

THE EDMONTON BULLETIN

Published every Monday and Thursday by the Bulletin Company, Ltd., at the office, Bulletin Building, 318 Jasper Avenue East.

SUBSCRIPTION.

One year to Canadian or British post office address, \$1.00
Six months to Canadian or British post office address, .50
One year United States post office address, \$2.00
Six months United States post office address, 1.00
All subscriptions are payable in advance.
Classified advertising one cent per word; four insertions for price of three; and six insertions for price of four.
Notice of Estray Cattle for insertion, \$1.00.

JOHN HOWEY, Managing Editor.
F. C. HAYES, Business Manager.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1911.

RECIPROCITY OR RESTRICTION.

J. A. Currie, Conservative member for North Simcoe, speaking in the House of Commons, December 17, 1909 (Revised Hansard P. 1715):

"The Americans send thousands of bushels of potatoes into Canada because their potato crop ripens earlier than ours, and yet the Canadian farmers in New Brunswick are practically prohibited from sending potatoes into the United States."

Every Conservative should vote for reciprocity.

REDUCTION NEEDED, BUT WRONG.

The Montreal Gazette says the Federal taxes levied in the customs houses are responsible in part for the high cost of living. The truth will come out once in a while—even from an anti-Reciprocity is a proposal to reduce the tax rate and the amount of taxes collected. But the Gazette objects to the reduction. Why?

FAKIRS.

Mr. R. B. Bennett is throwing eloquent fits before Calgary audiences in his supposed zeal for trade between Canada and Great Britain. This has caused some one with a memory to remark that it is not long since Mr. Bennett equally emphatically declared: "I don't believe in building up Yorkshire woollen mills." It may be added, it is not so very long since the Parliamentarians to were declaring to the world that British-made cloth was absolutely unfit for use, being infested with disease germs. The language of these gentlemen past and present is absolutely inconsistent with itself, with the facts and with common sense. But their conduct is perfectly consistent. In denouncing reciprocity they are serving the same ends and the same masters as when they condemned the British preference and labelled British manufactures. In both cases they are vindicating the "traditional alliance"—as The Toronto News once aptly put it—which has existed and does exist between the class which profits through privilege and the politicians who profit through defending privilege. Whatever affects the "special interests" or seeks to weaken their grip upon the industry and trade of the Dominion is sure of the warmest denunciation from Mr. Bennett and his class. Whether in denouncing it they use language which libels the American people and their President and makes for ill-feeling between the people of that country and this, is purely a matter of adapting words to ends. Language with an anti-British tinge comes to their lips quite as freely as language with an anti-Yankee complexion when the circumstances of the case require it. It is simply a matter of adapting language to the end to be attained, and in that Mr. Bennett is something of an expert.

SIR THOMAS IN TROUBLE.

Sir Thomas Shaughnessy has begun his anti-reciprocity campaign—if that be the object of his western trip, by an unfortunate "break." In Winnipeg he denied that Mr. J. A. M. Aikins—who is running as an "anti" candidate in Brandon—is a solicitor for the C.P.R. Someone has hunted up a copy of the Winnipeg Telegram two weeks old and found therein a report of a speech in which Mr. Aikins explicitly declares that he is a solicitor for the C.P.R., but will give up the job if he gets elected.

There seems to be as much uncertainty about when one is or is not a C.P.R. solicitor as over the kindred problem of when one is or is not a commissioner of the city of Edmonton.

Sir Thomas says Mr. Aikins is not a C.P.R. solicitor and Mr. Aikins says he gave up the position twelve months ago. But two weeks ago Mr. Aikins told a public audience that he still had the position. An expert definition of the relations of Mr. Aikins to the C.P.R. seems to be urgently needed, in the interests of Mr. Aikins and Sir Thomas as much as of anybody. If it is permissible, may we put in a word for the learned city solicitor of Edmonton.

This gentleman—beside his former training in navigating the curvatures of legal phraseology—has recently had a considerable experience in this particular matter of determining whether an official is still an official, if not why not, and if so what steps are necessary to make him no longer such. The benefit of this experience should not be lost either to the worthy solicitor or to the world, and if Sir Thomas and Mr. Aikins cannot of themselves determine in just what relation they stand to each other, the city might be induced to lend them—for a reasonable time and a fair consideration—the services of its expert on the severance of official relationships.

