I tried raising beef, but as all I could see in it was the society of the rattle and helping to maintain the combine, and not being very found of their acciety. I quit it and don't intend to try again in spite of all this glorious article atoms consuming our by-products at home sud-the wonderful advantage of the manure.

Langvale, Man. C. T. WATKINS.

TARIFF INCONSISTENCY

Languale, Man. C. T. WATKINS.

TARIFF INCONSISTENCY

Editor, Guide.—Owing to the diversity of opinions expressed in the public press on the question of reciprocity, which is believed in some quarters to be the thin end of the wedge that will rend assunder the fetters of protection, I am constrained to add my mite of thought in support of freedom, which is undoubtedly one of the inalienable rights of man. Who is it that says we must not deal with "that" main or "that" country, but"we-shall trade with "this" man or "this" country, but we-shall trade with "this" man or "this" country, but we-shall trade with "this" man or "this" country, but we shall trade with "this" man or "this" country, but we have a penalty, otherwise a tariff, for the "privilege" of trading not only with our neighbor at a distance but also with that one close at hand? None other than that government which uphodds and enforces the principle of protection. What is protection? It is a conspiracy for the restriction of trade. Who ronspires? A certain class of people, who, for personal and selfish ends, dominate and direct Parliament by and with the consent of an ignorant and credulous electorate. By permission of the masses Parliament enters into a conspiracy with Special Privilege wherehy trade is restricted for the benefit of Special Privilege, which this combine (of Parliament and S. P.) agrees is not within the reach or the right of the great mass of humanity. In the statute books of Canada and also those of the U. S., I understand, is an act under which it becomes an indictable offence for any person or persons to conspire for the restriction of trade. Thus the protection government which has the power to pass a law under which it are for any mornion those who would those of the U. S., I understand, is an act under which it becomes an indictable offence for any person or persons to conspire for the restriction of trade. Thus the protection government which has the power to pass a law under which it can fine or imprison those who would restrict trade, is itself the aider and abbettor, the very Beelzebub of all trade restrictions and combines. And a man who would evade the customs laws of Canada, or in other words, refuse to pay the penalty enforced by trade restriction is liable under a law which finds restriction is liable under a law which finds restriction of trade legal. Thus, the law which holds restriction of trade to be unlawful is ultri ories of the law which enforces protection. Human law and government, like the house divided against itself, must fall till everything that worketh or maketh a lie be eliminated. We are living in the year 1911 Anno Domini, but the laws which we have established for ourselves, under which every man's hand is against nis neighbor, are very far removed from the law laid down 1900 years ago by the Great Founder of the Faith we protess. One of the greatest acts of modern times was the abolition of the corn laws of Great Britain. The world has hooted England as an idiot and a fool. But who can say that she has suffered by this act? Free trade in England was the outcome of freedom of thought, right desire and Christian effort, and upon this has been built up the greatest and wealthiest manufacturing country in the world. There are those in Canada today still advocating trade war, and waving the flag of loyalty to the Empire, which, when analyzed is only loyalty to self with a big S. The advocate of preferential trade would demand that England reject her principles, place a tax on food stuffs and natural products offered to her by foreign countries that Canada might enrich herself at the expense of the collers of the motherland. I congratulate the farmers who congregated at Ottawa on the 18th of last December, in repudiating this sort of loy

OPPOSES RECIPROCITY

Editor, Guide: "As a new subscriber your valuable paper I am "a seeker ter wisdom" on the question of the

