

# CANADA PASSING THROUGH RECONSTRUCTION PERIOD

## Right Hon. Arthur Meighen Tells of the Abnormal Task Before the People of Canada and the Measures Proposed for its Successful Outcome.

(Continued)

I have read the first clause. I now come to what I will call the tax clause:

That, while recognizing that existing financial requirements of the Dominion demand the maintenance of a Customs tariff, the House is unable to concur in the declaration by the Government that the tariff should be based on the principle of protection; the tariff is a tax—

The tariff is a tax, mind you—and the aim of legislation should be to make taxation as light as circumstances will permit.

Just keep that in mind. We recognize that for good reasons we have to have a tariff, but it should not be protective at all. It should not be based on protection, because the tariff is a mere tax. See how that fits in with the next paragraph:

That the aim of the fiscal policy of Canada should be the encouragement of industries—

Now may I ask the hon. member for Red Deer, which clause is he voting for? Did the hon. member ever hear about encouraging industries by taxing them? The tariff is a mere tax, just for the sake of raising money on account of our financial conditions, but the fiscal policy of the country should be the encouragement of industries. Now if there is any human being that can put those two clauses together and get his mind on the same side of the both of them, supporting them or opposing them, that is, if he is honest with his mind, I would like to see the specimen produced. The amendment goes on:

That the aim of the fiscal policy of Canada should be the encouragement of industries based on the natural resources of the country, the development of which may reasonably be expected to create healthy enterprises giving promise of enduring success.

That is good enough for any party. But if such is the case, how is it that the tariff is a mere tax, to be made as light as possible? Let me go into that for a moment. The aim should be "the encouragement of industries" based on the natural resources of the country. Now what are those industries? The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's told us; he gave us the key to the whole thing. The industries I would encourage by a tariff tax, he says, are those, and the raw materials of which are in this country. That would be one class, and he mentioned steel; steel was very appropriate, very appropriate indeed.

Why, of course, he would protect the steel industry. Such an industry would be one based on our natural resources. But hundreds of industries in this country can get the bulk of their raw materials in Canada, and the purpose of a tariff, in so far as its protective effect goes, is to develop the natural resources of a country. He says further that those that are based on our natural resources get their fuel in this country. That is coal. You see where the hon. gentleman comes in. So far as coal and steel are concerned he can go to Nova Scotia and say: "I stand up for protection to these industries." But he went further than that; he said that if an industry were based on water-power, he would protect it. He says: "If they are using water-power, why, then, that is a natural resource, and I would encourage that too." And in case he should accidentally leave anything out, and thereby get into trouble anywhere, he included another class. He said: "You may have industries built up only upon the brains of the promoters of such industries," and he gave us a beautiful illustration. He said there was a man in Scotland, in Glasgow, I think—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Dundee, Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, Dundee. He said that, though there were no oranges growing in Scotland, and there was no sugar made there, a certain man had found a way to make marmalade, and having done so, had established an industry based on one of the natural resources of the country. And after he got through with that classification he declared: "That is the kind of industry I would encourage," adding the very comforting assurance that such industries would not need "very much protection." Now, I should like to know how those words accord with the declaration that a tariff should not be based on the principle of protection. What industry in the world would come in under the class named by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding)? And he says that the tariff should be such as to protect these industries! He declares, in one clause, that the tariff should not be based on the principle of protection, and, in another clause he says "the encouragement of industries" is just what it ought to be based on. Let me ask my hon. friends opposite a very plain and simple question: Is the tariff in effect in this country to-day based on the principle of protection, or is it not? Now, I should like to get an answer, even a nod, I do not care whether vertical or horizontal. But I cannot get either one. I venture to say that there is not one gentleman opposite who will tell us in this debate whether the present tariff is based on the principle of protection or not. Why, if they say no, the immediate answer is: What then do you want? If they say yes, then the answer is: Why, this is your own tariff.