Meantime the public are pretty likely to conclude that Mr. Aikins knows whether his relations with the C.P. are such as warrant him in sending an occasional account to the cashier of that concern with reasonable assurance of an early and satisfactory response, and are likely to take the former statement of Mr. Aikins in preference to the latter. The former statement was made voluntarily, the latter under circumstances which made it politically advisable to deny any dependence upon the C.P. and obligation to that company. If, therefore, the people of Brandon persist in believing that the anti-reciprocity candidate there is still on the pay of the C.P.—as he said two weeks ago he was—that gentleman will have himself to blame for it and for the consequences of it. And should Sir Thomas find that even his knightly assurances do not completely dispel this unfavorable impression, the fault cannot be fairly charged to those he is said to be trying to beat. They simply took Mr. Aikins at his word, freely and even boastfully given from the public platform. If Sir Thomas came out openly and said that he had "fired" Mr. Aikins for making this untimely admission he might gain credence, and also some added reputation as a man of judgment. The admission was not a good one for a candidate to make—and if Mr. Aikins is given to making damaging admissions on the stump he may not be altogether proof against making them in court. That he ought to be "fired" may be a reasonable contention; but that he has been dissociated with the company has yet to be established.

THE REAL BOURASSA.

Toronto Globe: Mr. John Boyd of Montreal has come up to Ontario to give a certificate of character to Mr. Henri Bourassa and the Nationalist movement. Mr. Boyd has been known heretofore as a Conservative newspaper writer and the author of some very good verse. He has become a great admirer of Mr. Bourassa, and in an interview in The Toronto World says that "it has served the purpose of a number of Liberal organs to represent Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Monk as trying to form a party based on racial and religious prejudices. Mr. Bourassa has, however, solemnly declared that his object is not to isolate his compatriots from the rest of the Dominion, but simply to have them consider and solve public questions from the point of view of Canada's interests and to work with English-speaking Canadians for the upbuilding of the Dominion. Mr. Monk, too, has emphatically declared on all occasions that the movement does not appeal to race and religion, but to Canadian patriotism throughout the Dominion."

Let us take that as Mr. Boyd's certificate to the chief of the Nationalists in refutation of the assertion that he is anti-British. There is no need to go far afield to prove that Mr. Bourassa is not the patriot Mr. Boyd pictures him, but a propagandist of French-Canadian nationalism with a distinct goal in view—the separation of Canada from the Empire and the refusal until that separation shall take place of any effective help toward the defence of the Empire. He captains a party the most prominent members of which have gone even farther, and openly expressed their purpose of setting up in Quebec a French State independent of the Dominion. They not only propose to sever the Imperial tie, but they propose also to follow that up by breaking in pieces the Canadian confederation.

And now for the proof. Mr. Bourassa quarreled with Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1900 over the question of sending Canadian volunteers to fight for the Empire in South Africa. In a speech delivered in Montreal on October 20, 1901, the Nationalist leader said:

"What I should wish is that between the old English frigate about to sink and the American corsair preparing to pick up its wreckage we should manoeuvre our bark with prudence and firmness, so that it will not be swallowed up in the vortex of the one or be carried away in the wake of the other. Let us not sever the chain too soon, but let us not rivet its links too closely."

"I am not referring to the situation

which the triumph of Imperialist ideas would impose on us. If the partisans of such ideas should gain the upper hand, oh! then I would say: 'Forward! Let us be independent without hesitation.'"

Here we are told that the British Empire, "the old English frigate, is about to sink." That is strange language in war time for a friend of Britain. By 1903 Mr. Bourassa had decided what the sequel to the sinking of the old English frigate would be, for in a pamphlet published by him in that year as to the relations of the French-Canadians and the British Empire he said: "Independence is in our eyes the natural crowning of our destinies."

Mr. Armand Lavergne, Mr. Bourassa's first lieutenant, was even more explicit. In an article published in Le Nationaliste on July 16, 1905, Mr. Lavergne said:

"When we shall be sufficiently numerous and strong the Franco-American race will also wing its flight, independent and unmixed, to play in the new world the glorious and sublime role played in Europe by France."

On August 12, 1905, there appeared in La Verite, then edited by Mr. Omer Heroux, who now edits Le Devoir, Mr. Bourassa's organ, an article in which it was stated that "we believe the constitution of an autonomous French State is our logical destiny."

