

## THE EDMONTON BULLETIN

SEMI-WEEKLY

Published every Monday and Thursday by the Bulletin Company, Ltd., at the office, Bulletin Building, 218 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, .75  
Six months United States post office address, .40  
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 Entry Cattle for inspection, \$1.00.

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

THURSDAY, AUGUST 31, 1911.

## RECIPROCITY OR RESTRICTION?

J. W. Edwards, Conservative member for Frontenac, speaking in the House of Commons, January 21, 1910 (Revised Hansard P. 2228):

"But, when this government took the duty off American corn they neglected a splendid opportunity of conferring a great benefit upon the farmers of Canada in not exacting from the United States a quid pro quo that they would remove the duty from Canadian barley."

"In 1908 the United States provided us with a market for \$96,900,000 of our goods, but in the same year our smaller population afforded for the people of the United States a market for \$214,000,000 worth of their goods. There was thus an adverse balance of trade for Canada of \$118,000,000. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that cuts no figure. But will any man in this House say that he would not prefer to have those figures reversed? Will any man say that it would not be better for Canada if we were selling the United States \$214,000,000 worth while they were selling us \$96,900,000 worth? In 1908 we bought from the United States \$1,254,704 worth of horses. And what market did they afford for our horses? They took \$900,000 worth. Why was this? As I stated last session and repeat today, it is largely because our tariff discrimination against the Canadian farmer, that is, under the tariff arrangements, it is easier for the American farmer to bring stuff into Canada than for the Canadian farmer to get his stuff into the United States."

Every Conservative should vote for reciprocity.

## DISAPPOINTMENT.

The Winnipeg Telegram complains strongly because President Schurman of Cornell University addressed the Winnipeg Canadian Club on the subject of reciprocity. The plaint serves to show how touchy the Antis are getting on the reciprocity question. Mr. Schurman was the invited guest of the Canadian Club and spoke on request. No doubt the officials of the club knew beforehand what he was going to talk about, and from what viewpoint he would discuss it. If they did not approve the subject being discussed, or being discussed from that point of view, all they had to do was say so. Apparently they said nothing of the kind, the speech was made—and the Telegram is wrathful.

It is only a few weeks since the foremost opponent of reciprocity in Canada delivered an address in Montreal, in the course of which he urged upon Canadian Clubs their duty to plunge into the fight against reciprocity by having Opposition speakers discuss the subject at their gatherings. Did the Opposition papers rise up to reprove Hon. Clifford Sifton for the suggestion that Canadian Clubs from ocean to ocean should be turned into political agencies for the Opposition? Not by a long way. Where then their justification for wrath when one club allows a foremost educationalist of the continent—a Nova Scotia man by birth—to set forth to such members as choose to come and listen, the arguments in favor of freer trade?

The truth of the matter seems to be that the Opposition are a trifle disappointed in the Canadian Clubs—and correspondingly liable to be easily angered at them. When the Opposition raised the annexation cry, they did so, no doubt, with the thought of lining up with themselves all the patriotic organizations in the country. If they could only stampede the Canadian Clubs and the various other societies of a patriotic or semi-patriotic nature into opposing the agreement, these would become very valuable allies in the rough-and-tumble scurrilities of an election campaign. Their own members would mean a large voting strength, and their influence might easily affect as many more votes.

The plan broke down in the beginning. The Canadian Clubs and the other societies declined to be stampeded. To the disappointment of the annexation-talkers, their

fuss and fury caused more amusement than alarm in the minds of cool-headed people; and people who do not individually take much stock in a cry of "wolf" are not going to divert their social and non-political societies to shooting away a danger they think to be unreal. The Canadian Clubs and the other organizations of kindred nature continue to discharge their normal functions, and to leave to His Majesty's loyal Opposition the distinction of persuading the voters that reciprocity means annexation. The Telegram's wrath is not roused because President Schurman discussed reciprocity but because he discussed it favorably.

