

United Farmers of Alberta

Mrs. Paribby's Resignation

MRS. PARIBBY, the president of the United Farm Women of Alberta, on account of ill-health and the absolute necessity of complete rest for several months, has sent in her resignation to the U.F.W.A. Board. As president of the U.F.W.A., she was also a member of the U.F.A. Executive, and to this body she also sent a statement of her resignation. The U.F.A. executive accepted this statement and instructed the chairman to write her expressing their deep regret and sincere sympathy.

Mrs. Paribby is a woman of rare ability and her withdrawal from public activities is a distinct loss, not only to all branches of the farmers' organization, but to the progress of social well-being. Her speedy and complete recovery of health will be devoutly wished for by the people of Western Canada.

Livestock Shipping

The secretary of the Waskatemow Local Union No. 101, D.C. West, of Pine Creek, reports: I am pleased to report that the Waskatemow local union is making splendid progress this, our second year. The present paid-up membership is not quite as large as it was at the end of last year, owing to some of our members transferring to new locals which have been organized near us, and some have moved out of the district. We are gaining new members at every meeting and our membership is greater than it was this time last year, and before the year is closed we expect to surpass last year's membership (65).

The greatest progress, however, has been the growth of interest in the local. Members last year who were lukewarm in their support are now enthusiastic U.F.A. workers. This is largely due to our Livestock Shipping Association which, as was already reported, organized about the first of the present year. The first car of hogs was shipped January 10. We have shipped five cars since, the net proceeds being over \$12,000, part of this business coming from the surrounding locals, Egremont local in particular loyally co-operating with us. Now, some will ask, "Have your members profited by shipping?" One or two facts will answer that. The first car we shipped from Egremont Station, local buyers offered \$1.85 a hundred less than Edmonton stockyard prices. The last car, in trying to put the association out of business, they offered 10 cents per hundred more than Edmonton Stockyard prices. From these facts any person can figure for himself whether our members have profited by the association, and not only our members, but every farmer who has sold stock locally has profited by the protection afforded by the association. Yet some contend that the U.F.A. is of no benefit. One stock buyer remarked that he did not care whether he bought hogs or not, as there was no profit in it any more, so you see we are taking the buyers' profit and putting it in the pocket of the farmers.

In some localities in the past, buyers in order to break up shipping associations, have paid more than the stock was worth on the open market. That is the situation this association is facing today. Some ask, "Will the association survive?" No doubt about it. The U.F.A. locals in this district have members who know how to stick. As an example of one of the stickers, one of them remarked that the buyer could not get his stock if they offered two cents per pound more than it was worth on the market. He figured that the protection of the association was worth more than that to him.

During February and March members of this local organized the Warspite and Smoky Lake locals, both of which give every promise of being successful.

On April 6 representatives of Egremont, Railway Centre, Waskatemow, Warspite and Smoky Lake locals met and organized the Egremont District Association, of which R. C. New, of Clodford, has been appointed secretary. This district association will succeed

Conducted Officially for the United Farmers of Alberta by the Secretary

H. Higginbotham, Calgary, Alta.

the Waskatemow Local U.F.A. Shipping Association, and from this greater organization we expect more and greater benefits.

At the meeting it was decided to offer 300 shares in a scales company for sale at 1.00 each for the purpose of putting in scales and yards at Egremont, and judging from the way our members bought shares at our last meeting, I think the shares will soon be sold.

Rights on Vacant Land

A number of instances have been referred to this office of farmers going on vacant land without having previously obtaining any legal right to do so, and after trying to put in a crop or trying to take off the hay from the land have been stopped from doing so by other persons who have in the meantime obtained a legal right to the land, and the question has arisen whether the first parties could be stopped in this way.

The law is quite clear that no man

has a right to go on any land and either put the land in crop or take any crop such as hay from the land without having first obtained some legal right to do so. He may be stopped at any time by a person having the legal right to the land or may be sued for damages later on by the person having the legal possession of the land.—U.F.A. Legal Department.

Note.—The C.P.R. this year upset the expectations of a lot of farmers by deciding to cut hay on some of their vacant lands. They are only cutting what they require for their own use, and there has not been any general prohibition against farmers cutting hay on vacant C.P.R. lands.—Central office.

Supply of Screenings

H. S. Arkell, Dominion Livestock Commissioner, writes:—

"I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 23 and have to thank you for forwarding me copy of

circular which has been addressed to your local associations in regard to screenings, etc. It will be understood, of course, that, as you have been previously advised, the supply of screenings from last year's crop has been practically exhausted. It is not expected that there will be any further accumulation until the cleaning of the current year's crop begins. I trust that there may be no misunderstanding as regards this point, in order that, if orders for screenings are placed, disappointment on the part of the farmers may be avoided if the branch is unable to make delivery of screenings until later on in the fall."

Secretaries' Convention Report

Reports of the secretaries' conventions at Edmonton and Calgary were mailed to all secretaries and delegates at the beginning of September. No local should miss these reports, for they contain a fund of valuable information. The report is in two parts, one part containing the discussion on co-operative trading and the other containing the discussion of the educational problems of the U.F.A. locals.

