NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS

This department of The Guide is maintained especially for the purpose of of providing a discussion ground for the readers where they may freely exchange views and derive from each other the benefits of experience and helpful suggestions. Each correspondent should remember that there are hundreds who wish to discuss a problem or offer suggestions. We cannot publish all the immense number of letters received, and ask that each correspondent will keep his letter as short as possible. Every letter must be signed by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication. The views of our correspondents are not of necessity those of The Guide. The aim is to make this department of great value to readers, and so letters not of public interest will be published.

WHAT IS THE NOISE ABOUT?

Editor, Grain Growers' Guide:—You will notice the noise in regard to the reciprocity agreement is not made by the producers whose products are being placed on the free list, and who will be in competition with like producers on the American side of the line. The noise is made by those who, not short-sightedly, see that the success of an open market in farm products, will soon lead to a more open market in manufactured goods. Railways will suffer, so say the wise. Would they have the producers of the three Prairie Provinces further taxed, in order to maintain a ten per cent. dividend on watered stock, as well as on cash invested? The C.P.R., we are told, had something over $30,000,000 profits in last year's business, and had the watered stock been removed and no dividends paid on watered stock, but confined to the actual cash invested, it is hard to say what the surplus would have been. The Western Provinces have built all the roads we have in the West, so far as finance is concerned, but do not own them, and we are compelled to pay dividends on as much watered stock as we pay on actual cash invested. Sir D. D. Mann is quoted to have said, "We need have no fear as to the existing railroads, as the increase of production will tax the existing railroads to their limit whatever competition may come into existence." Sir Wm. Mackenzie, has said in a first interview, that the tariff negotiation did not look good to him, and upon further information he said he could not see much the matter as Canada's hands were not tied in any manner and could be released at any time if desired. E. J. Chamberlin, general manager of the G.T.P., says there is nothing in the reciprocity agreement to cause alarm. If the Canadian railways do not get the grain to haul, it will be because the producer can do better by being allowed an open market and selling where he can do best, then it is up to the transportation companies, millers and others in the grain trade, to give us a square deal. Some of our statesmen are trying to make out that the agreement will not help the farmer in selling his grain. Why are the grain dealers and transportation companies so anxious to create a sample market if the proposed measure goes into effect, and why are they so much against a sample market if the measure does not go into effect? Surely any sane man can see through that little game, and so do they, (the grain dealers), that an open market which will allow the producer to sell his grain on the sample market in Minneapolis or Duluth, getting him away from the unfairness of the present grading system in Winnipeg, which is a tax on the producer from 2c. to 3c. on the higher grades and from 5c. to 7c. on the lower grades. The proofs of these statements are in this fact. Compare the Minnesota Grain Inspection Act, which governs the Dakotas, with the Manitoba Grain Inspection Act, and we have got the proof without argument. The Manitoba Grain Inspection Act demands that 1 Nor. shall contain 60 per cent. of hard Red Fyfe wheat, and the Minnesota Inspection Act demands that 1 Nor. shall contain fifty per cent. of hard wheat.