## NOT CHASING RAINBOWS.

At Harriston, Ontario, Mr. Borden told his hearers that the choice is reciprocity with the United States versus reciprocity with the British Empire. This conveys in sufficiently plain words an impression which the opponents of reciprocity have been long trying to instill into the minds of the public but which hitherto the leader has hardly dared to so explicitly assert. Hard pressed as he is for a campaign cry, and shady as have been some of his past treatments of public questions, the admirers of Mr. Borden on both sides of the political fence will not find their estimate of his sincerity raised by this glaring attempt to trade upon the ignorance of his hearers and to stampede the electors into chasing the unattainable glories of an economic rainbow.

In putting the case this way Mr. Borden is trifling with the truth, if he is not openly denying it. The reciprocity agreement, he well knows, is not a hard and fast treaty which binds the two countries for a specified time to retain the reduced rates of tariff they agree to charge upon products passing between them. It consists merely in a coincident reduction of tariff by the two countries, acting independently of each other and without undertaking of any kind that the duties so reduced shall not at any time be re-imposed. If at any time either country becomes persuaded that the agreement is not in its interests, the parliament of that country is entirely free to raise the duties to their old height or any other height thought proper or advantageous—and that without consulting the other country or giving notice other than that required by common international courtesy. In no way can the acceptance of the agreement bind the Canadian Parliament to not re-impose the duties so reduced or abolished, if at any time it should become necessary to do so in order to negotiate or accept preferential tariff treatment from the Old Country and the other British Dominions. Mr. Borden knows this as well as any man; and in giving utterance to a statement whose plainest meaning is a negation of this known fact he is either openly defying the known truth or is dealing in language of double meaning. In either event his sincerity gains nothing by the venture.

It was plainly Mr. Borden's desire to make his hearers think that if they wanted preferential treatment in the British markets all they had to do was to vote down reciprocity on the 21st of September. Is that true? What foundation is there for it? What is the tendency of thought in Great Britain—in favor of a food tax for the benefit of the farmers of Canada and other British Dominions, or away from that notion? Surely the most enthusiastic protectionists cannot but see in the course of events there that the British people have irrevocably decided that their food remains free. It is not so many years since a Unionist Government in Great Britain put an import tax upon wheat. Was the wheat of Canada and the other British Dominions exempt from the tax? Not a bit of it. Yet Mr. Borden left the people of Harriston to understand that what the Marquis of Salisbury dare not do, even as a temporary measure, is likely to be done as a measure of permanent and calculated policy. Two general elections occurred in Great Britain after the war in each of which the Unionists put forward prominently the proposal for so-called "tariff reform." With what result? Again, when the third election came around, Mr. Balfour declined to even face the issue with the food-tax charged against him. On the eve of the election he announced that a vote for him would not mean a vote for what is called "tariff reform," but that this matter would be submitted to the people directly for a pronouncement by plebiscite. Was the result such as to lend ground for the belief that tariff reform had made any substantial headway among the masses of the Old Land? Hardly.

The talk of the British people putting a tax on themselves to make Canadians and other over-sea Britishers happy is so much humbug and may as well be put down at

## EDMONTON BULLETIN

that first as last. When hens grow teeth there may be a tax against food entering Great Britain; not before. Britishers may be decaying—as some of them tell us—or they may not be; but in any event they have not yet approached the stage of economic imbecility which would make them increase their own cost of living for the benefit of somebody else—especially a somebody who does not need the sacrifice and who would be equally amused and amazed at their making it. Should they ever reach that stage the reciprocity agreement with the United States will not in any way prevent Canada accepting the handle of the jug thus accommodately held out to her. But we have too high an estimate of British common sense to expect the offer to be made this side the millennium. Canadians are not turning down business proposals these days for the fun of chasing rainbows.

## THE SWING OF VICTORY.

At Napanee, Mr. Charles Anderson, a prominent Conservative farmer, stated that reciprocity was of far more importance to Canadian farmers than abject party allegiance. He declared he was not a traitor to his party, but that the party was a traitor to the old policy for which Sir John Macdonald and all other Conservative leaders had stood up to the time it became possible through the Fielding-Taft agreement.