Will the loyal Conservatives of Ontario, who are asked to take Mr. Boyd's kindly view of Mr. Bourassa and his followers and to join with them as close political allies, read Armand Lavergne's statement two or three times and let it soak in: "When we shall be sufficiently numerous and strong the Franco-American race will also wing its flight, independent and unmixed, to play in the new world the glorious and sublime role played in Europe by France."

Is there any doubt at all that Bourassa leads a crew that is but waiting a convenient season to scuttle the good ship Canada after "the old English frigate" sinks, and set up a French State, "independent and unmixed," on the banks of the St. Lawrence?

In the name of Imperial unity the Conservative leaders call upon their followers to march to the polls with Bourassa and Monk and Lavergne and Heroux and vote to destroy Laurier, who is hated by the Nationalists because he insists that Canada shall do her share by land and sea in the defence of Canada as an integral portion of the British Empire. Was there ever in the history of Canada so notorious, so open and shameless an illustration of political hypocrisy? The loyal people of Ontario cannot thus be hoodwinked.

The Saskatchewan Capital is opposed to reciprocity because it thinks that when a car goes south loaded with Canadian wheat it will come back loaded with the products of United States factories. The railways, the Capital explains, could afford to pay the duty on the manufactured articles for the sake of getting the return freight rates on the contents, and the farmer would thus get his manufactured goods, in part at least, duty free. Terrible, isn't it?

FEELING VERY BAD.

Some Opposition sympathizers more rich in nerve than in judgment tried to disturb the Liberal meetings at Fort Saskatchewan on Friday evening and at Lacombe on Saturday evening. Both attempts were abortive, and therefore altogether to the advantage of the reciprocity cause. Efforts to break up a meeting serve only to advertise the fact that the disturbers are afraid to allow the arguments of the other side to be properly presented. If they have any effect at all it must be to gain sympathy for the speakers whose views are so much feared by their opponents, as well as to create disgust in the minds of unprejudiced people with those who seek to prevent their hearing a fair presentation of what the speakers have to say for their side of the case. Such tactics, too, are not usually indulged in when the disturbers can find anything to do which seems likely to promote their chances of winning. That the Opposition are now in the disposition to create disturbance rather than to allow a proper discussion of the reciprocity question only serves to show that they know they are beaten and that the knowledge has put them in very bad humor.

AN EFFECTIVE CAMPAIGNER.

Mr. Bennett has made another speech on reciprocity; and the prospect of Mr. Van Wart's election is correspondingly brightened.

The campaign against reciprocity has produced some triumphs in the way of self-deceiving speeches, but that the latest effort of Mr. Bennett has been surpassed or will be surpassed in the deadly onslaught it makes upon itself is not probable. Examining

this speech as it is reproduced in the Calgary Herald it seems unlikely that from any portion of it there can be selected a principle or a maxim, an argument or a presentation of fact, which in some other portion is not inferentially repudiated or deliberately slaughtered. Naturally the net result of this process of oratorical suicide is to reduce the whole thing to zero, and thus to leave Mr. Bennett that much poorer in wind and Mr. Van Wart ahead by the count of one more unsuccessful attempt to criticize the cause for which he stands.

As the first point in his argument, Mr. Bennett laid it down that reciprocity was not necessary to secure the admission of Canadian products into the United States, because the United States would remove the duty anyway, being hard pressed for farm products. Grant this, and what becomes of the ensuing laboriously constructed argument that the people of the United States have more farm produce than they know what to do with, and that under reciprocity they would be able to flood this country with their surplus? Grant it, and what does Mr. Bennett stand as opposed to? Simply to the reduction of the Canadian duty on a large number of articles, manufactured and other, of which the Canadian people now import considerable quantities from the Republic, paying duty on them; in other words, his stand is against a reduction in the Canadian tariff, a reduction, that is, in the tax rate and in the total amount of taxes raised.

Mr. Bennett's second point is that if the agreement were once accepted it could not be cancelled by Canada, because if it were cancelled the United States would put up a ninety per cent duty against us and "We would be no longer independent." That somehow does not seem to fit the rest of the speech. If he made himself clear, what Mr. Bennett was trying to establish was that Canada can be independent of the United States only while there is a good high tariff wall between them, and the higher the wall the more independent we would be. Well, if that is so, how could the imposition of a ninety per cent tariff wall reduce us to dependence? If admission to the United States markets would destroy our fiscal freedom how could exclusion from those markets also destroy our fiscal freedom? If the English of Mr. Bennett is the English spoken by the rest of us, the whole purpose of his speech was to prove that the best thing for Canada is to have as little to do as possible with the people across the line. That way he says lies fiscal independence, high wages for our industrial employees, cheap living for the consumer, and good prices for the products of the farmer. Well if the way to create this economic Utopia is to cut ourselves off from the rest of the world and to live by ourselves, what more could Mr. Bennett desire or hope for than that the United States should put up a "Hamm's gallows" tariff at once all along the line and keep it up consistently and eternally?