There have been substantial reductions since their day, but the principle of protection is in the tariff now and it must have been there before the reductions were made. The tariff of this country to-day, in every essential feature, save reduction, is the tariff prepared by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's himself, which he lauded to the skies year after year as complying with every requirement of protection. He tells this House that he has never given adherence to the principle of protection. I tell my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's that he has given adherence to that principle in every Budget speech which he delivered during the course of fifteen years in power. He gave adherence to the principle of protection in every Budget he ever brought down, and in every tariff he framed; and not only did he do so, but he admitted the fact in Budget speech after Budget speech after Budget speech, and I have them before me. Let us see how the hon. member did obedience to the principle of protection. I will take first a speech he made—

An hon. MEMBER: What year? Mr. MEIGHEN: It does not matter what year; I will read from any speech he delivered by the hon. gentleman during the whole fifteen years. Here is one from the speech of April 15, 1903. Having said that you can possibly be too protectionist; and that if it is possible to go too far, he explained the kind of protection he was opposed to, doing so in such a way that he could go to any city in Canada and stand by selections from his words. He says: "The protection that I am opposed to is the kind of policy that would protect the growing of tea in British Columbia or of icicles in the north. Well, what man outside of an asylum would suggest any such thing? No one ever did that I heard of. We want protection in this country the same as every other country in the world has it to-day, except Great Britain, and Great Britain is getting there pretty fast, especially in the last week. We do not want anything in the way of insanity in protection. You can be extreme and abuse anything; we all know that. But when one says that he is opposed to such a process, and takes that as an excuse for saying in one paragraph of a heterogeneous amendment that he is opposed to the principle of protection, the thing is too absurd to admit of discussion. The hon. member said, in that speech, that there may be extremes. Undoubtedly. But are there ex-

trêmes in the present tariff? If so, he is the father of them. He says: "Then there are extremes on the other side. There are people who, relying upon the sound principles of free trade, sound enough in their proper place—

He has never yet told us where that "place" is. He is disposed to carry them to a point which takes no account of the conditions. They seem to adopt a theory, and they say: You must carry out that theory regardless of what may be done elsewhere. Fix your own tariff policy, and never mind what is done elsewhere. Well, I am sure we cannot go as far as that. Commercial questions are every day occupying more attention in the field of public affairs. There is great rivalry among the nations; nay, there is commercial war, and in a contest of that character, it is not enough to have a good old theory; you must understand the methods whereby your opponent plays the game, so that you may be able, if necessary to modify your views.

Does any one suggest that that is not an admission of protective principle? What in the world does it mean? If other nations put up tariffs we have to do the same, then is it merely to secure revenue? What difference does it make to us, as regards our revenue, whether they put up their tariffs or not? If they put up their tariffs we have to do the same to protect the industries of this country, for if we did not those countries would have the advantage over us. There is as plain an admission in the hon. gentleman's speech of protection as human lips could utter, unless perhaps a plainer admission was uttered by the hon. member himself. Later, on he said:

We have endeavoured to give the country a tariff of stability.

Every year it was a question of "stability," as if there was any need of having stable taxes—a tariff which, in so far as a tariff has any relation to prosperity, has been an important factor in the development of Canada the last few years.

The tariff an important factor in the development of Canada! Is a tax an important factor in a country's development? Why is the tariff an important factor in development if it is not by reason of its protective effect? This speech is an admission of the principle of protection. On June 7, 1904, he said:

This tariff has included a considerable measure of incidental protection.

As I remarked last year, what in the world is the difference what adjective you ascribe to protection if you have the duty? What in the world is the difference what you call it?

—and in that respect it will command the admiration perhaps of some hon. gentlemen opposite who are more anxious for protection than some of us on this side of the House, I think. As to whether or not it is adequate protection—

Just listen to this. —we have some evidence of a gratifying character that the tariff, without being expensive, is high enough to bring some American industries across the line.

Gratifying? Not sorry as he is now; not holding up his hands in warning to them to stay away if they think they need protection. Gratifying? In those days he endeavoured to bring American industries across the line, and a tariff which is able to bring those industries into Canada looks very much more like a tariff which affords adequate protection. It certainly did. Now does the hon. gentleman want to say that it is not an admission of the principle of protection? Everybody knows it is. Everybody knows from the experience of fifteen years that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's believes in the principle of protection. If he does not believe in it how can any one account for his record during those fifteen years? He then expressed belief in it on platform after platform, and I have given credit to him for adhering to it still, notwithstanding the fact that he said he and his friends would follow an entirely different principle if returned to power. I have given him credit for it because I say it was far better for his party to

break a political pledge, dishonourable though it be, than to bring the industrial fabric of this country into ruin or semi-ruin. But the hon. gentleman went on:

If my hon. friends opposite wish to see some of the good results— Good results mind you— of the tariff let them go up to the city of Hamilton.