Now by observation it is found that the larger portion of our 3 Nor. as graded under the Manitoba Inspection Act, contains 50 per cent. or more of sound hard wheat. Now our 1 Nor. sells in Winnipeg from 8c. to-day to 10c. or 12c. in the past below 1 Nor. in Minneapolis, and our 3 Nor. sells below our 1 Nor. 6c., 7c. or 8c., whereas if it was sold on the Minneapolis market most of it should sell at the price of 1 Nor. If reciprocity goes into effect it will be the means of creating a sample market in Winnipeg, just what we, the Grain Growers, have been clamoring for, for years, but have been strongly opposed by all grain men and transportation companies. Some of the American statesmen and others, including J. J. Hill, claim it will not reduce the price of wheat to the American farmer. Now either our Canadian statesmen or our American statesmen are wrong—they cannot both be right. It is a settled fact, that if our wheat does not affect the Minneapolis market with a downward tendency, then it follows that we must get more for our wheat, without taking into account the gain made by having the privilege of selling on a sample market. If the above statements are correct, then there is just one conclusion to come to, that is, it will force the creation of a sample market here, and the above statement will stand all kinds of investigation. If, as Mr. Hill has said lately, the American grain men have exported fifty million bushels in the last year, and so long as America is an exporting country in wheat, and Liverpool the great centre as a wheat market, and all other markets are affected by its actions, **then in the name of common sense what difference does it make to the foreign dealer or to the Liverpool dealer whether Canadian wheat comes through American channels or through Canadian channels?** It is claimed, of course, that the Americans have mixing privileges which the Canadians have not, but just on this point we know without guessing, that to prove that statement to be correct in reality will require a great amount of explanation, in fact no amount of explanation will make us clear on this point. And it is safe to say that in the event of reciprocity going into effect that further mixing privileges will be demanded by the grain dealers here. And I would say in order to make a sample market a success in Winnipeg, it will be absolutely necessary to have special binding privileges in a government system of terminal elevators, and a mixing system recognized by the government and under the absolute control of an independent commission, and until such as outlined above has come into effect it will be impossible to have a successful sample market. It is impossible to create a successful sample market while private ownership exists in the terminals, and the same may be said so far as internals are concerned. If we can get a sample market carrying the advantages of Minneapolis and Duluth, in Winnipeg, our producers will get just as much for their grain passing through the Winnipeg sample market as they will get for it passing through the Minneapolis or Duluth sample markets. Now the great good to come from reciprocity is the fact that it will force our government, grain dealers and transportation companies into an action that will create and put into effect such conditions as will enable us to have a sample market in the city of Winnipeg. If reciprocity will bring such into effect it will be the means of saving to the producers of the Prairie Provinces from five to seven million dollars on every one hundred million dollars worth of wheat we have to sell, and I do not believe it is possible to get a sample market till we get reciprocity because our grain dealers know better than we do what a sample market means to the Western producer, that is, a sample market carrying the advantages of Minneapolis and Duluth. A sample market is our salvation.

Live Stock

Then take the question of live stock. We know as a matter of fact that for years some of our Western farmers have taken their cattle across that imaginary line, paid the duty and made a profit. With duty removed it will mean ten to fifteen dollars per head to the producer. That would mean better treatment for the farmers who did sell in the Winnipeg market and should mean that the city of Winnipeg would be compelled to take over the present stock yards and handle them in the same manner as the stock yards in Toronto are handled by the city of Toronto. When the C.P.R., who control the only stock yards here, found that new conditions warranted such an action, they will be ready to do so from the standpoint that it will pay them to do so. That is about the only way to get large corporations to change their systems, and when the city realizes that the new channels opened for the producer of cattle, is diverting the cattle trade that way, then the city will at once come to its senses and see that the producers and shippers in the future will be treated in a manner they are entitled to, which has not been the case up till the present time. I notice that figures have been quoted lately showing cattle to be as high or higher in Winnipeg than on the other side of the line, but the following figures show the fact. Winnipeg, Feb. 27th, showed the highest point for cattle $6.00. Chicago on Feb. 27th, highest point $6.50, a difference of 50 cents per hundred, and I am not sure but a greater difference could be shown if many other points were taken into consideration, and at many times in the past the difference has been greater than even this. As far as the hog question is concerned, at present our prices are about fifty cents per hundred higher than Chicago, and Buffalo is higher than Toronto or Montreal, or as high as Winnipeg, and when we go back over a term of years you will find that the average price on the American side has been much higher than ours and it is safe to say that it will be the case in the future, if there is no reciprocity. Reciprocity would mean a much steadier market in Winnipeg than we have had in the past. It is patent to every person who has studied up the hog question, that prices fluctuate and go down to such a low point that farmers would starve in the business when supply and demand would not warrant such conditions.

As to the horse trade, free trade will give us horses for farm purposes from $25 to $50 per head less than we are paying at the present time. Probably we have fifteen to twenty-five per cent. of our people raising horses for sale, but on the other hand we have seventy-five or eighty-five per cent. who have to buy them. Then we would say, the greatest good to the greatest number. I am informed to-day that good teams sold in Winnipeg the other day under the hammer, spot cash, from $600 to $800 per team. It goes without saying that farmers can raise horses at $25 per cent. less than the above prices and make money. It is acknowledged by all struggling farmers in the new parts of the country, that the horse question makes heavier demands on them than all other things they have to deal with, then surely it would not be fair to place any hindrance in the way of the producer getting his horses at reasonable prices.