## RECIPROCITY OR RESTRICTION?

From an article by Hon. G. E. Foster in the University Magazine, Dec., 1910:

"Our reply to Uncle Sam should be: Granted that you fully realize that no scheme of Reciprocity which interferes therewith (i.e., with Canada's autonomy) is desirable; that understood, we welcome the fullest trade and intercourse consistent therewith. Meanwhile, as a neighborly beginning, could you give our products tariff entrance to your market on the same terms which we accord to yours in our market? This would be an earnest of good feeling, and might dispose us to further converse."

Every Conservative should vote for reciprocity—Mr. Foster included.

## COMPANIONS IN DISTRESS

Dr. Schaffner of Souris, Manitoba, is in trouble, all over this "infernal reciprocity" business as Mr. John Herron puts it. Dr. Schaffner, like Mr. Herron, was a member of the last Parliament. When the question came up of siding with his constituents or with his leader, Dr. Schaffner decided for the latter. Now he has made the painful discovery that, like the former constituents of Mr. Herron, the people of Souris want reciprocity. But, unlike Mr. Herron, the learned doctor has gone too far to back up. Wherefore, with a nominating convention staring him in the face, he penned this affecting appeal to a former supporter:

"I am taking the liberty to write you and ask you to come to convention at Nipinka next Friday night. You may not think with me on the reciprocity pact, but I have given this question much thought. I believe on every other question we will agree, and there are many important questions. I have worked for the farmer ever since I have had the honor of being your representative. I care for no other interests. I have stood for everything the Grain Growers asked for, and I have been successful in getting Mr. Borden and the party to come to my way of thinking. I promise you I shall always do all in my power to help the farmer, the most important of all classes. I know you are a very leading man in your community and I do want you with me. If you come to the convention I will pay your expenses as I want very much you to be there."

Touching as this missive is, it failed to touch the gentleman to whom it was addressed. Like Mr. Herron's constituents—and no doubt like many more of Dr. Schaffner's former supporters—he wanted reciprocity. More than that, he knew that he wanted it and that the way to get it was to support the candidate pledged to vote for it. So he gave the tender billet to the press, and decided to have nothing to do with the convention. This treatment of the doctor's letter confirms the present judgment of its troubled author—that when he decided to oppose reciprocity he made a mistake. Of that fact he now has no occasion to doubt. For once his conclusion is unquestionably correct.

Let the doctor take comfort, however. He is not alone in his humiliation, his regrets, and his apprehension. Mr. Lake of Qu'Appelle, Mr. Magrath of Medicine Hat, Mr. John Herron of Pincher—not to men-

tion a considerable number of gentlemen lately opposition members from his own good province—are sharing his sentiments, and will, no doubt, extend their sympathies.

## NEUROTIC NONSENSE.

The Montreal Star has now reached that stage of political neurosis in which the unhappy victim sees a lion in every stump—or to put it more precisely, an enemy in every Yankee. The latest of the many mischievous individuals from that Republic to get upon the nerves of the Montreal paper and drive it to distraction is the American paper manufacturer. This one it seems belongs to a quite unusually monstrous and terrible species of the genus human. Possessed of an "enormous appetite"—for wood probably; "criminally," "recklessly, insanely wasteful"; coming of a "hungry people, wanting everything in the world and wanting it at once, and with 'pockets full of money with which to pay 'for what they want'; and 'it is proposed 'to permit them to rush in upon our national forest preserves and help themselves 'with their wasteful, destructive, hand-to-mouth methods.' That surely ought to send the thrills down the spinal columns of the Star's readers.

But there is worse torture for them yet. It quotes from some gentleman—himself a Yankee, by the way, and writing to promote the cause of forest preservation which is now receiving more vigorous attention in the United States than anywhere else in the world—who has been travelling in Asia, and has there seen some Chinamen trying to farm on land made desolate by the wanton destruction of forests. The Star quotes him to this effect: "Where the 'thriftless, pig-tailed Chinese peasant once 'cultivated broad and level fields in such 'river valleys, he is now able to rescue only 'a few half-hearted patches by piling 'stones in heaps and saving a few intervening arable remnants from the general 'soil-wreck.' Not yet satisfied with harrowing the feelings of its readers, the Star tells them about Greece—"once a most fertile and fruitful land, but now in places 'a series of rock-bound hills where nothing 'grows.' Palestine too, excites the horrified commiseration of the Star. Its "olive groves are gone, even from the Mount of 'Olives, and the hills that are compassed 'round about Jerusalem are barren wastes 'of grey rock and deserted terraces.' Verily it seems appropriate to exclaim, 'Oh, Jerusalem!'"