This is very interesting. —let them go to the city of Hamilton and look at the vast industries which have been established there by American capitalists who have come across the line under the operation of this tariff, and who are now engaged in carrying on very large businesses. Let them go to the city of Toronto and they will find similar organizations of American capital starting in the manufacturing business.

Starting under the tariff that he put on. How does that compare with my hon. friend's assertion now that if any company thinks it is going to get a tariff in this country to keep it going it had better stay out of Canada? And yet my hon. friend boasted when he was in office that by the tariff he had imposed, which he said was not only a protective tariff, but an adequately protective tariff—he had induced companies to come to Hamilton, Toronto and other places.

So, we are able to say that not only has the tariff been a great revenue tariff, but one which has afforded a reasonable degree of incidental protection and one which has brought about, as far as these industries are concerned, very gratifying results.

Continuing he said: This Government can be relied upon— And it could all right. —while guarding against monopolies, trusts, and combines to give reasonable aid to the legitimate industries of the country—

Now, did they give reasonable aid by taxation or by a protective tariff?

—and to adopt a tariff policy which will not only be a policy for the benefit of the manufacturers— This is the hon. gentleman who says he has never admitted the protective principle.

—but a policy which, while giving them all due consideration, will have regard also to the interests of every class and section of the people and of every province in this great Dominion.

I could go further, I could go from speech to speech, but I want particularly to refer to a speech that the hon. gentleman made when he introduced the increased woolen duties into this country.

An hon. MEMBER: What year was that? Mr. MEIGHEN: I think that was in 1904. The Finance Minister of that day had said some woolen firms were not well managed. He went on to say that the woolen industry of the country was in a very difficult position, that it was struggling because of the advantages that competitors in other countries had over it. He said he thought something ought to be done to help the woolen manufacturers, otherwise they could not get along. Then he made this statement:

The complaint is made very largely by our woolen manufacturers and by various public men who sympathize with them that although on the better grades of goods they can fairly compete with all persons, even the British manufacturer, a very large proportion of the imports of British woolen goods coming into Canada are really shoddy goods of an inferior character, against which we ought to legislate—

Bear that in mind—ought to legislate— and it is alleged that any increase which we might make in the woolen duties would have the effect of shutting out, not the purer woolen goods, but the shoddy goods. That is argued with much force, and I am inclined to believe that there is something in it.

That is, of course, very consistent with the idea that a tariff duty is only a tax to get money. However, we propose to deal with the matter in this way: Our present duty on the class of goods which I may describe as cloths, tweeds, overcoatings wearing apparel and goods of that character— These are the goods he increased the tariff on. Now just watch— is 35 per cent, subject to the preference, which brings the duty on British goods down to 23 1/3 per cent. We do not propose to increase the general tariff— It was 35 per cent. —but we propose to put a limit on the extent of which the preference shall apply to these goods. We propose to fix a minimum tariff of 30 per cent on this class of goods coming in under the preferential tariff. This change will apply to all woolen goods mentioned in the tariff item 394 with the exception of blankets, flannels, bed comforters, and counterpanes, which are placed in a group by themselves.

