

The Grain Growers' Guide

Winnipeg, Wednesday, August 6th, 1913

MANUFACTURERS HAVE REPLIED

The following letter, from the president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, was received by us on August 2:

THE CANADIAN MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

Toronto, Ont., July 30, 1913

Editor, "Grain Growers' Guide,"
Winnipeg, Man.

Dear Sir:—

I desire to acknowledge your communication of the 19th inst., received through registered mail on the 23rd inst., after you had gone to press.

Your communication will be laid before the proper committee at its next meeting, and the committee's decision made known to you in due course.

May I say, personally, that I had hoped that the delivery of your challenge on the day you went to press was simply an inadvertence; that no public announcement would appear in your paper until you had given me a reasonable opportunity for reply, and that in the spirit of fair play the terms of the suggested debate could have been mutually agreed upon, and that they would have been of no personal or direct financial benefit to either party.

Your issue of July 23rd, with editorial comments, indicates clearly that I was mistaken in my expectation, and that a manifest purpose of the challenge is to increase the circulation of your paper.

Yours very truly,

ROBT. S. GOURLAY,

President.

We replied to the above letter as follows:

Aug. 4th, 1913.

Robert S. Gourlay, President,
Canadian Manufacturers' Association,
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Sir:—

We beg to acknowledge yours of July 30th, and are glad to know that it will be dealt with by your committee, and we trust that the committee will decide to accept our invitation to debate.

It was not our intention, in publishing our letter to you, to violate the spirit of fair play. We did not regard our invitation to debate as of a private nature, and as we have always considered it in the best interests of our readers and the public generally to conduct as much as possible of our business in public, we merely followed our usual course.

You are quite incorrect in thinking that our challenge was merely for the purpose of increasing the circulation of our paper. Our chief purpose in issuing the challenge was to convince the western farmers that there is no sound and logical argument in favor of a Protective Tariff for Canada. Our circulation will naturally increase, as it has been doing regularly every year, but that will only be of benefit to you because if your cause is just and ably supported in the debate you will have that many more readers to convert to the principles of Protection. Therefore, we should think that a wider circulation of your arguments in the proposed debate would be the chiefest thing you would desire.

We do not think it is possible to conduct this debate without "direct financial benefit to either party" because, if you succeed in converting our readers to Protectionism, then the Free Trade agitation will become very weak, which would be to the "direct financial benefit" of the Canadian Manufacturers. But if, on the other hand, you do not succeed in converting any of our readers to protectionism then the death knell of Protection will be sounded, and that will be to the "direct financial benefit" of the Western farmers.

We deeply regret that you are not quite pleased with the terms of the debate suggested by us. We thought, by throwing open our paper to you, without any restrictions, and without asking anything in return, that it would be satisfactory; but we have such faith in the cause for which we are working that we will gladly make any reasonable alteration in the terms of the debate to suit the wishes of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. When your committee acts upon our invitation, kindly ask them to advise us what better terms they would like to have and we will do our best to meet their wishes.

Thanking you for your communication and trusting that in the near future we may have the pleasure of publishing the viewpoint of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in our

paper for the education of our readers, we are,
Yours very truly,

THE GRAIN GROWERS' GUIDE.

P.S.—We are publishing your letter and this reply in The Guide issue of August 6th.

We think it may be taken for granted that the C.M.A. will accept our offer to allow them to educate the Grain Growers to Protectionism. Probably the executive committee will deal with the matter very shortly, and we shall look for further word in a week or two.

