

# The Grain Growers' Guide

Winnipeg, Wednesday, August 23rd, 1911

## PEOPLE OR PRIVILEGE

Mr. Borden's manifesto issued to the people of Canada gives his reasons for opposing reciprocity, and why he is asking the people of Canada to turn down the opportunity which they have been struggling to secure since 1866. The leader of the Opposition accepts the statement of the government that reciprocity is the issue of the election, and is devoting all his energies to an elaboration of the evils of reciprocity. Our readers in looking over the arguments advanced by the Opposition leader will observe that he makes no new points. It has all been thrashed out before during the past few months. Mr. Borden is a man for whom, personally, the people of Canada have the highest respect, but his trade policy is absolutely bad, and tends to place full power into the hands of the manufacturers and special interests. In his fight against reciprocity the Conservative leader has the very powerful support of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and that organization contributes very largely to campaign funds for the upholding of protection. Then there is the Canadian National League, which is also devoting all its energies to the defeat of reciprocity. This league is fathered by Z. A. Lash, former chief solicitor of the C.N.R., and now a millionaire director of various trusts and financial institutions. Then there are the leading bankers of the East, who are also fighting reciprocity. These bankers, like Sir Edmund Walker, take in the money of the Canadian people on deposit at 3 per cent., and then carry it across to the United States and loan it out at a high rate of interest, while Canadian industries and needs may wait. There is free trade in money and it apparently hasn't hurt Sir Edmund's loyalty, but if a farmer sells anything across the line he is disloyal at once. The manufacturers of Canada believe that in opposing reciprocity they are fighting for the retention of the protective tariff. They believe, and rightly, that once the bogus protection is removed from the farmers that it can never be kept for the manufacturer. Coupled with these organizations are the journals influenced by them. The Monetary Times and the Financial Post, two of the leading financial journals in Canada, are opposed to reciprocity because their patrons are opposed to it. The Canadian Century, said to be owned by Sir Max Aitken, the cement merger artist, published a number of articles against reciprocity a few months ago, and then paid high advertising rates to have these articles republished in the country weekly papers throughout Ontario and the Maritime Provinces. These articles were published in 400 of such papers. The cost was enormous. Then there is Industrial Canada, the official organ of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and owned entirely by the Association. This paper is making a desperate fight against reciprocity. Then look at the railway interests. Where are they? The tremendous influence of the Canadian Pacific is thrown against reciprocity, and there is every reason to believe that the Canadian Northern railway is giving very substantial support to the anti-reciprocity forces. Why this action on the part of the railways? Simply that in Western Canada they have the greatest melon patch, in the high freight rates they are charging, that can be found in the civilized world. They do not want any other railways to encroach upon their preserve. The fight upon the reciprocity agreement is in reality a fight between the common people and Special Privilege. If the reciprocity agreement receives a strong approval from the Canadian people, then the organized farmers will be the greatest power

in the land. They will then be able to force the government to come to terms upon the rest of their platform. The government will have a practical demonstration of the power of the people. If, on the other hand, the anti-reciprocity forces are successful, what then? All these great forces of Special Privilege that are pouring out their money to defeat reciprocity do not spend their money for nothing. Mr. Borden is an upright and honorable man, but if these special interests defeat reciprocity by the use of their money they will dominate the government they have created. These manufacturers and financiers will be absolute rulers of the Parliament at Ottawa, if they triumph over the common people at the present time. They will make the tariff laws of Canada in the office of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. The tariff will go up instead of down, and the shackles of protectionism will be more closely riveted upon the necks of the Canadian people. These would-be patriots who have flapped the flag and talked about closer relations with the Mother Country would soon be shown in their true color. They would never permit the slightest reduction in the duties charged upon imports from Great Britain. If reciprocity is turned down by the Canadian people at this time the movement for democracy will be set back for a quarter of a century.