Raising the duty on woolen goods from Great Britain—and in the case of every other country it was 35 per cent—from 23 1/3 to 30 per cent because the woolen industry could not survive unless he did. And still he says now he has never admitted the principle of protection. He did the same in the case of twine and cordage, not binder twine—he raised the duties from 16 2/3 per cent up to 20 per cent because otherwise the industry could not survive. Now surely I have driven enough extracts home to show that not only in speech but in practice, in every single budget effort, straitly act, in every single budget effort of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's during the whole fifteen years he was in office he adhered consistently and determinedly to the protective principle. After he went out of office he made the same profession. Why he made it last year. He tells us now that while he would protect existing industries based on the natural resources—as he defined them in his speech—he would say to any industry that was going to start up, "If you are depending on protection, my advice is keep away, I would not have anything to do with you. But as to those that are here I do not object to protecting them because they will not want much protection." Does the House know that last year he stated precisely the opposite? Last year he intimated that as far as a new industry was concerned he would not mind it getting protection at all, but that as regards one that had become an industry of long standing he would not give it any. Where the infant had grown up, he said, and was beating the old man round the House he would let it take care of itself. He said he never did object to the protection being supplied to infant industries. The hon. gentleman went further and he said this last year: I do not want to insist that these departures from free trade are absolutely right, but I put them before my friends who are extreme free traders facts which I believe can be sustained.

ent with the idea that a tariff duty is only a tax to get money. However, we propose to deal with the matter in this way: Our present duty on the class of goods which I may describe as cloths, tweeds, overcoatings wearing apparel and goods of that character— These are the goods he increased the tariff on. Now just watch— is 35 per cent, subject to the preference, which brings the duty on British goods down to 23 1/3 per cent. We do not propose to increase the general tariff— It was 35 per cent. —but we propose to put a limit on the extent of which the preference shall apply to these goods. We propose to fix a minimum tariff of 30 per cent on this class of goods coming in under the preferential tariff. This change will apply to all woolen goods mentioned in the tariff item 394 with the exception of blankets, flannels, bed comforters, and counterpanes, which are placed in a group by themselves.

Raising the duty on woolen goods from Great Britain—and in the case of every other country it was 35 per cent—from 23 1/3 to 30 per cent because the woolen industry could not survive unless he did. And still he says now he has never admitted the principle of protection. He did the same in the case of twine and cordage, not binder twine—he raised the duties from 16 2/3 per cent up to 20 per cent because otherwise the industry could not survive. Now surely I have driven enough extracts home to show that not only in speech but in practice, in every single budget effort, straitly act, in every single budget effort of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's during the whole fifteen years he was in office he adhered consistently and determinedly to the protective principle. After he went out of office he made the same profession. Why he made it last year. He tells us now that while he would protect existing industries based on the natural resources—as he defined them in his speech—he would say to any industry that was going to start up, "If you are depending on protection, my advice is keep away, I would not have anything to do with you. But as to those that are here I do not object to protecting them because they will not want much protection." Does the House know that last year he stated precisely the opposite? Last year he intimated that as far as a new industry was concerned he would not mind it getting protection at all, but that as regards one that had become an industry of long standing he would not give it any. Where the infant had grown up, he said, and was beating the old man round the House he would let it take care of itself. He said he never did object to the protection being supplied to infant industries. The hon. gentleman went further and he said this last year: I do not want to insist that these departures from free trade are absolutely right, but I put them before my friends who are extreme free traders facts which I believe can be sustained.

He says here this week there are none talking free trade at all, and he seemed about to spring across the table of the House at my throat because I had suggested at Sherbrooke that there really was an issue against free trade in this country. Nobody, he says, is a free trader now.

I believe they justify a departure from free trade principles under certain conditions. If those conditions can be limited, if he can get anybody to start any new industry— Just listen to this. —under the circumstances under which these were started,— That is, the ones he started, as he explained in the previous part of his speech.

—If we can get anybody to start any new industry under the circumstances under which these were started, then I think myself that would justify a departure from the abstract principle of free trade.

(To Be Continued.)

MADE THE MOST OF IT

A famous big game hunter visited the Swazi one winter, and the king took a liking to him and loaned him on his first hunt, the court praiser. The praiser's business was to laud the king and the king's favorites. The white hunter on his expedition had had luck. He only shot a rabbit. But as he passed with his retinue through the Swazi village on his return the praiser marched before him chanting in a loud voice:

"The great white huntsman has killed a rabbit! Let all the Swazi people hear! It was as big as an ox, as fierce as a lion and as swift as a buck. The brave white huntsman killed it alone and unaided. He killed it with his thunder tube. Listen, ye people. The white huntsman has killed a rabbit! It was as terrible as a tiger, as large as an elephant, and yet the huntsman from afar the great white slayer he alone has killed it!"

