



NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS

This department of The Guide is maintained especially for the purpose of providing a discussion ground for the readers where they may freely exchange views and derive from each other the benefits of experience and helpful suggestions. Each correspondent should remember that there are hundreds who wish to discuss a problem or offer suggestions. We cannot publish all the immense number of letters received and ask that each correspondent will keep his letter as short as possible. Every letter must be signed by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication. The views of our correspondents are not of necessity those of The Guide. The aim is to make this department of great value to readers and no letters not of public interest will be published.

FAVORS OTTAWA DELEGATION

Editor, Guide:—If appearances go for anything it is the intention of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government to force upon the West corporation control and operation of the Hudson Bay railway, notwithstanding that the universal desire of the people of the West, whose business it is and who will have to foot the bill, is that the road shall be built and operated by the government of the country. The idea of sending a large delegation to the Capital when the session opens, is an excellent one, and each of the delegates should go armed with strong resolutions as it is possible to secure, strongly protesting against the handing over of the Hudson Bay railway to any private corporation, no matter who they may be. Might it not be well in the meantime to hold a series of meetings throughout the country to emphasize the protest of the West against such high handed outrages as it would undoubtedly be to set at naught the will of the entire Western country. There is one remarkable fact in connection with this matter. Neither Sir Wilfrid nor his ministers have gone any further than that they are not in favor of public ownership. They do not deign to offer any argument or reason why public ownership is so objectionable, that it should not be adopted in connection with the Hudson Bay railway. It may be quite true that they are not making a startling success of the I. C. Ry. This is not, however, a very flattering commentary on their business capacity as a government, when every other country with the exception of Canada that has adopted the principle has made it work out to the entire satisfaction of the people. Nor is Canada entirely an exception, as the Timiscaming and Northern Ontario railway, which has been constructed and operated by the government of Ontario, is claimed to be giving substantial satisfaction, as well as serving the people well is also proving a good business undertaking for the province. Then Mr. Editor, let us have a series of rousing meetings, to protest against the iniquity of setting the will of the interested people at defiance when it is so apparent to every thoughtful person, that it is only a matter of time, and not long at that, when that great principle, the greatest by all odds, that has ever come before the Canadian or any other people, will be adopted not in small sections, but in the entirety. Why then should great additional burdens be laid on our shoulders, as that is what the result will be, when we undertake to get rid of the incubus of corporation ownership.

S. THOMSON.

Douglas, Man.

MR. TREGILLUS REPLIES

Editor, Guide:—I thank you for permission to reply to Mr. Frost, and will not abuse that privilege by taking much space. I wish to state emphatically that I have no desire to make this or any question a personal one. I regret Mr. Frost did not write me, instead of taking the matter up in the columns of THE GUIDE, which obliged me to reply in same way. The Vermillion incident occurred at a subsequent period and had nothing to do with the original affair. I explained in my letter to THE GUIDE that I made it clear at every meeting; that I was there as a private citizen and not representing the U. F. A. and I would hold no position for a moment that required me to relinquish my rights of citizenship or my individuality; and I ask Mr. Frost why should I not support any man who pledges himself to support the principles

adopted by the U. F. A. and who is a member of the association. Mr. Clark did the former before I promised to help him and he is a member of the U. F. A. Thanking you, Mr. Editor, for your courtesy.

W. J. TREGILLUS.

Calgary, Sept. 20th.

MR. HORN'S RESIGNATION

Editor, Guide:—The resignation of Mr. Horn, chief inspector of grain at Winnipeg, came as no surprise to me. I have been looking for something of that kind ever since he was brave enough to institute proceedings against those manipulators of grain at the terminal elevators. The failure of Mr. Castle in having these elevators weighed up, long ago, and results published, prove again how strong

SIXTY YEARS OF PROTECTION IN CANADA 1846-1907

(By Edward Porritt)

Western farmers at the present time are intensely interested in the tariff, and are anxious to secure information upon tariff matters. The above mentioned book by Edward Porritt is the best work on the subject. Mr. Porritt is a British Free Trader and is a professor in Harvard University, teaching political economy and lecturing on Canadian constitutional history. In 1905-6 he travelled with the Canadian tariff commission and has devoted a great deal of study to the Canadian tariff and the abuses which have followed protection. Mr. Porritt's book is entirely non-political and is a study of the tariff history of Canada for the last sixty years. It is written in a most interesting manner and at the same time contains exact information on trade and manufacturers and the methods by which tariffs are made. Every farmer who is interested in tariff reduction will find Mr. Porritt's book the most valuable one that he can secure. He will also learn how the manufacturers lay aside politics in their efforts to have the tariff burden increased. If every farmer in Canada would read Mr. Porritt's book, the "system of legalized robbery" would come to an end inside of one year. The book contains 478 pages and is fully indexed. It will be sent to any reader for \$1.50 postpaid.

BOOK DEPARTMENT, GRAIN GROWERS' GUIDE, WINNIPEG

an opposition the Grain Growers are fighting. There is little doubt in my mind that the above reasons occasioned the resignation of Mr. Horn. If that supposition is proved to be a fact what are the Grain Growers going to do? Will they allow these parties to skin the grades again for a season? Is there no law for such cases? It looks very much as if there were not.

