

agreed to give, but it is not more than the farmers are entitled to. If resolutions of this nature are passed by each of the local branch associations and sent to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Western members at Ottawa it will do a great deal of good. Action should be immediate.

WILL MANITOBA FARMERS BE SILENT

We call the attention of our Manitoba readers to Mr. Scallion's manifesto in this issue on page 24 and also to Mr. Woods' letter on page 22. They should be read very carefully, because these men do not act without thinking, and they are deeply interested in the welfare of their province. Through the manipulations of the political parties in the Manitoba legislature the reciprocity agreement received a black eye in the resolution put through the legislature two weeks ago. As a matter of fact the legislature had no business to discuss reciprocity; they had no power in the matter whatsoever; it was never discussed when they were elected; they are not paid to dabble in federal matters; no member of the legislature in discussing the tariff could represent more than his own personal opinion, and they wasted the time and the money of the province in discussing a subject that was entirely beyond their jurisdiction. We do not believe that the men who voted against reciprocity represent even their own opinions, but that they were hoodwinked by an appeal to party loyalty. There is no credit coming to the opposition in the Manitoba legislature for introducing the reciprocity resolution, because they did it merely for party advantage and to embarrass Mr. Roblin and Mr. Rogers who had given public expression against reciprocity, or to assist their friends at Ottawa. However, that does not excuse the action of the country members who voted against reciprocity, and we think they should be called to give an account to the men who elected them. This is a case where action should be taken not by the men who voted **AGAINST** these members at the last election, but by the men who voted **FOR** them. The men who supported at the last election these members who have voted against reciprocity did so because they believed in the general policy of the government—but they did not believe in protection. The men who voted against reciprocity in the legislature were: Hon. Hugh Armstrong, James Argue, B. L. Baldwinson, Jos. Bernier, A. H. Carroll, Hon. C. H. Campbell, Hon. R. P. Roblin, Hon. Robert Rogers, Hon. G. R. Coldwell, Wm. Ferguson, O. I. Grain, J. G. Harvey, Hon. J. H. Howden, S. Hughes, George Lawrence, R. F. Lyons, A. M. Lyle, D. H. McFadden, L. McMeans, F. Y. Newton, A. Prefontaine, J. C. W. Reid, J. Riley, H. C. Simpson, George Steel, T. W. Taylor. Some of these men represent city constituencies, but the majority of them represent farmers of Manitoba. We believe that these men should explain their action to the men who voted for them. If they were merely representing their own personal opinion it was their privilege to do so, but they had no warrant to claim to represent the feelings of the men who voted for them at the last election. It is time that both parties in the legislature were told to pay attention to provincial matters and to leave federal matters to the men who are elected and paid for the purpose of looking after them.

Barley in Winnipeg is worth 57 cents; in Minneapolis 93 cents. Canadian farmers are giving up raising barley because it will not pay. The new market and the high price will give a stimulus to barley raising. There is no better crop to clear up weedy land. The wiping out of the duty on barley will mean dollars in the pocket of every farmer in the West who grows grain. Support reciprocity.

MR. SIFTON'S BETRAYAL

Hon. Clifford Sifton, the member for Brandon and former minister of the interior, on February 28 delivered an address in the House of Commons in opposition to the reciprocity agreement. He reiterated the same arguments which have been used by the manufacturers, the corporation magnates and financiers, and declared that he would fight against reciprocity. Mr. Sifton carries no weight in Western Canada today. In the early days of his political career he watched the interests of the West, but since he has been at Ottawa he has done more for Mr. Sifton than for anybody else. He is now one of Canada's wealthiest men and is entirely out of touch and out of sympathy with the Western Canadian people. His interests are with those of the big corporations and financiers of the East and it is their views that he presents. It is to be hoped that the men of Brandon constituency who supported Mr. Sifton at his last election will rise in their indignation at his betrayal and repudiate his action. Indeed they might even go so far as to demand his resignation, because he no longer represents the people of Brandon constituency. In view of the strenuous opposition being made in financial centres against the reciprocity agreement the executive officers of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association decided last week that something should be done to counteract such influence and indicate to the powers at Ottawa that the people of Manitoba were in favor of reciprocity. On March 2 the executive met and passed the following resolution:

WHEREAS the Hon. Clifford Sifton from his place in the House of Commons, on February 28, claiming to speak for the West, declared that reciprocity with the United States was not in the interest of the Western people; AND WHEREAS the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, the Winnipeg Board of Trade, and the Manitoba Legislature, by resolution, have also, in the name of the West, declared against reciprocity;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that we, the executive officers of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, emphatically assert that the above mentioned gentlemen and public bodies, by their public utterances and resolutions upon the question of reciprocity, have absolutely misrepresented popular opinion in Manitoba;