That is, of course, very consistent with the idea that a tariff duty is only a tax to get money. However, we propose to deal with the matter in this way: Our present duty on the class of goods which I may describe as cloths, tweeds, overcoatings wearing apparel and goods of that character— These are the goods he increased the tariff on. Now just watch— is 35 per cent, subject to the preference, which brings the duty on British goods down to 23 1/3 per cent. We do not propose to increase the general tariff— It was 35 per cent. —but we propose to put a limit on the extent of which the preference shall apply to these goods. We propose to fix a minimum tariff of 30 per cent on this class of goods coming in under the preferential tariff. This change will apply to all woolen goods mentioned in the tariff item 394 with the exception of blankets, flannels, bed comforters, and counterpanes, which are placed in a group by themselves.

Raising the duty on woolen goods from Great Britain—and in the case of every other country it was 35 per cent—from 23 1/3 to 30 per cent because the woolen industry could not survive unless he did. And still he says now he has never admitted the principle of protection. He did the same in the case of twine and cordage, not binder twine—he raised the duties from 16 2/3 per cent up to 20 per cent because otherwise the industry could not survive. Now surely I have driven enough extracts home to show that not only in speech but in practice, in every single budget effort, straitly act, in every single budget effort of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's during the whole fifteen years he was in office he adhered consistently and determinedly to the protective principle. After he went out of office he made the same profession. Why he made it last year. He tells us now that while he would protect existing industries based on the natural resources—as he defined them in his speech—he would say to any industry that was going to start up, "If you are depending on protection, my advice is keep away, I would not have anything to do with you. But as to those that are here I do not object to protecting them because they will not want much protection." Does the House know that last year he stated precisely the opposite? Last year he intimated that as far as a new industry was concerned he would not mind it getting protection at all, but that as regards one that had become an industry of long standing he would not give it any. Where the infant had grown up, he said, and was beating the old man round the House he would let it take care of itself. He said he never did object to the protection being supplied to infant industries. The hon. gentleman went further and he said this last year: I do not want to insist that these departures from free trade are absolutely right, but I put them before my friends who are extreme free traders facts which I believe can be sustained.

He says here this week there are none talking free trade at all, and he seemed about to spring across the table of the House at my throat because I had suggested at Sherbrooke that there really was an issue against free trade in this country. Nobody, he says, is a free trader now.

I believe they justify a departure from free trade principles under certain conditions. If those conditions can be limited, if he can get anybody to start any new industry— Just listen to this. —under the circumstances under which these were started,— That is, the ones he started, as he explained in the previous part of his speech.

—If we can get anybody to start any new industry under the circumstances under which these were started, then I think myself that would justify a departure from the abstract principle of free trade.

(To Be Continued.)

### CHAMBERLAIN'S

THEY SATISFY WHEN OTHER LAXATIVES FAIL  
The action of Chamberlain's Tablets is surprisingly mild and gentle yet the effect is certain. They tone the liver and cleanse stomach and bowels. For persons of advanced years who experience difficulty in obtaining a satisfying laxative, Chamberlain's Tablets are unequalled.

### LINIMENT

#### The Markets

There were no new developments in the local market for live hogs yesterday owing to the fact that the offerings were light, and trade was quiet, with no change in prices to note, selected lots being quoted at \$10.50 per 100 lbs. weighed off cars, but the prospects are that they will be lower next week. The market for dressed hogs was about steady at the recent decline in prices noted, with a fair trade passing in small lots of city abattoir fresh-killed stock at \$19 to \$19.50 per 100 lbs.

A good steady trade continues to be done in all lines of smoked and cured meats, and the market was fairly active, with no change in prices to note, but the undertone was easy. Sales of 8 to 10-lb. hams were made at 35c per lb., 10 to 15 lbs. at 35c to 34c and 18 to 25 lbs. at 32c to 31c, while Windsor selected ed bacon sold at 49c to 50c per lb., and breakfast grades at 85c per lb. The demand for trimmed loins of fresh pork continues good, and prices rule about steady at 30c to 31c per lb., and trimmed shoulders at 18c to 19c per lb.