moment—the reciprosity treaty. Of course it is, or should be, the object of our law makers in making laws to do as with the aim of henefiting the country as a whole and not one perticular class, and I venture to doubt whether such a treaty would be to the interests of the country as a whole and not one perticular class, and I venture to doubt whether such a treaty would be to the interests of the country as a whole. We are told that this treaty would bring us better prices for our wheat and five stock. In the case of wheat, would it? The U.S. A. is a large exporter of wheat, most of it I presume inferior to, our hard wheat if we had free trade with the U.S. in wheat would not the price we get still be based on the export price? Promitly we might get a little higher prices at first, but would they last? Why reciprosity in case of live stock? The West imports horses, why should we cry for entry to U.S. markets when we cannot supply our own demands? With meat there is a growing home market and the Old Country can take all we have to export. The fruit growers of B.C. and the East have passed resolutions against reciprocity. Did the U.S. attain her present greatness under free trade or protection? Would she ever have got a start as a manufacturing country had she not protected her own infant industries against foreign competition? If we want to induce our manufacturers to lower the prices on their goods, especially on agricultural machinery, why not do so by a means conducive to the good of the empire to which we belong, viz. by increasing the British general elections we should not be hearing so much about the reciprocity freaty. There would not have been the need for it. Canadian and other colonial products would them have a preference on the British Empire would benefit. How has free trade benefit the Engish farmer? He is undersold all the time in his own market. The town dweller buys American flour, Australian mutton. Roumanian fowls, French eggs, Dutch cheese, Danish butter, German beet sugar, etc. Canadia stil

Nokomis, Sask. E. B. BELL.

JOHNSON MEMORIAL FUND
The Tom L. Johnson Memorial committee, of Cleveland, Ohio, have effected a temporary organization by selecting as temporary officers: Newton D. Baker, chairman; Chas. W. Stage, secretary; F. H. Goff, treasurer. So far as can now be announced the committee plans—First: An enlargement of its membership, followed by permanent organization. Second: The collection of funds for the erection of a suitable memorial of the services of Tom L. Johnson to mankind and especially to the city of Cleveland spall its people. The form of the memorial sail be determined with reference to the amount of money contributed, but the committee will seek to have it symbolize the beliefs to which Tom Johnson devoted his life.

his life.

For the present, contributions may For the present, contributions may be sent to the treasurer of the committee, F. H. Goff, president of the Cleveland. Trust Company. Cleveland, Ohio, to whom the funds already collected by the Cleveland press and others have been turned over. Contributions sent to any of the newspapers or to any member of the committee will be handed to the treasurer and acknowledged through the coulding research.

treasurer and acknowledged through the public press.
Third: The committee will provide for the holding of a memorial meeting, to be held in one of the parks, so that the people of Cleveland will have an oppor-tunity to pay their respects to the memory of this beloved and departed leader. Since it is to be an open air meeting, the date will probably be in the latter part of Max.

NEWTON D. BAKER, Chairman. CHAS W STAGE Secretary

Dr. Clark, M.P. for Red Deer, has informed the Toronto Star that he will not be able to attend the coronation.

The GILLETTE Is An Economy

Not An Extravagance

Because a fairly good open-blade razor can be bought for two dollars, while a GILLETTE costs five, have you concluded that the GILLETTE is an extravagance?

The open-blade costs you \$2.00 to buy and at least 25c, a year to keep honed and in condition.

Total, \$2.25 for the first year.

The GILLETTE, with 12 double-edged blades,

costs \$5.00, and a second box of blades (should your beard be very tough) adds \$1.00. Total, \$6.00 for first year. Difference \$3.75. Looks bad for the GILLETTE, eh? But wait!

The three-minute GILLETTE will save you 5 to 10 minutes every time you shave. Put it at 5. That's over three working days a year. Isn't your time worth over \$1.25 a day ?

When you're nearly late for the train or an portant engagement, the five minutes which the GILLETTE saves you is apt to be worth several times the whole cost.

Then there's the comfort of the clean, cool, easy GILLETTE shave-worth in itself several times the difference in price.

For real economy—time and face as well as cash considered—buy a GILLETTE and enjoy it.



WITHIN THE REACH OF EVERY FARMER



ELECTRIC LIGHT OUTFITS

From \$65.00 up

You are entitled to all the conveniences of the city by ordering one of our Electric Farmhouse Lighting Outfits. Ask for estimate, etc. Our plans are guaranteed for 5 years. Absolutely the best in existence.

W. PETSCHEL ELECTRIC COMPANY WINNIPEG, MAN 410 CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE,

Why Pay

Four Prices for a Sub-surface Packer?

Write for descriptive catalog and prices to

Northern Alberta Machinery Co. Ltd. 1134 First St., EDMONTON, Alta.