One of the most valuable features is the address of Mrs. Walter Paribby, president of the U.F.W.A., which is crammed full of suggestions on how to make a local successful.

By carefully reading these reports you will get many suggestions as to how other locals are tackling the problems of our organization. An excellent plan would be for the secretary to summarize this discussion and present to his local any suggestions which he thinks might be applied in that district.

Is the Outsider Unfair?

Officers of the Swallow local have addressed the following circular letter to the farmers of the district:—

Why Every Farmer Should Be a Member of the U.F.A.

Because—It is not fair that a few farmers should spend time and money organizing with the end in view of having a square deal and of obtaining the best prices possible for our produce, the lowering of the tariff on machinery and other articles necessary to produce as cheaply as our neighbors to the south, the betterment of social conditions, the supporting of an executive and headquarters at Calgary to look after our interests, such as legislation in the farmers' interest, railway rates and other things essential to the farmers well being, and then for others to reap the results of their (the U.F.A.) endeavors without any thought as to how these things were brought about. It is the bounden duty of every farmer to strengthen the hands of our organization.

Next month we will issue another circular, stating what the U.F.A. has accomplished.

Yours very truly,

Ray A. Bell, president; W. Waldron, vice-president; A. F. Smith, W. Allsopp, J. Patterson, C. Toews, J. Callahan, directors; W. H. T. Olive, sec.-treas.

U.F.A. Briefs

T. R. Sarver, of Thorhild, advises that they hope to get the U.F.A. under good headway at that point, and also that they hope to carry on co-operative trading.

At the monthly meeting of the McCafferty local, held on September 6, it was proposed and carried that the secretary obtain prices of potatoes, carload lots. The crops of cereals have failed and they have few potatoes in that locality.

At the meeting of the Burns local, held on August 31, the question of Rural Free Delivery of mail was discussed, and a committee was appointed to look after correspondence concerning same. A resolution regarding seed grain was adopted. It was decided that they purchase "Deep Furrows," and also an oilstove and boiler to make coffee for entertainments, etc. They have now a membership of 65 paid-up members.



H. W. Wood

The Farmers Not Muzzled

By H. W. Wood, Pres. U.F.A.

Under the heading "Tariff Truce," Mr. Parsons says that "It was understood, when Union Government was formed that the agitation of Western Grain Growers for the abolition of the tariff would not be continued during the period of the war." I do not know where such an understanding arose. I, as President of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, never had any intimation of such an understanding, and if the farmers were a party to it I am yet totally unaware of it. He goes on to say that Mr. Crerar had said that the winning of the war and not the tariff was the issue in the election. So far as I know Mr. Crerar has faithfully lived up to this pre-election declaration, but he said nothing to indicate that he personally was opposed to the discussion or agitation of the question. If he had, he could not have bound the farmers, as he had no mandate from them to put any kind of a muzzle on them.

Mr. Parsons needs no excuse for discussing this question at this time. The vital importance of the question itself is ample justification. He goes on to say that it is "necessary to deny many of the unfair, erroneous, and misleading statements that have been made for the purpose of trying to prejudice the minds of the public against manufacturers and manufacturing interests in this country."

It may be that these things have been done, and that he is fully justified in this statement, but the adjectives "unfair," "misleading," and "erroneous" would be weak and inadequate in defining some of the propaganda that has been carried on in some of the Eastern press about the "selfishness" and "profiteering" of the Western farmers. Does he expect our people to stand up and be pelted with rotten eggs, and throw a shower of bouquets in return?

"Agriculture and Industry Interdependent." Under this heading Mr. Parsons expresses a deep concern in the interest of agriculture, and a strong desire that all "inequalities or unfair burdens" be removed from the agricultural industry, but he indicates a fear that this can not be done without risking the "ruination of our great industrial fabric." His meaning is not very clear. If he means that he thinks relations can be so adjusted that both agriculture and manufacturing can be made reasonably prosperous, then I entirely agree with him and will be glad to co-operate with him to that end. But if he thinks that one of these industries should be enriched at the expense of impoverishing the other, and that agriculture is the one to be impoverished, then in the interests of human rights I will have to take issue with him.

He says a "great Toronto daily" sets forth the relations between manufacturers and agriculturists "admirably," and this remarkable sentence occurs in his quotation from that paper: "Progress and prosperity for one invariably means progress and prosperity for the other." I must confess that the only admirable thing I see in this is that it should be true, and I believe it would be true if the right adjustments maintained between the two industries; but unfortunately these right adjustments do not maintain, and the facts entirely break down the truth of this otherwise admirable statement.

For five years before the war there was a general and conspicuous lack of prosperity among the Western farmers, while there was no visible lack of it among the Eastern manufacturers. Some measure of prosperity has been restored to the farmers since the war began, almost entirely on account of higher prices, and in spite of the protective tariff.

If the protective tariff can be raised high enough—and I am inclined to think it is now high enough under normal conditions of peace—agriculture can be made permanently unprosperous. Do the manufacturers want to accomplish this? I am sorry to have to say that the evidence in the case looks bad. But to the farmers of Canada I want to say that if this is accomplished **You Will Be to Blame.** You yet have it in your power to protect your own industry from permanent impoverishment if your intelligence and manhood can rise to the occasion.