The market for live birds is about steady, but the volume of business shows little improvement on account of the fact that the demand was chiefly for small lots to meet actual wants, and sales of Canadian refined grades were made at 12 1/2c per lb. in 20-lb. wood pallets and 15c per lb. in 5-lb. boxes. The receipts of provisions yesterday were 4,182 packages lard, 206 boxes hams and bacon and 918 packages tinned meats.

Future quotations were:  
Open High Low Close  
Mess Pork, per bbl: \$17.30  
May ..... \$17.00  
July ..... \$17.00  
Lard, per 100 lbs.: \$9.95 \$9.60 \$9.42 \$9.60  
Sept ..... 9.75 9.90 9.75 9.90  
Short Ribs, per 100 lbs.:  
July ..... 9.90  
Sept ..... 9.90 9.97 9.90 9.97  
Cash prices closed: Pork, nominal. Lard, \$9.35. Ribs, \$9.25 to \$10.25

A good steady trade continues to be done in eggs for domestic consumption and the market in this respect is fairly active, with no changes in prices to note, but the feeling is reported steeper on account of the higher prices being paid in the country this week, which is claimed to be due to the fact that some export business has been done from here. The receipts yesterday were 1,508 cases, as compared with 2,461 for the same day last week and 2,876 for the corresponding day a year ago.

We quote wholesale jobbing prices as follows:  
Selected eggs ..... 33c to 34c  
Straight candled ..... 31c to 32c  
No. 1 stock ..... 29c to 30c  
No. 2 stock ..... 26c to 27c

The market for maple product was reported quiet, the demand for small lots being somewhat limited on account of the falling off in the consumption, but as supplies on spot are not large, a steady feel prevails and prices are unchanged, with maple syrup quoted at \$2.10 to \$2.25 per tin of one gallon, and light colored maple sugar at 22c to 23c per lb., and dark at 20c to 21c.

The offerings of potatoes for shipment from the country are light, but on account of the limited demand for car lots on spot, the volume of business is small and prices are nominally unchanged, with Green Mountains quoted at 75c to 80c and Quebec stock at 85c to 70c per bag of 90 lbs., extra-truck, while in a wholesale jobbing way they are selling at 85c to 90c per bag of 80 lbs., ex-store.

CHICAGO, May 27—Eggs, firm. Receipts 27,774 cases. Fresh gather ed extra firsts 27c to 28c; firsts 25c to 26 1/2c; State, Pennsylvania and nearby western hennery whites, firsts to extras 26c to 27c; State, Pennsylvania and nearby western hennery, browns, extras, 33c to 34c; do, gathered browns and mixed colors, firsts to extras 25c to 30c; storage packed, extra firsts: 29 1/2c to 28c; do, firsts 27c to 28c.

MADE THE MOST OF IT

A famous big game hunter visited the Swazi one winter, and the king took a liking to him and loaned him on his first hunt, the court praiser. The praiser's business was to laud the king and the king's favorites. The white hunter on his expedition had had luck. He only shot a rabbit. But as he passed with his retinue through the Swazi village on his return the praiser marched before him chanting in a loud voice:

"The great white huntsman has killed a rabbit! Let all the Swazi people hear! It was as big as an ox, as fierce as a lion and as swift as a buck. The brave white huntsman killed it alone and unaided. He killed it with his thunder tube. Listen, ye people. The white huntsman has killed a rabbit! It was as terrible as a tiger, as large as an elephant, and yet the huntsman from afar the great white slayer he alone has killed it!"


### DON'T DO THIS!



#### LEONARD EAR OIL

RELIEVES DEAFNESS and STOPS HEAD NOISES. Simply Rub It Back of the Ears and Insert in Nostril. Proof of success will be given by our druggists. MADE IN CANADA. ARTHUR LILES CO., Sales Agents, Toronto & London, Eng., 110 St. E., R. T. City.

For sale in Charlottetown by H. W. Tombs & Co., Two Macs and Reddin Bros.



