

was fifty years later before the white slavery was abolished, and eighty years before the negro-chattel slavery was wiped out by the immortal Lincoln, who was a descendant of Samuel Lincoln, who sailed from London April 18, 1637, as the servant or serf of Francis Lawes. But the abolition of chattel slavery only made way for the industrial slavery of both whites and blacks. So that we have had enough delegations to represent wealth, and if the farmers and other producers of wealth in Canada or any other country have a real desire to get their rights, they must send their own men, not to ask for anything, but to make laws representing labor (mental and manual) as the supreme source of all wealth and entitled to full and just consideration.

WM. NESBITT, Sr.

Tessier, Sask.

Note—It surely is not money wasted to give the Ottawa government to understand that the farmers mean business and will have a square deal.—Ed.

REGARDING FREE TRADE

Editor, Guide.—I have read with interest in your issue of November 20 letters by Mr. A. Brown and Mr. J. Robertson which are logical and relevant as far as they go, but I wish to take exception to the Editor's note, which states "That Free Trade in England and its benefits is a matter of fact," palpably not an accepted fact, since a very large number of taxpayers hotly dispute its benefits. The whole farming interest is conscious of the fact that it suffers heavily in order to lighten the labors of other classes, and many people consider that the benefits thus aimed to reach their fellow subjects are in a great measure gathered in by hostile foreigners. In order to find the fact accepted on this question, Mr. Editor should step across the next herring-pond and hit Denmark where there is no dispute as to fact that a well arranged protection does immensely benefit a population. I think the chief difficulty in the matter is the fact that most people regard it as a question of commercial economy only, whereas it is mainly one of international policy. If "peace on earth and good will towards men" prevailed exclusively, the chief reasons for protection would not obtain, but as long as the rivalry of states, of creeds and of races continues it will be suicidal to abandon our commercial weapons and to let enemies exploit us in trade and in finance. As an instance I would note that for many years Cape Colony raised most of its revenues by import duties because the commercial classes understood the necessity of providing revenue for administration, while the farming classes, largely Boer and Kafir, were mostly beyond argument in that direction. The first Free Traders stampeded wildly, not from a judicious protection, but from a system of extravagant monopolies, such as we seek to reduce to reason today. Do not, therefore, let us rush to the other extreme, or we shall lay ourselves open to unlimited raiding by U. S. cornermen, who will mob our markets with dumpage and destroy or capture our legitimate manufactures. Neither imagine that the freest of trading will save us from combines in lumber, cement and all the lines that are as raw material to the farmers. Fair and easy, with a cool head and a steady hand we shall get all the benefits obtained from our country's natural resources.

J. M. LIDDELL.

Pineher Station, Alta.

AMERICAN PRICES BETTER

The majority of the writers on this subject take the tariff as a basis of estimating the loss which the Canadian farmers suffer. Some put the average farmers loss at \$200. That I think is too low. A better way would be to put the markets of Buffalo and Chicago along side of those of Winnipeg and Toronto. Put the prices that the American farmers pay for their implements beside what the Canadian farmer pays for implements. Put the price list of the Chicago mail order houses against the prices of the Canadian mail order houses, by so doing you could form a just estimate of the loss that the Canadian farmer suffers. I have farmed on both sides of the line and can give you some figures. I am a

Praying for Rain is all very well but Irrigation is more reliable

That is why we are irrigating the Whatshan Valley, although experts have assured us that irrigation is not really needed as there is enough annual rainfall to take care of the growth of our apple trees. But we had to put in a water system to provide water for domestic purposes for our settlers, and we decided to make the mains big enough to take care of irrigating the land. The Whatshan Valley is in the Arrow Lakes district, West Kootenay, British Columbia, and we are rapidly making it one of the garden spots of the continent. We are **Clearing, Irrigating and Planting 10 acre tracts and selling them for \$1,500, on time payments with no interest.** You can remain in your present position while we get your orchard to the bearing point and then move on to it, getting away for ever from cold winters or other climatic disadvantages. Besides all this, your ten acres will bring you in a profit of \$5,000 to \$6,000 per year when the trees reach maturity.

