

Direct Legislation in effect the three legislatures of the Prairie Provinces would be directly in the control of the people, and the \$1,500 legislators would be compelled to make the laws the people require. Also there would be an end of this-humiliating relationship that today exists between the provincial and federal political parties. The Western legislatures must be made responsive to the will of the people, and then the West can make itself felt in Dominion wide democratic legislation. Down in the United States the people of many of the states are making a splendid fight to have the tools of democracy placed in their own hands. They have had considerable success, and a number of the very leading men, including Governor Woodrow Wilson, have stated their conversion to the principle of Direct Legislation. The following shows the standing of the movement in the various states giving the date when the law was secured:

State	Referendum percentage.	Initiative percentage.
1898 South Dakota	5	5
1900 Utah		8
1902 Oregon	5	
1905 Nevada (referendum only)	10	
1906 Montana	5	9
1908 Maine		
1908 Missouri	5	5
1910 Arkansas	5	8
1910 Colorado	5	8
1911 States in which the amendments have been submitted till April 1st		
California	5	5 and 8
Washington	6	10
Nebraska	10	10
North Dakota	5	8
Nevada (initiative)	10	10
Wisconsin	8	8

\*Referendum, 10,000 voters; initiative, 12,000 voters.

\*\*Reduced from 8 by law.

This is merely the record of what is actually coming into operation, but there is a strong campaign in favor of Direct Legislation now going on in nearly every state in the Union. In many cases the legislatures have placed "jokers" in the Direct Legislation laws to render them inoperative and useless. For instance, in South Dakota no law can go to a Referendum until it has been enacted by the legislature, and the legislature acts upon its own sweet will in the matter, so that the Initiative is nothing more than a petition to the legislature. In Utah the legislature merely enacted the principle, leaving the details to be enacted by law later. The legislature, however, has refused to put it into operation, so Utah has no Initiative and Referendum. In Montana the petitions must be signed by 5 per cent. or 8 per cent. "in each of two-fifths of the counties of the state," which makes it too difficult and too expensive to operate. Oklahoma has what is considered the worst of all "jokers," as it requires a two-thirds majority vote upon any measure to carry it. Naturally none have ever carried. This state is the only one, except Oregon, which has a publicity pamphlet to be mailed to every voter prior to an election. But under a hostile administration this section of the law has been very poorly administered. In Missouri a petition must be signed by the necessary voters "in each of two-thirds of the congressional districts," which is needlessly expensive. In Nebraska the new law requires that the petitions be signed by 5 per cent. of the voters in each of 36 counties, which is effective in making the law practically inoperative. In Wyoming the enemies of democracy have provided the law that there must be a 25 per cent. petition and an absolute majority of all the electors must vote in favor of a bill to carry it. In addition, each signature to the petitions must be witnessed by three persons, which is very expensive. In Idaho the legislature intends only to enact the principle of the Referendum, and to render it inoperative by regulating the percentages so that they cannot be secured. This foregoing review indicates the fight which the people have to meet in the United

States. The correct percentages are 5 for the Initiative and 8 for the Referendum, as it is in Oregon. This should be borne in mind in the Western provinces, as the legislatures may possibly put "jokers" in any bill they pass if the people are not properly on the watch. The Direct Legislation League of Manitoba is already preparing for an energetic campaign during the coming winter. Speakers will be sent throughout the province and the educational work will be continued steadily. The local branches of the Grain Growers' Association could do good work by bringing the matter before their local member, and securing his support. This is true educational work. No persons need more education than our legislators. If the people really want Direct Legislation they must go after it in the right way. They can get it.