### Sudbury A Tooke SOFT COLLAR

WITH THE TOOKE HOOK

### CLASSIFIED ADVERTISEMENTS

Advertisements under this heading, 2c per word for each insertion. Where copies come to our care to be forwarded, five cents must be added to cover postage, etc. Contractions count as one word, but five figures (as \$1,000) are allowed as one word. Check remittances to cover cost must accompany all advertisements. In no case can this rule be overlooked. Advertisements received without remittance cannot be acknowledged.

### FOR SALE

FOR SALE—HEAVY BROWN PA per, suitable for placing under carpet. 5 cents a roll at Guardian office.

### FARM FOR SALE — SPLENDID

farm of 44 acres at Milton, 6 miles from Charlottetown, near churches, school house and saw mill. Apply to L. Moore, Milton.

### MALE HELP WANTED

MAKE MONEY AT HOME — \$15 to \$60 paid weekly for your spare time writing showcards for us. No canvassing. We instruct and supply you with work. West-Angus Show Card Service, 67 X., Colborne Street Toronto.

### SALESMAN WANTED — SALESMAN

a self-respecting salesman whose ambition is beyond his present occupation might find more congenial employment with us and at the same time double his income. We require a man of clean character, sound in mind and body, of strong personality who would appreciate a life position with a fast growing concern where industry would be rewarded with far above average earnings; married man preferred. Apply to Mr. J. C. McLean, Bell second floor, Riley building, Queen St., opposite Prowse Brothers.

### TIRES RANGE LOWER THAN PRE-WAR RATES

Are automobile tire prices really low? A careful analysis indicates that they are—lower than pre-war prices, and considering mileage, lower than at any previous time in history.

### A GLIMPSE AT CANADA'S AGRICULTURAL WEALTH

A table given in the report of the Dominion Minister of Agriculture for the year ending March 31, 1921, places the value of all the field crops in that year at \$1,812,915,500 and the value of dairy products at \$247,531,352. The number of horses in the country is given as 3,667,304, the number of cows as 3,548,437, other cattle as 6,536,574, sheep as 3,421,958 and swine as 3,040,070. Except in swine these numbers are slightly in advance of those given in the previous year and swine are quoted as more numerous than in 1915, 1916, and 1917. A noteworthy statement is that in three years of the war the Imperial War Office was supplied under the supervision of the Dairy Branch of the Department with hay, oats and flour to the value of \$98,631,568, representing 481,250 tons of hay, 76,495,221 bushels of flour and 984,782,080 pounds of oats, for which approximately 24,000,000 bushels of wheat were required. Another statement of special interest is that the live stock that came under the supervision of the officers of the markets and intelligence division of the Live Stock Branch, during the year was in excess of \$200,000,000. During the year 3,788,138 pounds of wool were graded by the branch for farmers' co-operative organizations. The dairy business is shown to have developed greatly especially in the Prairie Provinces, where the output of creamery butter has increased in a decade from 5,478,304 lbs. to 25,356,711 lbs. The number of publications issued during the year by the Publication Branch of the Department was 2,400,000, including 200,000 market reports. A vast variety of information is given in the departmental reports, which details in a comprehensive, well directed way, the operations during the year of all the experimental farms and stations and all the branches and divisions.

### BLUEBARD TO BE TRIED

It now seems fairly certain that Henri Desire Landru, who, for the past 30 months, has been awaiting trial on charges of murder growing out of the disappearance, without trace, of eleven women to whom he had promised marriage, will come before the Versailles Assizes in July. Landru has become a great favorite with the warden owing to his unflinching good humor.

### ASTHMA USE RAZ-MAH

No Smoking—No Spraying—No Snuff Just Swallow a Capsule  
RAZ-MAH is Guaranteed  
to restore normal breathing, stop mucous gatherings in the bronchial tubes, give long nights of quiet sleep, contains no habit-forming drug, \$1.00 per box. Trial free at all druggists. Trial free at all druggists. Trial free at all druggists. Trial free at all druggists.

### Constipation

is quickly relieved when the liver is aroused to activity by the use of Dr. Chase's Kidney-Liver Pills. One pill's dose. 25c a box, all druggists.

### Dr. Chase's K & L Pills

### Constipation

is quickly relieved when the liver is aroused to activity by the use of Dr. Chase's Kidney-Liver Pills. One pill's dose. 25c a box, all druggists.