OLIVER KING.

Wawanesa, Man.

BELIEVES IN FARMERS' CAUSE

Editor, Guide:—I may say I have not been a shipper through the farmers' agency for the simple reason that I could not get cars when I wanted them, but in the future I am going to strain a point and have my grain go through your hands, and I would advise every shipper in this great West of ours to do likewise. I also advise every farmer to take THE GUIDE and read it carefully as I claim it is the only journal printed which is trying to educate the producers to co-operate together to look after their own interests. W. J. Powell called on me last June and persuaded me to take ten shares of Home Bank stock, which I believe is a good investment, so much so that I have increased my number to fifteen. I also made application for four shares of the Grain Growers' Grain Company stock which is a good investment, but I did not take them purely for the profit they would earn per annum, but to build up our company and make it one of the strongest institutions in Canada, which I think it will be in the near future. I would advise every grower of grain to take one or two shares in the company, and a few shares in the bank.

As I see that it is necessary that we producers should concentrate our capital through a channel of our own, so that we will be able to protect ourselves against any such stringency as took place in 1907.

ANDREW INGVARSON.

FREE TRADE vs. PROTECTION

Editor, Guide:—Mr. Blodgett in his letter printed in your issue of August 10, repeats the protectionist fallacy that it is possible to tax a community into prosperity. According to the theory propounded in his letter all that is needed to increase the prosperity of any country is protective tariffs and the higher the tariff the greater the prosperity. He seems to think that what one nation gains in the matter of trade some other nation must lose. And as a matter of fact protection and free trade stand for two antagonistic theories of civilization. Protection stands for the idea of national exclusiveness and rests upon the view that the benefits of one nation can only be secured at the expense of other nations. Free trade on the other hand stands for national interdependence. It rests on the idea that in an industrial and commercial epoch the gain of one nation is the gain of all.

We would consider it very foolish of the grocer if he was agrieved at the success of the tailor across the street. The greater the trade the tailor has the more he will be able to patronize the grocer, and vice versa, to their mutual advantage. When a big departmental store advertises a cheap sale no protectionist refuses to take advantage of the bargains offered on the plea that the sale is unfair to those firms that con-

H.B.K. BRAND

Patent Ripless Gloves

are made for hard wear. Practically everlasting. No seams inside to hurt the hands, and they are

GUARANTEED NOT TO RIP

ing £46,609,772 (stg), an increase of £3,748,301 over July 1909 and £5,593,119 over July 1908. The figures for the seven months of the year show a total increase of £71,993,254 (£31,830,457 in imports and £40,162,777 in exports) over the corresponding period in 1909. Every branch of trade shows a substantial increase on last year's figures—manufactured goods £2,588,762—the chief rises being in iron and steel, cotton, and woollen fabrics.

[Note:—In Great Britain the Board of Trade is a government department.]

Mr. Blodgett evidently wants to be taken seriously, but when he blames free trade for the unemployment in Great Britain he can hardly expect readers of The Guide to accept his dictum. He admits there is unemployment on this side of the Atlantic and cites three causes, viz., laziness, drink and incompetency. Now, Sir, unemployment will occur under either fiscal policy. There will always be times of depression and times of prosperity. Just as there will be good seasons and bad seasons for the fisherman and the farmer. But, unwittingly, no doubt, Mr. Blodgett gives away the case for protection when he says of free trade Britain "she must either levy a tariff to cover the difference between her accustomed wages and the wages of continental Europe, or her laborers must accept the same miserable wages paid on the continent." The continental nations have protection. Miserable wages are paid to the laborers of continental nations. Great Britain has free trade. Higher wages are paid to British laborers. So although he advocates protection for Canada he tells us that in Europe higher wages are paid under free trade and miserable wages under protection. And it is a fact, that today, in free trade Britain wages are higher, commodities are cheaper, the working day shorter, and there is less unemployment than in protectionist Germany.

One advocate of protection tells us that the tariff keeps out the foreigner and secures the home market for the home producer. Another tells us that we must tax the goods the foreigner sends us to secure a revival. But if the tariff is going to keep out the foreigner, how can we raise a revenue by taxing his goods? If the foreigner is to pay the tax it can only be because his goods come into the home market. If they do then protection is of no use in securing the home market for our own people. The protectionist cannot have it both ways. He can't have his cake and eat it. We are all producers; we are also all consumers. Usually we only produce one thing or one kind of thing. We are all consumers of many things. Free trade considers both producer and consumer.

Let me show you how, Mr. Blodgett. Take the case of woollen shirts. Say the price of one is 50c. of that amount 30c. is tariff. For \$1.80 I will get two shirts. The retail merchant will get a profit on two shirts. The manufacturer will get a profit on two shirts plus 60c., which is tariff. Now, suppose we abolish the tariff my \$1.80 will buy three shirts. I, the consumer, am much ahead. The retail merchant will get a profit on three shirts and the manufacturer will get a profit on three shirts. But on this latter transaction he gets no 60c. of tariff. But do not

Board of Trade Returns

The Board of Trade returns for July issued on 8th August show exports total-