Mr. Bennett's third complaint against reciprocity is that it would reduce the cost of living in Calgary. Under reciprocity, he says, the consumer would have the chance of buying from the Alberta farmer if he grew what the consumer wanted and offered it at a price the consumer was willing to pay—and if not, then the consumer could buy from a farmer across the line. Of course if the Calgary consumer really thinks his living is costing him less than he should pay, or would like to pay, this argument may enlist him in Mr. Bennett's following. But it is not really necessary that he should vote against reciprocity in hope of bringing about the desired boost in his household expenses. If he wants to pay more for his flour and his meat then he is now paying it is likely his grocer and his butcher will be able to arrange matters for him if he will mention the desire to them, even after reciprocity comes into force.

Fourthly, says Mr. Bennett, the farmer cannot fix the price of a commodity which he exports. Well, outside of the asylum nobody has said he could. If the farmer could fix the price of what he exports it would not matter to him if he had only one export market so long as that market was large enough to consume his surplus. It is just because he cannot fix the price that the farmer needs access to all the export markets he can get, and the benefit which at times it to be had by selling in one market rather than in another.

As a campaigner Mr. Bennett is singularly effective. Few men in all Canada have a larger gift of that peculiar talent which makes votes for the other man. In the present campaign he seems to be working this part of his abilities at full pressure. If he can only be kept going on reciprocity for three weeks longer Mr. Van Wart should win handsomely.

IGNORANCE VS. KNOWLEDGE.

Lethbridge Herald—Mr. B. Bennett says reciprocity will ruin the packing business, but Pat Burns, the greatest packer in Alberta, says he has no fears. The Tories say that reciprocity will ruin the milling business, but D. B. Wood, one of Canada's leading millers, says that it is not true. The anti-reciprocity people say reciprocity will ruin the sheep business, but Henry Askell, Parkinson Bros., and other leading sheep breeders hold up both hands for reciprocity. The opponents of the pact say that it will ruin the western cattle business, but Ray Knight, Geo. Lane, Pat Burns, D. Isakovski, Archie Jackson and the other great cattle men of the west, say it will be a great benefit. The Tory campaigners say it is the thin edge of the wedge that will ruin the manufacturers, but Messrs. Tudhope, of Orillia, Hallis, of Brockville; Muir, of Brantford; Wright, of Hamilton; Stevens, of Chatham; Maxwell, of S. Marys; Caldwell, of Perth; Campbell, of Hepworth; Harrison, of Owen Sound; Mitchell, of Guelph; and a host of other prominent manufacturers, say that the increased markets and larger demands will be of great benefit to the manufacturers. The opponents of the pact say it will ruin the lumbermen, but such men as Peter Lund, of Wardner, B.C.; A. E. Dymond, of Algonia; Harrison, of Owen Sound, and Chew, of Midland, declare to the opposite. That reciprocity will injure the fishermen is the claim of the opponents of reciprocity, but Alram Ernst, A. V. Conrad, and other leading fish men, say it is the hope of the business and will double the prosperity of the fishermen. The Tories say reciprocity will not benefit the farmers, but the great body of agriculturists of the country demand it, and are now supporting it as a means of increasing their markets, prices, and general prosperity. All through it is a case of opposition in ignorance and support in knowledge.

LOYALTY.

Toronto Globe—In a most shocking way the News has libelled Mr. J. W. Flavell. It says that under reciprocity "the Canadian packer will be able to cross the line and buy American hogs whenever the Canadian prices are too high to suit him." He will be able, but will he? The News ought to know that Mr. Flavell is far too good a Britisher to buy Yankee hogs at any price. No, no, the motto of the packers is "patriotism and adequate profit on Canadian-born hogs."

TREASON.

Regina Leader—Like the constitution of Macleod, the whole province of Saskatchewan is, according to R. L. Borden, seething with treason and disloyalty. Both the premier and the leader of the opposition favor reciprocity, and are therefore annexationists. The opposition "legislative" assembly has gone over to the enemy, and has declared for reciprocity, which Borden says means annexation. The outlook for the province is bad. Borden had better send his trusty lieutenant Bourassa up here to save it.

