

any advantage to increase their own gains on account of this tariff but that it goes into the pockets of the working man. I am not going to take up space to argue this point but I think Mr. Casey might find some of his figuring up a little faulty if he had time to consider it. He endeavors to strengthen his arguments by stating that "Protection is good when it protects the working man's wages but beyond this it should not go." I thoroughly agree that any tariff regulations that protect the working man's wages are justifiable, but how does this matter work out? It is evident from Mr. Casey's argument that cotton manufacturing in Canada could not be carried on without this 25 per cent. protection, therefore in order to encourage home industry and to enable a certain number of laborers to get work in that particular kind of employment he would recommend that all the people of Canada should pay 25 per cent. extra on all cotton goods they buy. This would be 75 per cent. for cotton and 25 per cent. for loyalty. Good in its way perhaps, but wherein is the reason of it? We import more cotton goods than we manufacture in Canada and it is plain that the duty on this does not go into the working man's pocket but into the government treasury; but notice this, cotton is an article used mainly by the poorer classes, who by this method are forced to pay the wages of the cotton factory employees, and secondly, to make up revenue, thus piling all the burden on the poorer people or working men. Is it not a recognized fact that capital should be invested in such enterprises only as are naturally advantageous? Mr. Casey says that many farmers make 50 per cent. on capital invested, so would it not be wise to re-invest the capital now invested in cotton mills in Canada in agriculture or in developing some of Canada's natural resources that are lying idle for want of capital to develop them and which would return larger and more legitimate profits than many of the industries which now claim so much attention. This would be adding true wealth to the nation. It would furnish more work and better wages for the workman, and last but not least let us buy our cotton goods in an open market where it can be produced most cheaply and we be not forced to pay this unjust duty of 25 per cent. Suppose someone should take a notion to try growing oranges in Manitoba and should ask for a protection of fifty cents an orange he would thereby be enabled to build glass houses and compete with foreign dealers. This would be another home industry. Similarly with tea and other articles we use, but the idea is absurd. We save money by buying these articles in countries which are naturally suited to their production, now the same argument applies to all industries. This old earth was so made that certain parts are adapted to certain kinds of pursuits whether it be manufacturing or otherwise, and for man to endeavor to re-arrange old mother earth's natural make-up by the introduction of modern ideas of improvement, and as it were, try growing oranges in Manitoba, is evidently a battle against nature and must consequently end in failure, which failure is shown in the fact that industries so located as not to be naturally advantageous cannot live without protection, and as shown the working man pays the protection. Now, I fail to see how protection protects the man who pays it. Mr. Casey says that "higher wages and a higher standard of living than prevails in European countries depends on our protecting our manufacturers accordingly." To my mind enhanced prices in any direction are delusive. A man gets \$1 a day and pays a certain price for his necessities. He comes out even at the end of the year. The next year he gets \$2 a day but has to pay double the price for his goods. Well, at the end of the second year he is in the same place he was at the end of the first year, so big wages with proportionately costly living was no gain to him. Supposing we apply the same reasoning to other pursuits, say farming, if everything is high priced as at present, how does it work out? In the first place the farmer has an extra amount of responsibility which in itself is a burden, then he has to over crop his land and resort to every possible means of getting money out of his possessions in order to meet the flood of expenses. Then should the country get a set back as was the case in parts of the West this year through crop failures, how much more would the farmer feel it than he would have felt it had he been travelling the humble but surer road to success. The lower and prevailing prices all round so long as balanced, the more stable will

200 PRIZES GIVEN AWAY. SEE CATALOG, Page 5

Our Stocks Are Limited

Wm. 4 out of 5 Prizes at Guelph Fair

Has Given Best Results in 3 Years Test



**O. A. C. No. 21
SIX ROWED BARLEY**

SUPERIOR ALL OTHER TYPES

The Satisfying success that have followed the introduction of O.A.C. No. 21 Barley throughout the Canadian West have amply demonstrated its exceptional merits.

In comparative tests covering a period of three years it has excelled all other types in yield, freedom from rust, and in length and strength of straw.

Keeps in appearance and size resemble Mammoth.

1 bushel or under 5 bushels	\$2.50	\$2.45
5 " " " " " "	2.25	2.40
10 " " " " " "	2.00	2.40

A POSTCARD WILL BRING OUR CATALOG

McKENZIE'S EARLY RIPENING GARDEN SEEDS

POSTPAID PRICES	Per lb.	Per 100.	
BEET	Early Blood Turnip	25	2.50
BEAN	Golden Wonder	25	2.50
CARROT	White Flame	25	2.50
CABBAGE	Winnipeg	25	2.50
CARROT	Orange	25	2.50
CORN	Superior	25	2.50
CUCUMBER	Long Green	25	2.50
LETTUCE	Grand Rapids	25	2.50
ONION	Yellow Globe	25	2.50
PEA	Stratagem	25	2.50
RADISH	French Breakfast	25	2.50

OUR 1911 CATALOG THE HARBINGER SET

A. E. MCKENZIE CO. LTD.
BRANDON, MAN. CALGARY, ALTA.

WESTERN CANADA'S GREATEST SEED HOUSE

business be and the easier it will be for the man who may have small means to get a start.

ANDREW RUSSELL,

Rocky Coulee, Alta.