## HERRON FOR RECIPROCITY

John Herron, who represented Macleod constituency in the House of Commons during the last session, was renominated by the Conservatives for the same constituency last week. At the nomination meeting Mr. Herron made the following statement in regard to his reciprocity attitude:

"I want to say that I am going to vote for reciprocity, if I am your candidate, and for these reasons: After the question had been launched last winter I began to get stray letters from my constituents asking me to support reciprocity. I wrote home to the people in my district asking them to ascertain what the general opinion was toward it. The farmers' unions have voted in favor of the agreement practically unanimously, town councils and boards of trade have endorsed it, and influential farmers and business men have expressed themselves as being in favor. I received a few letters opposing it, as was natural, and some who favored reciprocity at first wrote me subsequently saying that they had changed their views; but I decided that it was my bounden duty to support what I believed my constituents desired. I never made a secret of it; I have concealed it from no man. I have written hundreds of letters stating my position, and I have repeated it in conversation hundreds, yes, thousands of times. These are my reasons for taking this stand. I cannot recede from that stand, no matter whether I get a vote or not. I see a good many dangers in reciprocity, but I see enough in it to influence my choice and to give the advantage in its favor. The greatest advantage, in my opinion, is that if the people do not find it to work to their advantage, it can be cancelled by a stroke of the pen."

Now, Mr. Herron says he will support reciprocity because his people know it will be to their benefit. Mr. Borden says he will not support reciprocity if all the people in Canada were in favor of it. C. A. Magrath of Medicine Hat, says the same thing. A member of parliament is supposed to represent the people who elect him, and not do as he likes. If the leading men in the Conservative party get away from the policy of their party there is no reason why the rest should do so.

If the journalistic attitude towards reciprocity counts for anything it is interesting to note that every agricultural journal in Can-

ada, that amounts to anything, is strongly in favor of reciprocity.

## SHARPE BELIEVES IN RECIPROCITY

On April 14, 1910, W. H. Sharpe, M.P. for Lisgar, Manitoba, made an able address in the House of Commons on the unfair conditions surrounding Western agriculture. He subjected the minister of agriculture to some sharp criticism, and showed how much the Western farmers needed the removal of restrictions. Mr. Sharpe sent out a great many copies of Hansard containing his speech to his constituents, and also sent a copy to The Guide. We were so well pleased with it that we published it in The Guide on June 8, 1910. In that speech Mr. Sharpe showed how reciprocity would benefit the farmers in his constituency. He said:

"In the little town of Mowbray, in 1908, the elevators handled over 300,000 bushels of wheat, but last spring a spur railway was built across the line into North Dakota, and an elevator erected there, with the result that last year instead of handling 300,000 bushels on the Canadian side, there were only 100,000 bushels handled, while the United States elevator handled 300,000 bushels. Our farmers took their grain across the line and shipped it in bond back into Canada to the lake ports, and by pursuing this course they received from 13 to 14 cents per bushel more for their grain than had they dealt in Canada.

"Let me tell the minister of agriculture also that, whereas, in the province of Manitoba, along the boundary line the land is worth only \$20 or \$25 and in some cases \$30 an acre; right across on the American side on account of the better treatment which is accorded the farmers in North Dakota, the land is worth from \$40 to \$50 an acre.

"I represent a mixed farming community, and last year we shipped 512 cars of cattle to the city of Winnipeg. I know numbers of farmers in my constituency who always in the past have kept from fifty to seventy-five and one hundred head of cattle, but these men are selling out their herds and going out of business because the combines are robbing them of every dollar they should make. It goes without saying that the farmers must keep stock in order to keep up the standard of their land, and if the cattle industry goes, so much the worse for general farming. There were 110,000 head of cattle shipped to the city of Winnipeg last year, and all the farmers could get from the beef combine in that city was an average of \$3.76 per hundred weight, while the same time the average price for similar cattle in Chicago was \$6.27 per 100 pounds.

"With 110,000 head of cattle going in, the meat combine in Winnipeg took out of the producers between \$1,000,000 and \$2,000,000 more than they should have done. Is it any wonder that the producers are quitting? The combine is simply driving them out of business. The drovers from North Dakota come across to Manitoba and buy cattle and drive them cross the line and pay duty, which I think is 25 per cent."

Could anybody possibly put up a stronger argument in favor of reciprocity? This was only a year ago. Conditions have hardly changed in that time. If reciprocity was worth 13 to 14 cents a bushel on wheat, \$10 to \$20 an acre in land, \$2.51 per hundred weight on cattle a year ago, why isn't it worth just as much now? Mr. Sharpe might explain.

The organized farmers have asked for better trade conditions. Reciprocity will give them a great step towards what they asked for, though by no means all of what they deserve. If they now turn down reciprocity what chance will there be of securing any tariff reduction in the next fifteen years. What will happen to the prestige of the organized farmers, if, after forcing the reciprocity question upon parliament they should turn and reject it?