AND WE FURTHER DECLARE and reaffirm that the tariff resolution placed before the government by the Canadian Council of Agriculture on December 16, 1910, is a correct representation of the opinions of the people of Manitoba today;

AND WE FURTHER DECLARE that the people of Manitoba will not be satisfied with anything short of the following action by the Canadian parliament during the present session:

1. The ratification of the reciprocity agreement now before parliament;
2. The complete abolition of duties upon agricultural machinery and implements;
3. An increase in the British preference to fifty per cent. of the general tariff.

This resolution indicates the true feelings of the people of Manitoba and deserves the endorsement of every local branch association in the province.

COCKSHUTT FAVORS RECIPROCITY

It is very refreshing to know that all the manufacturers of Ontario are not of one mind in fighting reciprocity. Mr. Frank Cockshutt, president of the Cockshutt Plow Co., Brantford, expresses himself in a letter to the Globe, on February 27, as decidedly in favor of free trade in natural products. He says:

"I would like to express disagreement with the attitude of many business men and boards of trade on the reciprocity question, and to affirm my opinion that free trade with the United States in natural products will be of great material advantage to this country."

Mr. Cockshutt does not see eye to eye with the self-appointed champions of imperialism. His idea is that:

"Loyalty to the British Empire is founded upon two main principles: (1) The sentiment of respect and affection to the land that gave us

being; (2) The liberty to govern our country and develop its resources in our own way."

He says that "reciprocity with United States violates neither of these principles," and that "freer trade with United States in natural products in some form is inevitable, and that in the near future." Mr. Cockshutt is very outspoken on the subject and declares that "the proposed reciprocity pact is in its form and terms remarkably free from objections from the Canadian standpoint," and he adds:

"Why, in the name of common sense, should we not accept the commercial privileges now offered, which will so greatly stimulate production, extend commerce and promote the prosperity of Canada?"

Why, indeed! Mr. Cockshutt believes that the "extraordinary wave of opposition unsupported by argument" will soon spend itself, and "the common sense of the people rise above all prejudice and sectional feeling." He challenges the big financiers of Toronto to answer a recent query and to explain:

"If a financier can use his present privilege of trading freely in the money markets of United States and remain loyal, why cannot a farmer sell his wheat in the free market of the United States and remain loyal?"

This concluding statement by Mr. Cockshutt is a complete exposure of the hypocrisy of the Toronto financiers. They cannot answer it. They flap the flag and talk annexation at the same time that they are sending Canadian money into United States and starving Canadian industry. Canadian financiers invest their money wherever they can secure the best returns, but of course it would not be loyal if the farmer should get a better price for his grain. Oh, no! We suggest that Sir Edmund Walker, president of the Bank of Commerce, explain his loyalty in view of the money which his bank sends across the line to finance American industry. Mr. Cockshutt has taken a broad-minded view of the situation, and he makes a lot of the opponents of reciprocity look ridiculous.

One Northern wheat at Minneapolis ranges from 4 to 12 cents above Winnipeg prices for the same grade. Just now it is about 9 cents. But 2 Northern Manitoba wheat is a better milling wheat than the Minnesota 1 Northern. Opponents of reciprocity are busy explaining that the Canadian farmers will get no better price for their wheat. The same stamp of men a few years ago said that the farmers would never reduce the spread between "street" and "track" wheat by which the elevator combine became wealthy. They were bad prophets then and are yet.

Martin Burrell, M.P. for Yale and Cariboo, B.C., opposed reciprocity in the house two weeks ago because it would injure the fruit industry. He said the fruit growers had to pay duty on all they bought so should have protection upon their own industry, or else the whole tariff should be wiped out so that the fruit grower could buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest market. That is just what the farmers want to see ultimately. It would be well for the fruit growers in Canada to join hands with the other farmers and demand the removal of protection from the manufacturers.

The reciprocity agreement means that farm horses will come into Canada from the Western States. The struggling farmer in Western Canada will be able to buy them at from \$50 to \$100 less per team. Support reciprocity. The horse industry in Western Canada will not suffer. The demand for good horses is never ending in this country.

If we remember rightly was not Mr. A. M. Lyle, M.P.P., who voted against reciprocity in the Manitoba legislature two weeks ago, the same gentleman who went to Ottawa with the big delegation last December and voted in favor of reciprocity?