no connection with the Grain Growers' Grain Company, and, as far as we have been able to ascertain, is not in any way entitled to use the term "Grain Growers" in its name. As far as we know it is merely a company that has made use of the term "Grain Growers" in its name for the purpose of attracting the business of the organized farmers. While it is very desirable to have companies selling to farmers their necessities at the lowest possible cost, there is no excuse for any concern deliberately attempting to capitalize the name "Grain Growers," which has become a valuable commercial asset, due to the great organization which the farmers have built up at much sacrifice and expense to themselves.