

of the Johnston Harvester Co., of Batavia, N.Y.; Director of the Verity Plow Co., and a Director of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, and his desertion of the Liberal party is attributed to its advocacy of free agricultural implements. This is certainly a good sign and it will be for the good of Liberalism and for the good of the country if other beneficiaries of Special Privilege can be offended by the policies adopted by the Liberals and induced to resign from the party. One of the cardinal principles of true Liberalism is liberty, and it is difficult to understand how any party can profess to believe in liberty and at the same time maintain a protective tariff which robs the people of the liberty to buy and sell where they can do so to the best advantage. In opposition prior to 1896 the Liberals professed Liberal doctrines; in power from 1896 to 1911 they practiced the opposite, and naturally they secured the support of many such as Sir Lyman Melvin Jones, who benefitted by protection. Now, in opposition again, some of the Liberals are again advocating more Liberal principles, and the fact that Sir Lyman has quit the party is an indication that he, at any rate, believes they are in earnest. This incident conveys a valuable lesson to the people of Canada and particularly to the farmers. It shows how little regard the protected manufacturers and other beneficiaries of Special Privilege have for any political party when their pockets and privileges are threatened. It will be remembered that Lloyd Harris, former M.P. for Brantford, who is also interested in the Massey-Harris Company and other large manufacturing concerns, left the Liberal party in the Reciprocity issue along with many other representatives of privilege, including the "famous eighteen" Toronto Liberals, one of whom is now the Conservative Minister of Finance. If the Liberal party gets rid of all those who supported the party because the party supported them, it may regain the confidence of the people and once more attain power.

### DIRECT LEGISLATION BILL

At the Moose Jaw Convention, held in February last, the following resolution was unanimously passed by the 600 or more delegates present:—

"Resolved—That this Convention again declare itself in favor of the principles of Direct Legislation by the Initiative, the Referendum and the Recall, and that we ask the Provincial Government to pass this law, or again submit the question to a Referendum of the voters of the next Provincial election, as we believe a large majority of the electors are in favor of this reform, and that a majority vote be sufficient to bring it into force."

The resolution, it will be noticed, leaves the question open for the Government either to place the bill on the statute books or to put it to a referendum at the next provincial election. We believe that the Grain Growers are fully justified in asking the Government to place the bill on the statute books at the next session of the legislature, and not wait either for another referendum or for a general election. One referendum has already been held, which showed the people of Saskatchewan to be overwhelmingly in favor of Direct Legislation, and we cannot see that there is any justification for the expense that would be entailed in holding another referendum on the very same question. The bill is a very mild one, and contains a considerable number of what we consider are unnecessary restrictions. Yet if it is put into force it will give the people permission to initiate legislation on certain questions, and we consider that in the interest of the people of Saskatchewan the bill should be given effect to at the next session of the legislature. If the local associations of the Province believe this, it would be advisable to have a resolution to this effect prepared and forwarded to Premier Scott at

the earliest possible moment. Premier Scott is at present absent from Saskatchewan, but such resolutions addressed to him will reach the other members of the Government promptly and have the same effect.

### CANADIAN TARIFF HIGHER

The claim is being made by the defenders of high protection in Canada that, even after the reductions that have been made in the United States tariff, the American duties on the average are still higher than our own. Fantastic calculations, such as those commonly used by the protectionist statisticians, have been used to support this view, but when the two tariffs are put side by side these conclusions do not seem conclusive. The fallacy of the protectionists' argument has been forcibly exposed by Professor O. D. Skelton, in the University Magazine, where he compares the duties of the two countries on the more important articles of everyday use in the household and in the field of production. Professor Skelton gives the following table:—

Food Stuffs—	United States	Canada Preferential	Canada General
Wheat, flour, per bbl...	Free	.40	.60
Oatmeal, per cwt. ....	.30	.40	.60
Biscuits, unsweetened ..	Free	15%	25%
Sugar, per cwt. above 16	Free		
Dutch standard .....	After 1916	.72	1.08
Tea .....	Free	Free	Free
Coffee .....	Free	Free	Free
Eggs, per doz. ....	Free	.02	.03
Butter, per lb. ....	.02½	.03	.04
Cheese, per lb. ....	20%	.02	.03
Meats, fresh per lb. n.o.p.	Free	.02	.03
Fish, per lb. ....	Free	.05	.01
	fresh water and n.o.p.		
Fruit, tropical .....	Duty Free	Free	Free
	varying		
Fruit, apples, peaches, pears, etc., per bushel	.10	Varying	
Clothing—			
Woolens, tweeds .....	35%	30	35
Woolens, dress goods, n.o.p. ....	35	30	35
Woolens, blankets .....	15	20½	35
Woolen clothing .....	35	30	35
Cotton fabrics .....	7½ to 30	15 25 25 32½	
Cotton clothing .....	30	25	35
Boots and shoes .....	Free	20	30
Silk fabrics .....	45	17½	30
Lace .....	60	25	35
Diamonds .....	10	Free	Free
House Furnishings—			
Furniture, wooden .....	15	20	30
Table cutlery .....	15	20	30
Tinware .....	20	15	25
Carpets .....	20-35	25	35
Production Materials—			
Bricks, common .....	10	12½	22½
Cement, per cwt. ....	Free	.08	.12½
Structural iron and steel	10	22½	35
Paints .....	15	20	30
Lumber, dressed both sides .....	Free	17½	25
Lumber, dressed one side .....	Free	Free	Free
Steel rails, per ton .....	20%	\$4.50	\$7.00
Steel bridges .....	20	22½	35
Railway cars .....	20	20	30
Locomotives .....	15	22½	35
Gasoline engines .....	20	15	27½
Mining machinery .....	20	Free	Free
Hides .....	Free	Free	Free
Leather .....	Free	10-12½	15
Harness and saddlery ..	Free	20	30
Mowers, harvesters, etc.	Free	12½	17
Plows .....	Free	12½	20½
Wagons .....	Free	17½	25
Cream separators .....	Free	Free	Free
Coal, bituminous, ton...	Free	.35	.53

