

RECIPROCI- TY ANENT RECIPROCI- TY

A Farmer Opposes Reciprocity

Editor, Farm and Dairy.—It is rather surprising to read in Farm and Dairy, to which as a weekly agricultural paper we are accustomed to look for impartial opinions, such biased arguments in favor of reciprocity. Listen to the conversations on the streets, in the markets, the country stores, and blacksmith shops, and you will need no further assurance that you are not voicing the sentiments of the majority.

The most apt comparison I have seen is that which compares the reciprocity terms offered us by the Americans to the Trojan horse. Everybody knows the story of the strategy resorted to by the Greeks to enter their city, and to take the city of Troy. They built an enormous horse, in which were concealed numerous warriors, and presented it to the enemy. The unsuspecting Trojans took the "gift" into the city, and in the night were attacked by the concealed soldiers, and Troy fell. It is just such a bargain we are being offered now, and to those who remember what our neighbors have been to us in the past the old Trojan proverb holds good: "I fear the Greeks, even bearing gifts!"

As it affects the farmer, the advantage which would accrue to the farmer under the proposed measure—our exceptional horse market in the West would be practically surrendered to the Americans. Our hog market would be ruined, as anybody can see who compares the average yearly market reports of Chicago and Montreal. We hardly appreciate the privilege of being allowed to send our wheat into a country which has already a considerable surplus of that commodity to export. The consignments of Chicago eggs which even under the existing tariff conditions slumped the Montreal market the other day, is a striking illustration of the future of that industry under the proposed change. Small wonder the vegetable growers are up in arms at the prospect, to say nothing of the Niagara fruit growers, who see ruin staring them in the face, because when they went to ask justice from their country their Premier told them they were "too late."

There are many other aspects of the case to be considered. The audacity of two men, unsupported by the mandate of the people, and without even consulting the 280 odd members of the House, taking upon themselves to draw up a trade compact which surrenders all our natural resources, is unparalleled.

As a crushing blow anybody can see that a measure which deals such a crushing blow to our manufacturers cannot help injuring the man who feeds the manufacturer and his thousands of employees. Our friend, Mr. Drury, objects to contributing to the making of Canadian millionaires. The American magnates will undoubtedly appreciate Mr. Drury's preference and his efforts on their behalf. If we are placed under the sway of the American combines—the Chicago beef trust of unswerving reputation, for instance—he will have ample opportunity to appreciate his blessings.

It is almost unanimously conceded that the proposed measure would be almost fatal to Imperial preference. That the Premier of this country should support, nay, inaugurate, such a measure seems incredible. But when we remember the man who in an unguarded moment exposed his hand and called Lord Dundonald a "for-

eigner" and a "stranger," his attitude is more easily explained.

LOSS OF NATIONAL SELF-RESPECT I fail to see the pecuniary advantages this measure would bring us; but were we to derive mercenary benefits unlimited it would be a poor return for the loss of our self-respect. Mr. E. B. Higgs says: "The history of the rise and fall of the Empires of the past furnishes us with too many sad evidences that the nation whose policy is swayed first and last by trade considerations is running its train into a broken bridge." In a letter written on the same subject in 1887, Col. Fred Dennison says: "I fail to see why we should throw in our lot with a people who produce more bank thieves and embezzlers than any other people on the globe; a people who care so little for the sanctity of the marriage vow, that 100 divorces have been granted in one city in a day. To do so would be national suicide. The appeals in favor of commercial union are all addressed to the pocket, and you gentlemen who advise it talk as if my countrymen would sell everything, dear to them for money. Believe me you entirely misunderstand my people."

Col. Dennison's words may be aptly applied to the present situation, and his faith in his fellow-countrymen would be borne out by the action of Mr. German and the other self-sacrificing men who see this is a time for party considerations to weigh in the same balance with national issues. And in this they have the bulk of patriotic Canadians at their backs.—Yours truly, R. E. BIRDSALL.

Peterboro Co., Ont.