The barley question has many features that strongly recommend the reciprocity proposed. Barley is the greatest solution of the noxious weed problem. Some say that duty removed from oats and corn will hurt us in coarse grains, but the duty has been removed from corn for some time and I do not think any person will claim it has hurt the oat trade. Now in the face of the above facts, how any body of men can take the stand that the arrangement will not help us as producers, is hard to reconcile indeed. Every man who produces something to sell should be allowed to sell his product where it best suits him, without hindrance. Surely it is very hard to show how we would be justified in keeping up restrictions between ourselves and our nearest neighbors, and over ninety million of people, that places them in the same position as if they were a thousand miles distant from us. Let us deal with our neighbors as if they were our neighbors, and let no man stop us. As to loyalty, my opinion of loyalty is to get the best conditions possible for the producer, the man who creates wealth, and let no body of men place toll gates in his path which will compel him to pay tribute to non-producers. **A contented people is a sure indication of loyalty.** I am sorry for those men who are so frightened of annexation. If we ever get annexation it is when Canada annexes the United States, and I am sure it is not necessary to be alarmed at this early date. I am sorry that our government did not go further into the matter of reduction in tariff on the many things we are compelled to pay taxes on, in a manner that the great plain people do not realize to the fullest extent, as to what it really means; for instance, when we buy a woollen shirt costing $1.30 you pay a dollar for shirt and 30 cents for tariff, and when we buy a spade we do the same thing; but when some person who does not produce, buys a valuable diamond, he pays no tariff. Of course the diamond is a very necessary article in production, which is the mainstay of the country, but agricultural implements or other necessary articles in production, such as the producer must have, would apparently not figure to any extent in production. Then we are not surprised that some great statesman in the past has said, "Do not attempt to tax directly in a manner that they, the great plain people, can readily understand to what extent they are being taxed, but you can place a tariff on everything he has to buy and you can tax the last rag on his back and he does not know it, thus you get the revenue you desire and there will be no discontent except to say that times are very hard." By what right should we interfere with the American people as to their action in allowing our producers free access to their markets. To say the least, it is hard to understand the actions of some of our wise men at this time. Would it not be safe to say that those protectionists are just as opposed to British preference as they are opposed to the reciprocity proposed?

JOHN KENNEDY.

Winnipeg.

THE COST OF THE TARIFF

Editor Guide:—I heartily endorse the idea of a vigorous organization campaign, as it is but too plainly evident that the Ottawa government is trying to dodge us farmers at every turn, and it is not at all hard to guess in which direction its sympathy lies. The "Farmers' Railway to Hudson's Bay" is another great idea. The Western farmers should all shout "Hurrah," and do our best to realize this railway. I just wonder how big a subsidy the farmers would get from the government to build this railway. The Guide asks for a list of yearly purchases by different individual farmers, in order to give an illustration of how much the protection tariff costs the farmer. Well here is what I bought during the year 1910:

		Duty
1 Drill	$110.00	$11.20
1 Landpacker	40.00	10.00
2 Gang plows	175.00	20.40
3 Eight-foot binders	545.00	57.75
6 Sections of harrows	35.00	3.40
4 Wagons	400.00	80.00
2 Wagon gears	130.00	26.00
4 Sets of harness	200.00	25.00
1 Gasoline engine	500.00	67.50
1 Grain crusher	55.00	10.50
25,000 ft. lumber	700.00	Free
Articles of clothing	500.00	60.00
Blacksmith tools and repair tools	150.00	20.00
1,800 lbs. binder twine	198.00	Free
Hardware	250.00	37.50
Woven fencing	75.00	5.00
Paint	60.00	10.00
	$4,233.00	$438.25

I raised the same season 20,000 bushels of wheat which grades No. 2 and No. 3 Northern at Winnipeg, and which European millers would like to buy at No. 1 Northern price and possibly pay a premium of a few cents per bushel. Now the question is, have we farmers a grievance or not? Mr. Laurier seems to think that we have not, that we are growing wealthy and doing very well indeed. I'll admit that a very few of us are doing fairly well, thanks to our undaunted energy and labor, risking all our yearly earnings and credit on the next year's crop, and while some of us have succeeded more of us have gone broke, and the majority of us are laboring and worrying how to pay interest on the mortgage on our farms, to say nothing about our instalments, and these are facts that I am sorry to say I have occasion to notice quite frequently. I am quite in line with a single tax on land values as a source of government revenue, and do away with the protective tariff. If the amount of revenue collected by our