Now, if this wild raving about desolate lands foolishly robbed of their fertility by ignorance and greed, and the frenzied denunciation of the American lumbermen, are to be supposed to have anything to do with the matter in hand it seems to be this: that the Star thinks the American paper manufacturer will destroy the forests of Canada as surely as his unrestrained forefather destroyed those of his own country; as ruthlessly as the Greeks and the conquerors of Palestine and of China have destroyed the forests of those lands in bygone days. Will he? Are we living in the days when ignorance allowed the forests of these Old Lands to be destroyed? Even in the day when modern ignorance allowed the forests which once clothed a large part of the United States to be destroyed? Are the Governments of the Dominion and of the various Provinces—which have in keeping the care and preservation of the Canadian forest—to cease to exercise their functions when reciprocity comes into force? Who is proposing to turn this terrible Yankee loose in our forests with his "wasteful, destructive, hand-to-mouth methods?" Are the laws which now stand between the forests and their extravagant utilization to be suspended? Are our legislators, Federal and Provincial, to suddenly lose either their sense or their power because the freedom of trade is extended? Does anyone propose to turn loose this man with the terrible appetite for timber and tell him to cut and burn and destroy as others have done in the dark ages of the remote and recent past? There is nothing of the kind in the reciprocity agreement. The passing of this measure will not deprive our parliaments of the power to fix the laws governing the utilization of the forests, nor even suspend the laws already made for their preservation. If the Yankee lumberman gratifies his appetite for timber in Canada he will have to pay for what he consumes out of the "pockets full of money," the Star says he possesses; and moreover he will be allowed to do so only under regulations fixed by the law-makers—that is by the people—of the Dominion. Are the Antis afraid to trust the people to insist upon a proper preservation of our forest resources? How many different kinds of fools do they take the Canadian people to be, anyway?

Thursday, August 31, 1911.

## BUCHANAN A WINNER.

Medicine Hat News: Senator Talbot predicts that Alberta will send seven of its representatives to Ottawa to support reciprocity. Answering for Medicine Hat, the News can guarantee that W. A. Buchanan will assuredly be elected. The assurances of support from unexpected quarters are most gratifying. Reciprocity is becoming more popular every day. The more the people learn of it the more anxious are they to give it a trial and afford the farmer the chance which has been denied him so long.

Toronto Globe: Let Mr. Borden go down to Halifax and tell his own people that free trade in fish involves treason to the King. They have their answer ready. Let him say to the people of Nova Scotia that reciprocity in natural products will lead to an annexation. They will tell him that thousands of the brightest and bravest sons of Nova Scotia have been compelled to go to England and New England because a burdensome tariff made life hard and for some of them impossible in the Maritime Provinces. All this audaciously guarded terminology in which Mr. Borden expresses himself does not hide his meaning. It means that freedom to sell in American markets "may weaken or imperil the ties that unite us to our world-wide Empire," and "make Canada treat a political and afterwards a commercial appanage of the great Republic." What do intelligent Conservatives think of such a statement from their leader?

Charlottetown Patriot: Dr. McPhail it is well known is an ardent advocate of reciprocity. In one of his articles entitled "Freedom of Trade," he writes as follows: "There are certain subjects of which one does not speak unless he is compelled to. They are taken for granted, like the honor of a patriot, the virtue of a woman, the fidelity of a friend, the loyalty of a subject. And yet into this matter of trade the question of loyalty has been wantonly forced. To put it roughly we are told that if we are allowed to trade with the United States, we shall become disloyal. This suggests that those who utter the calumny are themselves loyal for their bellies sake. The attempt to put the stigma of disloyalty upon those who, confident in their own ability to meet the whole world in competition ask for nothing but freedom, gives force to the dictum of Samuel Johnson, 'that patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel.'"