From this table it will be seen that except in clothing, the balance is weighted against the Canadian consumer and the Canadian producer.

### TO PURIFY THE PRESS

We have explained in these pages several times some of the publicity methods adopted by the protectionist organizations of Eastern Canada. One of the most insidious and dangerous methods adopted is that now being carried on for the purpose of poisoning the

minds of those who read the country weekly newspapers in Western Canada. Articles are prepared by the protectionist press bureau and then made into plates, and shipped with all charges paid and laid down free in the office of the country editor. In this way a great many articles in favor of the protective tariff, or attacking The Grain Growers' Guide or The Grain Growers' Grain Company, are being circulated all over the West. The protectionist forces are spending a lot of money on this campaign in the hopes of injuring or ruining the farmers' organizations, so that the opposition to the protective tariff, and the combines and mergers that grow up under it, will be eliminated. We are glad to say that a great many editors of country newspapers have refused to betray their readers by publishing this poisoned material. Other editors, however, have either consciously or unconsciously joined hands with the protectionists against the farmers. In several places throughout the West the local associations have taken the matter up at their meeting, and appointed a committee to wait upon the local editor and explain the situation to him. We think this is an excellent idea. The country newspapers cannot live without the support of the farmers, and it is only right and fair that they should give the farmers a square deal. We would not in any way restrict the freedom of the press, because we regard it as the safeguard of the nation. It is, however, in the interest of the farmers that when these protectionist articles are published there should be a note attached explaining that they are supplied free of charge from the Protectionist Press Bureau. Every reader then knows what he is reading, and if he wishes to take the poison into his system he does it with his eyes open. We are always glad to see both sides of every question fully set forth in every journal. We have offered the Manufacturers' Association all the space they require in The Guide free of charge to set forth their protectionist doctrines. They have declined our offer, however, because they are afraid to face open publicity. They know their case will not bear the light of day. They prefer to work under cover of darkness, where they can more easily poison the minds of the public. We would urge the local associations to keep their eyes on the country weeklies, and to take up this matter for their own protection.

Now that our farmers and their wives are beginning to wear diamonds very commonly we would suggest that the Government take diamonds off the free list, and make them pay 100 per cent. duty. The Government taxes boots and shoes and clothing because they do not believe the people should have too many of them. Why not apply the same principle to diamonds? This would be a good subject for consideration by Borden, White, Searcity & Co.

When will our political leaders again attempt another triumphal tour thru the West? Whenever their education feels insufficient the Western farmers will be prepared to supplement it, as they did a few years ago. When the leaders tire of the flattery which surrounds them at Ottawa, a few plain facts are lying in wait for them on the prairies.

Will Sir Melvin Jones' flop towards the Conservative party forestall the reduction in duty on agricultural implements? Where does Hon. Arthur Meighen stand on this question? He was strongly for reduction in Opposition. Now that he is in the cabinet he should be able to make his views effective.

Let us hope that Finance Minister White will bring down the budget soon and end the suspense. Everybody is waiting to see who is going to get a "handout."

To the  
Guide:  
Sir:  
on the  
11th F  
more p  
ever, it  
and eve  
stood,  
invitati  
to refe  
purpose  
remarks  
public  
stand w  
for that  
amount  
rural co  
tion, th  
The que  
this am  
dates, I  
I am a  
age of  
part of  
siders,  
public  
tributed  
those w  
reached  
face us

1. W  
butors?  
2. W  
date?  
3. W  
among  
Prob  
admit  
way is  
help in  
the pe  
which  
interes  
As t

The  
to und  
writing  
for cou  
At f  
interes  
for the  
well t  
Islands  
The ci  
countr  
even t  
countr  
brothe  
devour  
is its  
escape  
no one  
think  
questio  
brothe  
But  
The ci  
as a c  
try's c  
source  
two ar  
their i  
antago  
without  
has m

The  
in the  
a com  
they c  
don't  
There  
knowi  
and id  
two a  
Let