BOTH PARTIES GUILTY

We believe that in the interest of democracy every public spirited man should keep ever in his mind that despicable transaction by which \$15,000,000 of the public funds were handed over to Mackenzie and Mann at the last session of Parliament. It was probably the most disgraceful piece of legislation ever placed on the Statute Books of Canada, and Premier Borden, in the two short years that he has held office has, by this action, won for himself an unenviable place in Canadian history. We note some Liberal papers are endeavoring to exonerate the Liberal party from any participation in this iniquitous dissipation of the public funds. A glance at the speeches made during the debate, however, shows the futility of such protestations. The bill by which Mackenzie and Mann were allowed to take \$15,000,000 out of the pockets of the public was introduced in the House of Commons just three days before the House closed, which in itself is conclusive, circumstantial evidence that the Liberal leaders had agreed not to obstruct the passage of the bill. There was only five or six hours' debate on the bill on June 3 and 4, both sides participating, and the lightning-like speed with which they railroaded the bill through the House shows that the interests of the people were not uppermost in their minds. It is quite true that the Liberal speakers mildly protested against the donation to Mackenzie and Mann, but their protest was of such a milk and water character that it seemed more like a blessing, and they contented themselves with introducing a few harmless amendments which were, of course, promptly voted down by the Government. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Hon. Geo. P. Graham, ex-Minister of Railways, both spoke, and if they were bitterly opposed to the deal we cannot find it in their speeches in Hansard. If the Liberals were opposed, why did they merely content themselves with voting against the bill? Why did they not give battle as they did on the Naval Bill and force the Government to apply the closure and thus take the full responsibility of the deal? The Liberal party in Parliament is quite capable of making a fight against any measure if they want to and it is quite apparent in this case that they did not want to. We merely present these facts in order to show our readers that neither of the Political Parties have made any bona-fide attempt to protect the interests of the people against the rapacity of the railway promoters.

A MANUFACTURER'S TESTIMONY

W. J. Laite, organizing secretary of the South African Manufacturers' Association, who visited Canada last year on a trip around the world in search of arguments in favor of Protection, has reached home and has begun to relate his experiences. The Rand Daily Mail, of June 26, contains a report of a speech delivered by Mr. Laite at a meeting of the Coach and Wagon Makers, Farriers and General Smiths' Association, on the previous day. In this address Mr. Laite impressed upon his audience very strongly

the importance of forming a strong organization for the purpose of influencing legislation. He stated that one of the most remarkable experiences he had gained during his world tour was that of the value set upon organization by the industrial communities of the countries he had visited.

"When he was in Canada," says the report of his address, "he had been impressed by the magnificent organization of their Manufacturers' Association. The Government would never dream of legislating without consulting them."

Later in his address Mr. Laite, speaking of South African affairs, said:

"The Government would 'feed' them every time they 'barked,' but they must bark in unison."

The people of Canada owe a deep debt of gratitude to Mr. Laite for his striking testimony to the fact that the real rulers of Canada are the manufacturers and their association. "The Government would never dream of legislating without consulting them!" Who told Mr. Laite this? The Guide has said this many times, but Mr. Laite, we fear, would not accept The Guide as an authority. As organizing secretary of the South African Manufacturers' Association, he naturally visited the headquarters of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, at Toronto, and as a representative of the South African Government, which was his status on his world tour, it is to be presumed that he visited the Canadian Government offices at Ottawa. And after doing so he made the statement quoted above. Thank you, Mr. Laite, you have spoken a truth and your words will be remembered.

"AFFLUENT" CANADIAN WORKMEN

When Parliament was discussing the ever-rising cost of living, Mr. Verville, the labor member, gave a long list of prices, showing how hard it was for a man to support a family of five on \$900 a year. That gave W. F. Cockshutt, M.P., a chance to ridicule such extravagant notions of living. Rising to uphold the honor of the Canadian manufacturers, Mr. Cockshutt said: "I know of families that are living in affluence on not much over one-half that amount; they have well-dressed wives and children." That means that an average weekly expenditure of \$1.73, or "not much more" than this amount, can support a person in affluence. The Brantford workmen, including, no doubt, some employed in the Cockshutt Plow works, felt a live personal interest in their protectionist member's rosy explanation of how far \$450 would go in buying affluence for five people for a whole year. They wrote Mr. Cockshutt, accordingly, and asked him if he meant what he said in Parliament. Mr. Cockshutt replied to the Trades and Labor Council that he should have used the word "comfortable" rather than "in affluence." Even that considerable reduction has not satisfied the Brantford workmen. They still demand to be "shown." Apparently they cannot locate the Brantford workmen whom Mr. Cockshutt knows and who support their families in affluence or even in "comfortable" circumstances on \$450 per year, or thereabouts. But what could Mr. Cockshutt, as a high Protectionist, do? According to the Dominion census figures of 1911, which Industrial Canada quotes with a good deal of pride, the Canadian manufacturers employed in 1910 471,126 men, women, and children and paid them \$197,228,701 in wages. That makes an average yearly wage of \$418.63. The 376,872 men employed receive \$173,435,642, or an average of \$460.19 a year. To admit that this average