MINNESOTA AND MANITOBA LAND.

Winnipeg Free Press—The senate report on comparative prices in the United States and Canada is made much use of by the opponents of reciprocity wherever it appears to support their contentions. We notice, however, that they are not saying much about the relative prices of improved farm lands on both sides of the line as set forth in this document. These show values of \$19 an acre in Iowa; \$37 an acre in Wisconsin; \$46 an acre in Minnesota; \$29 an acre in Manitoba; \$22 an acre in Saskatchewan, and \$29 an acre in Alberta.

Why the difference in the price of farm lands in Manitoba and Minnesota, which adjoin one another? The Manitoba land is more fertile than that of Minnesota, and raises larger crops; yet it is worth on an average \$17 an acre less.

There is only one explanation. The Minnesota farmer has access to the ninety-million American market, and the Manitoba farmer hasn't.

Weekly Bank Clearings.

The Canadian bank clearings for the week ending August 31, 1911, as compared with the corresponding week of 1910, are as follows:

	Aug. 31, 1911.	Sept. 1, 1910.
Montreal	\$2,296,939	\$48,850.85
Toronto	30,828,788	24,822,062
Winnipeg	17,784,372	11,294,883
Vancouver	5,668,672	8,402,161
Ottawa	5,569,949	3,181,095
Calgary	2,435,473	2,369,151
Quebec	2,397,514	2,144,232
Victoria	2,222,611	1,900,000
Hamilton	2,060,458	1,839,874
Halifax	1,432,631	1,458,016
St. John	1,241,052	1,382,809
Edmonton	1,904,409	1,084,907
London	957,008	909,759
Regina	1,289,089	806,611
Brandon	415,792	414,201
Totals	116,295,629	102,168,729
Lethbridge	472,307	
Saskatoon	1,236,655	
Brantford	470,133	
Moore Jaw	692,740	

KING OR PRINCE.

TO VISIT CANADA.
Canadian Associated Press.
London, Sept. 4.—The Evening Times understands that either King George or the Prince of Wales will visit Canada during Duke of Connaught's period of office as governor general of Canada.

For bowel complaints in children always give Chamberlain's Colic, Cholera and Diarrhoea Remedy and castor oil. It is certain to effect a cure and when reduced with water and sweetened is pleasant to take. No American doctor prescribes a better remedy. For sale by dealers everywhere.

TH

Bulletin Staff Correspondent.
The Grande Prairie Union lands opened charge of A. S. Mac assistant land agent of land office, while John Ellerslie and Strathmore Grande Prairie as heritor. Two other clerks of Prairie land office will. For the present the



GRANDE PRAIRIE Union members. The group consists of several men and women, some standing and some sitting, in an outdoor setting.

established in a house of John Wilson, on the Bear Creek, but an office was erected later, probably townsite near Grande office. This office will be the office of the Grande Prairie land district, will before part of the Peace River district with head office. The Grande Prairie is bounded on the east by meridian, on the west by the boundary of British Columbia, and includes the land south of township 61. D. business of the Peace River district, which is handled from the Grande office.

About fifty people from the land office door came on day, July 15, and the appearance of the open door. At the open door opened and as the office door each man number.

The rush and anxiety were over and the men



The Members of the Grande Prairie Union. The group consists of several men and women, some standing and some sitting, in an outdoor setting.

pleasantly chatting till number was called and the office.
The lucky No. 1 was a native of Ohio, an expert at Grand Rapids, Michigan, and Los Angeles, California, all the way from the Peace River Crossing to the town of Grande Prairie, but is now happy for new territory for the west half township 72, range 6, west meridian.

No. 2 and No. 3 were with and his son, R. H. Orono, near Toronto, Ontario, travelled by train to Edmonton and packing their over the Edison trail, at Grande Prairie in time to select a couple of steers and were fortunate their pick of the land.

Some Grande Prairie men, James Lowe and son, left their farm near Gadsby, and arrived at Edmonton, Saturday, June 24th, their team and demoted Northland Sun that evening at Ground on Wednesday, June 28th, and from their land all the way to Grande Prairie. They spent a day visiting, and arrived at Peace River on Monday, noon, July 2nd, spent two days there, and then crossed the ferry from crossing, day, July 5th the ferry and Mr. Lowe crossed. When the second next crossing the cable broke, the ferry drifted down stream. The passengers were all