## THE DISCOVERER.

Charlottetown Patriot: Looking at the marvellous results of his rule and the unprecedented growth of the Dominion since he took the reins of office, we are forced to the conclusion that Sir Wilfrid Laurier is the man who really discovered Canada.

## A LONG CAMPAIGN.

Ottawa Journal: The common opinion that a short election campaign is thrust upon the Canadian electors is not warranted by the history of previous elections. So far is this interval from being one of the shortest ever, between dissolution and election that with but one exception it is the longest campaign save one since 1878. This time we have eight weeks, all but two days, only extended in 1896, when the time was sixty days. The length of the campaigns from 1878 to the present has been: 1878, 41 days; 1882, 41 days; 1887, 37 days; 1891, 30 days; 1896, 60 days; 1900, 29; 1904, 35 days; 1908, 32 days; 1911, 54 days.

## BORDEN'S MISTAKE.

Toronto Globe: Mr. Cockshutt was quite right in saying that the present reciprocity issue is the most important since Sir John Macdonald raised the "National Policy" issue in 1878. It did not suit his purpose to remind his audience that reciprocity in natural products was part of Sir John's National Policy and that there was appended to the Tilley tariff of 1879 a standing statutory offer of such a measure of reciprocity. If Mr. Borden had possessed any of Sir John's political acumen he would have welcomed reciprocity and have depended on other issues as fighting ground.

## HEDGING.

Leithbridge Herald: One of the things of which Mr. C. A. Macgrath publicly boasts is that he gives a straight answer when he is asked a straight question. Some days ago, the Herald published an interview with a gentleman, who was one of the farmers' delegation to Ottawa last winter and who was one of the party to whom Mr. Magrath applied in the lobby of the House of Commons and expressed his sympathy with the demands of the farmers and promised to support reciprocity at that time, for it was first and foremost of the demands of the farmers and a few weeks afterwards came out strongly against it. Instead of fulfilling his boast of giving straight answers, Mr. Macgrath in taking up the Herald's question at his meeting at Cardston Friday evening, hedged. According to the report of the meeting sent the Herald he averred that as the delegation came down in December and the reciprocity pact was made public in February, he could not see the connection. That is not a straight answer. Mr. Macgrath told those men that he favored and would support their demands. He knew that the first of these was reciprocity. If he did not, he was foolish to promise to support the farmers' demand for something he knew nothing about. He told his hearers that he did not think the government would give them reciprocity, but he was in favor of it among their other demands. He assured them that he believed they were on the right track, but now he is trying to put them off that track.

## SCOTTISH M.P. DEAD.

London, England, Aug. 28.—The death is announced of Dr. Adam Ronald Rainy, Liberal M.P. for Kilmarnock since 1906. He was the son of the famous Scotch divine, the late Principal Rainy. He entered on political work in 1900 and contested Kilmarnock Burghs in the same year. Hemorrhage of the brain was the cause of his death.

Thursday, August

## Thr

"Yellowhead apples," "Oranges." It must be the "News" said so, and had the fruit right with the "News" northern one of the many words and hears of on a trip new wonderland westward. What the country is Grand Trunk Pacific what the railway is do country one should arise ing early and take the express from Edmonton the end of the steel. The



FOREST GROWTH.

vice has been in operation months only and though serves only a small part country lying west of Ed that country as yet in its tive state, it takes five of senger coaches of the G to commodate the traffic. these coaches are filled w army. There are busine fessional men enroute to places at Wabamun, pri ing to the mountains to ture's secrets, and Russ navians and men of alim tion and color and from point of the compass, b railway camps, to assist of altering the face of n the requirements of the when one sees the count the low spots to be filled the iv spots to be filled spects to be cut down, a mountains to be blown d the railway's right of w less that when the wor nature could never have that the whistle of the would awaken echoes in of the Pass. The Impes has been accomplished, now ever changing "and reaches its permanent t the Pacific seaboard the pany will have a road Winnipeg to Prince Rup ed the railroad buildi grade of one per cent. valleys have been filli diverted from their co portions of mountain b



ROCKE MOUNT.