### TIMES ARE CHANGING

It is but a few years since public opinion in Canada was represented almost entirely by the opinions of the few men who dominated the boards of trade in the large cities. When any national question was up for discussion these organizations passed resolutions which were heralded abroad as the feeling of the Canadian people. Organized labor was usually careful not to offend its employers by expressing contrary opinions and the viewpoint of Special Privilege prevailed. On the part of the common people there was a dangerous lethargy towards public affairs, and having no organization for educational purposes the rank and file of the Canadian people were unrepresented in the expression of their views. The politicians preached only party and devoted little or no attention to educating the people upon the affairs of the nation. All this tended towards the control being centred more and more in the hands of a few. The people were not watchful; they were not informed; they did not realize their danger. All this has been changed and there is today a greater opportunity of ascertaining correct public opinion than ever before. It is now evident in all quarters that the few men at the head of our industrial and financial institutions in the large centres do not correctly represent the opinions and feeling of the masses of the people. In other words the rule of money is no longer dominant, though it is still fighting for the supremacy which it fondly thought it held in perpetuity. Today the worker in the factory and the farmer in the field is taking a more intelligent interest in everything pertaining to the national well-being, and by organization is able to influence the trend of legislation. This greatly improved situation is due entirely to education, and the continued advancement of the great reform now in progress depends upon the further spread of information. The leaders in the organized farmers' movement realize this truth and in their efforts are continually keeping to the front the need of study, discussion and thought. The farmer upon the homestead has the same duty to perform as a citizen of Canada as has the wealthiest plutocrat, and at the ballot box—as in the grave—all are equal. An industrious and intelligent citizenship is a safeguard for any nation and this should be the aim of every educational campaign.

### GOOD ADVICE FOR FARMERS

The Canadian Century, the organ of Special Privilege, is still pounding away against reciprocity. Here is its latest utterance:

"Those farmers of the West who grow a variety of crops are more inclined to take a broad view of national matters than those who confine exclusively to grain-growing. Reciprocity with the United States would encourage the tendency to grow nothing but grain, and most of the farmers who have a variety of crops are opposed to it. The Grain Growers should realize that they are taking some-

thing out of the soil every year, and that continued growing of one crop cannot go on for ever. Their farms will become exhausted. A wise policy of crop variation, together with stock raising, which enables the farmer to return fertilizers to the soil, will ensure prosperity to the West."

Special Privilege is now opposed to reciprocity because of its fearful consequences upon the mental calibre of the Western farmers. The Western farmer has a lot to learn about farming. He admits it, and is studying. But the more he studies the more he sees of the handicaps that are placed upon him in favor of the manufacturers and other beneficiaries of Special Privilege. Big Business must get out of politics and stay out before there will be a fair opportunity for the common people.

### TARIFF FRAUD

An American engineer who recently went to Australia, sends the following statement to the Johnston (Pa.) Democrat:

"The unspeakable fraud and rascality of the tariff shows more plainly here (in Australia) than at home. I bought some hay-making tools last week. They are manufactured at Springfield, Ohio. To get here they travel more than half way around the world, pay 5 per cent. duty, and the agent's commission, yet I get them for one-third less than the Ohio price. That is the kind of protection the Ohio farmer votes himself. Owing to our rapid growth the state works could not build locomotives fast enough. Twenty were bought in America and twenty in England, all made from Victorian design. The American engines are cheaper than the British by 15 per cent. Why then should the Baldwin works be protected?"

This is what protection does to benefit the farmer. Protected manufacturers milk the home market, and sell at competition prices abroad.

The Winnipeg Telegram, the Western anti-reciprocity champion, has now discovered that reciprocity is bad both for the American and Canadian farmers. This means that both parties to the trade will get the worst of the bargain. Says the Telegram:

"Yet nothing can be clearer than the fact that if reciprocity works injury to the American farmer it can under no conceivable circumstances work profit to the Canadian farmer."

What really will happen is that the Minneapolis market will be affected, but that it will find its level above the Winnipeg prices. Therein will the Canadian farmer benefit.

Sir Melvin Jones, president of the Massey-Harris Co., who has just been knighted by the king on the advice of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for his "services to the Empire," has written as follows to the Canadian Century, the organ of Special Privilege:

"I have read the Canadian Century for some weeks past, and congratulate you upon the articles that have been appearing. They are well written and to the point."

Sir Melvin thus strongly favors the protective campaign the Canadian Century has been carrying on. Sir Wilfrid must be pleased to see his newly knighted friend opposing reciprocity.

In J. J. Harpell's recent book, "Canadian National Economy," appears the following statement:

"The cash price of a Canadian made harvester in Alberta is \$155, in Ontario it is \$132. But the same binder can be bought in Great Britain for \$121 cash."

The manufacturers have not yet denied that they sell cheaper in Great Britain than at home. Why does the Government retain the duty on farm implements?

The Winnipeg Telegram regularly outlines a course of action for The Guide. How about taking the duty off farm implements, which The Telegram was in favor of a while ago. The Telegram might explain its attitude towards the tariff, even though it does advocate a tariff commission.