Note.—In the foregoing letter Mr. Birdsall gives a strong presentation of the arguments of the opponents of reciprocity. As most of these arguments have been already answered in Farm and Dairy, no extensive refutation is here needed. That the great majority of farmers are in favor of the agreement is proven conclusively by the resolutions passed almost unanimously by all the important farmers' organizations of both eastern and western Canada. We must also disagree with Mr. Birdsall when he claims that by the agreement we will lose our national and imperial status. If a loss of such self-respect follows on larger trade we must have lost a lot of it in the last few years. In 1907 our total trade with Great Britain was \$98,985,000, and with the United States \$96,740,000. In 1910 our total trade with Great Britain had increased to \$234,819,000, but with the United States the increase was to \$324,792,000. At the same time, in spite of the great volume of our trade with the United States, there has been a steady growth in Canadian and Imperial sentiment. The question of our trade relations is an economic question purely, and it will add to the prosperity of our farmers the proposed reciprocity agreement should receive the support of all intelligent citizens.

Mr. Birdsall does not see the pecuniary advantages to follow reciprocity. A comparison of market quotations should convince any one of the advantages of free entry to the United States markets. Cheese, which sold in Canada last year at an average price of 10½ cents, averaged 14½ cents in the United States. Barley will bring at least 30 cents more under reciprocity. Already the price has gone up 10 cents under the influence of the prospects of free entry to the United States markets. Beans are 25 to 45 cents higher in the United States than in Canada. What a boon a free entry to United States markets would be to the bean growers of Southwestern Ontario, who even

now, handicapped by the tariff, sell their beans in the United States. Peas are 20 cents higher. Potatoes seldom go below Canadian prices, and quite frequently are 100 per cent higher. The potato market of the New England States would mean the regeneration of agriculture in many sections of the Maritime provinces. To compare prices of hogs on Montreal and Chicago markets is obviously unfair. As well might we compare prices on Toronto and Montreal markets and then condemn Ontario farmers and then condemn Ontario farmers for not shipping to the latter market. The difference comes in freight rates. The only true comparison is between hog prices on such

(Concluded on page 20)

Books on Alfalfa

The Book of Alfalfa by Coburn, Price \$2.00

Alfalfa in America by Jos. E. Wing, Price \$2.50

Worth their weight in Gold. Hand-somely bound, large books. You ought to have one or both of them.

BOOK DEPT. FARM & DAIRY PETERBORO, ONTARIO

GALVES RAISE THEM WITHOUT MILK Booklet Free Steels, Briggs Seed Co., Ltd., Toronto, Ont.

IF YOU HAVE 50 LOADS OF HAY



this summer would it pay you to handle them in the old fashioned way when a Louden Junior Sling Car with Centre Trip Slings would enable you to mow them away in one third or less time. Think of the saving of time and labor.

We make a full line of Hay Tools, Barn Door Hangers, Litter Carriers, Stalls, etc.

Write for our catalogue.

Louden Machinery Co. GUELPH, ONT.

INVESTIGATION OF ALL SEPARATORS EMPHASIZES IHC SUPERIORITY



You cannot afford to buy any separator without comparing it with others. You should not take chances. The closer you investigate all separators, the more you will see that IHC is superior. You will then know how much closer the IHC skims, how much longer it lasts, how much easier it is to clean, and how much easier it is to turn. There are no weak spots in an IHC Cream Harvester. IHC Cream Harvesters are the only separators with dust-proof and milk-proof gears, which are at the same time easily accessible. The frame of an IHC Cream Harvester is entirely protected from wear by phosphor bronze bushings. The IHC has large shafts, bushings, and bearings; it has a perfect oiling system; the flexible top-bearing of

IHC Cream Harvesters

is the strongest and most effective found in any separator; it has only one spring. IHC Cream Harvesters always run steady—without vibration. IHC Cream Harvesters are equipped with a patented dirt-arrester which removes the finest particles of dirt from the milk before the milk is separated. The crank is at the right height for easy turning, and the tank is at an easy height to fill. The IHC local dealer will be glad to point out the above features and many others. Made in two styles—Dairy and Bluebell—in four sizes. Write direct catalogue, or nearest branch office.



IHC Service Bureau The Bureau is a clearing house of agricultural data. It aims to learn the best ways of doing things on the farm, and then distributes the information. Your individual experience may help others. Send your problems to the IHC Service Bureau.

CANADIAN BRANCHES—International Harvester Company of America at Brandon, Calgary, Edmonton, Hamilton, Lethbridge, London, Montreal, North Bay, Ottawa, Regina, Toronto, St. John, Vancouver, Winnipeg, Yorkton. International Harvester Company of America Chicago (Incorporated) U.S.A.