INDEPENDENT VIEWS

Editor Guide.—After five years residence in Canada and sick of the party organs and their misrepresentation of facts I decided to subscribe to your paper, believing it to be a perfectly independent paper. Judge my surprise on opening the first copy to find an almost fulsome panegyric on that remarkable collection of political atoms that march under a banner bearing the legend "Liberal" in the old country. Taking into consideration the very large number of old countrymen who take your paper and are working for the ends The Guide professes to have in view, do you think your attitude independent of bias to print such a one-sided article regarding a party with which many of your readers must disagree. In all justice to your independent stand you might show some of the other side of the question. For instance, as regards free trade of the liberal party in England you or your correspondent should point out that it is not the free trade that is understood and advocated for by the Western farmer and his organization; it is merely a system of free imports—a very different thing. Under such a system in Canada the farmers in the West might—or might not—get his implements cheaper, that would depend on the combines, but he would certainly not have any more advantage in the markets of the United States than he has today. How a system of free trade imports would effect our pure-bred stock breeders is hard to say. Your correspondent infers that if the lords had not thrown out the plural voting bill that the Asquith government would have had a much larger majority. Now that is a subject that has two sides also. The liberals complain about one man having more but surely it is possible that some of the plural voters are liberals. However, it is, I think, generally conceded that the principle is not good and on this point the Unionists were willing to meet the Asquith government, but they said if you give one man a vote, we must insist that one vote shall have one value. Of course that was something that the so-called liberals could not entertain at all, for why? Because where in some parts of Ireland and Wales and Scotland 5,000 or less voters return a member for the government. Some of the Unionist members of Southern England represent as many as 50,000 voters, so you see there is something to be said for the other side. From the foregoing you may come to the conclusion that I am a high-bound politician from the old country. You will be wrong—the truth is I left England at the age of 14 in the year 1892, and have not lived there since. I am only writing this because I hate a one-sided argument. There are always two sides to a question. Your correspondent says that our liberal

party out here is not like the one in England. He is quite right. It is bad enough, I own, but it has not yet descended to the depths of the one in England. In conclusion I may say that I was very pleased to note that none of the big manufacturing concerns use your paper as an advertising medium; "A straw will show, etc." As I do not aim at cheap notoriety in the district I will sign myself, I say, Alta.

FAIRPLAY.

[Note.—We have no objections to this gentleman having his own opinions. If he considers his opinions of sufficient importance he should allow his name to be published. Publicity is the greatest factor in remedying present evils.—Ed.]

SOME HARD FACTS

Editor Guide.—I do not suppose there can be any reader of your paper who has now any doubts regarding the tariff or reciprocity with the States. However, if there is, allow me to submit the following few words. Having lived the greater part of my life in the States I know the arguments of the politicians working for the special interests was, "Vote for protection and we will give you protection on your products (talking to the farmer), 25 cents on wheat and potatoes, etc." Now it is a well-known fact that that in all these products there was a surplus for export and no one ever dreamt of importing, and so what good was protection to the farmers? The last few years there has been a change, however, and this protection is a benefit to the American farmers. But now watch and see how long they will enjoy it? No doubt, most of your readers saw an article in the Canadian press taken from the Northwestern Miller, the official organ of the Minneapolis Millers' Association. It says that the people are crying for cheaper bread and this tariff must be taken off, etc. The fact is the big mills in Minneapolis want our wheat and the transportation companies over there want to haul it, and so you see they soon get a new argument to hand to the farmers. Some time in October I was over in Grafton, N. D. Wheat in the elevators

brought in to Morris, Man., on that day was 80 cents for No. 1 Northern, and Ogilvie's Royal Household Flour sold in the stores at \$3.15 per sack. No. 1 Northern at Grafton, N. D. sold at \$1.05. Washburn, Crosby & Company's "Gold Medal" flour shipped from Minneapolis, 315 miles, was sold in the stores in Grafton for \$2.50 per sack. Now the wheat that brought \$1.05 at Grafton, I venture to say would not have brought over 75 cents in Morris on account of the quality, and the flour was 35 cents per sack cheaper. Grafton is only three hours' run from Morris in the same kind of country. In the Red River Valley, south of the line, a half section of land is worth around \$21,000, here it would be hard to sell a half section of land for a half that price, and what I have outlined above explained the reason why. I import a gasoline engine, 4 h.p., which I sell here for \$150. I have lists from the Canadian manufacturers. Their list prices on the same rated engine is \$250. After paying duty and freight about one-third the price of the engine. I make slightly more on an imported one at \$150 than I would at \$250 on the other. For one engine and \$19 at the Canadian factory I can buy three engines at the same rated power at the American factory. I get certified invoices showing both home and export prices which shows that I buy eight and one-third cents cheaper than an American agent which shows that these people do sell cheaper abroad than at home, even if the Hon. Melvin-Jones does not do that kind of business. Now, Mr. Editor, I wish to say to your readers that the facts I have here set forth are things I learned from my own personal knowledge and not something that somebody told me. We have a few party men in our association at Morris, but I think we are getting better and the time will surely come when the waving of the flag will have little effect during election time. We are getting more and more like the fellow from Missouri, you'll have to show us. Morris, Man.

O. H. GILMAN.

[Note.—The writer's comparison, while interesting, is scarcely conclusive, as the relative quality of gasoline engines cannot always be measured by the horse power claimed by the manufacturers.—Ed.]

METAL ROOFINGS

"GALT" STEEL SHINGLES

The Perfect Metal Roofing—Locked on all edges—Nailed on 2 edges. Can't work loose or blow off. Watertight.

"GALT" Corrugated Sheets

All sizes and gauges. Send dimensions and get our quotation.

DUNN BROTHERS WINNIPEG REGINA