You had better act quickly if you are going to take advantage of this

Apple Orchard Opportunity of a Lifetime

for we are not going to sell many orchards at the present price. At least give us the opportunity of giving you all information. Your name on a post card is all we need.

BEATON & VEZINA

305 Enderton Building - - - Winnipeg, Man.

native of Ontario. When I went to Michigan in 1879, I noticed that the Michigan farmer could buy as much for a dollar as the Ontario farmer could buy for a dollar and a half. On the other hand the Michigan farmer got a dollar and a half for the same amount of produce that the Ontario farmer would be lucky if he got a dollar for. Here are some figures to prove this.

The Ontario farmer paid 20 cents a gallon for coal oil—the Michigan farmer 10 cents. Tobacco retailed at 60 cents a pound in Ontario—in Michigan at 20 cents a pound. Syrup was worth 50 cents a gallon in Ontario—25 cents a gallon in Michigan. The same grade of coffee that retailed at 25 cents a pound in Ontario could be bought in Michigan at 10 cents a pound. The Ontario farmer paid 75 cents for a pair of overalls, that the Michigan farmer paid 50 cents for. In implements there was also a difference in favor of the Michigan man. In Michigan the price of a six foot binder is \$100 cash or \$115 on three years time. In 1897 the Ontario farmer paid \$150 for a six-foot binder. I have been informed that the price is now \$130 or \$145 on time. A similar difference exists in all lines of farm implements.

Speaking from my experience I believe the American farmer gets 20 per cent. more for his produce than his Canadian brother gets. And the American farmer buys his implements and other necessary things about thirty per cent. cheaper than the Canadian farmer buys his. That

simply means the Canadian farmer who annually makes and spends \$1000 would be \$500 in pocket if he had free access to the markets of the United States.

WILLIAM STERLING.

Pollux, Alta.

MINNESOTA LEADS U. S.

Minneapolis, Minn., Dec. 27.—Minnesota again takes rank by a big lead as the greatest wheat producing state of the country, and by a statistical coincidence the most remarkable that the department of agriculture, whose annual statistical report is out to-day, has ever found, is shown to have raised this year 94,080,000 bushels, exactly the number given by the estimate of the department for 1909. W. M. Hays, formerly connected with the Minnesota college of agriculture at St. Anthony Park, now assistant secretary of agriculture, Victor Ormstead, chief of the bureau of statistics, and the crop reporting board, which consists of N. C. Murray, Geo. Holmes, John J. Darg and Jos. H. Killebrew, all attest the correctness of the figures. It is pronounced by them a "mathematical coincidence" of the most extraordinary character.

It is between the prominence of Minnesota and Kansas as wheat producers, and the great valleys of the two states that the principal interest lies. Kansas, which is one of the greatest grain producing states, whose wheat fields extend every year over an area of between 5,000,000 and 6,000,000 acres, and whose product is winter wheat, which ordinarily averages

somewhat higher in yield per acre, passed Minnesota in 1908 by 10,000,000 bushels, the totals for the two states in that season being 68,577,000 bushels for Minnesota and 78,182,000 for Kansas. At that time the winning of first place from Minnesota by the southwestern state was commented upon all over the country, and was the cause of much speculative figuring what the comparative prominence of northwest and southwest in wheat production would be a few years later, this against the contention of northwestern authorities that temporary conditions of one season caused the change.

Last year Minnesota, with a production of 94,080,000 bushels, was 9,000,000 ahead of Kansas, which raised 85,478,000 bushels. This year, with 94,080,000 bushels for Minnesota, Kansas shows up 61,000,000 bushels, Minnesota thus running ahead by 30,000,000.

Minnesota, North Dakota and Kansas are the three great wheat producing states, and though other states run production far into the millions, none approaches these three. In 1908 it was thought Minnesota had lost the place to North Dakota, but the two big states lined up with 68,577,000 bushels for Minnesota, and 68,482,000 for North Dakota, leaving Minnesota still ahead. In 1909 North Dakota with 90,080,000 bushels, was still somewhat below Minnesota. It is predicted by grain trade statisticians that if Minnesota eventually loses first place, it will lose it to North Dakota.