



NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS

This department of The Guide is maintained especially for the purpose of providing a discussion ground for the readers where they may freely exchange views and derive from each other the benefits of experience and helpful suggestions. Each correspondent should remember that there are hundreds who wish to discuss a problem or offer suggestions. We cannot publish all the immense number of letters received, and ask that each correspondent will keep his letter as short as possible. Every letter must be signed by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication. The views of our correspondents are not of necessity those of The Guide. The aim is to make this department of great value to readers, and no letters not of public interest will be published.

HOW WILL YOU VOTE

Editor, Guide.—No recent problem in the sphere of practical politics has been more perplexing than that which now confronts the progressives of Canada. How shall we vote at the impending general election? If you vote Conservative you are trying to tie the hands of tariff barons, you are endorsing further pillage at the hands of this iniquity.

If you vote Liberal you are endorsing another subsidy of \$35,000,000 to Mackenzie & Mann. This fact will be disputed. Some will say the government is only guaranteeing bonds to this extent and will not be called upon to pay. Be this as it may, every dollar will be repaid out of the earnings of the producers of Canada. It makes little difference to those who pay whether Mackenzie & Mann absorb the amount in excessive freight rates or the amount be taken by the government in taxation and handed over to the exploiters. Good reason exists for the belief that the subsidy amounts to \$15,000,000, more than the actual cost of constructing the projected line. This will afford ample funds for an addition to the street railway, power and lighting plants the two knights own in South America; but this is an aside. If you vote Liberal you vote for a railway debt you don't want. If you vote Conservative you get a tariff you don't want, and probably the M. & M. deal too. In order to get the Hudson's Bay Railway and terminal elevators you do want, and to have them operated as you would have it done. How can the tangled skein be straightened? Can more eloquent testimony to the desirability of the Referendum be furnished? Truly representative government is impossible in the absence of some such device. It behooves every Democrat, every man who wishes to see the will of the people prevail to concentrate their efforts upon Direct Legislation. Ask Mr. Borden what he thinks of it.

R. L. SCOTT.

Winnipeg.

A HINT FOR REPRISAL

Editor, Guide.—The Manufacturers' Association have come out in the open now, demanding that which they got years ago as a special privilege, now as their absolute right, namely, under the tariff law to levy tribute of from 17½ to 30 per cent. of excess profit on their goods over and above the profit that they are legitimately entitled to. Judging from the noise they make when a sympathetic government reduces the duty 2½ per cent., so small a reduction that the farmer who buys their goods will never know the reduction has been made, if certain newspapers did not keep reminding us of it, I should say the farmers' pocket books will never show it. How would it do to try other tactics? We are told that our loyalty is in danger, that we will break our connections with the Mother Country, that we will soon be only the ice-house for the great American Republic, and so on, etc. Here is an alternative plan that I think would bring the manufacturers to time quicker than the slow legislation that we have asked for will ever do. I make this appeal to every Western farmer. To pledge himself that he will not buy or use any implement manufactured in Canada that is protected by a tariff of more than 5 per cent., and that he buys only British and American made machinery, and by so doing pays the duty and helps to build up Canada for the whole Canadian people. I have done business with one Canadian agricultural machinery firm for 27 years, but I pledge myself personally

to buy no more Canadian machinery, if I can buy an article from an importer, so long as they continue their fight against free trade in farm implements. This is getting down to the root of the matter and besides is carrying the war into the enemy's country. With perhaps one exception no Canadian implement manufacturer advertises in The Guide, trying to kill our paper because it advocates free trade. We know the treatment we had from these firms in the hard years when frost, drought, rust, etc., struck our crops. We know how they sold many of us out, how they tied us up with mortgages when we could not meet our notes, or only partly meet them. We know they are selling their implements to our competitors at less than they sell to us who have made them what they are today. Now let us buy machinery that pays into the revenue instead of buying machinery from those who contribute to the election funds with our money, stolen from us under the name of tariff, to get legislation so that they can steal more. Think this over, brother Grain Growers, and those that can join with me, buy no more Canadian manufactured farm implements.

F. W. KNOWLES.

Emerson, Man.

THE TARIFF AND NATIONAL PROSPERITY

Editor, Guide.—The above is the delusive title of a large pamphlet the Canadian Manufacturers' Association is scattering broadcast throughout the country. Doubtless this is the outcome of the manufacturers' deliberations at Vancouver last year when they were discussing ways and means of taking the farmer by the arm and whispering honeyed words into his ear. This document is certainly a sugar-coated pill, a soft soap pill at that, but we should very much if the farmers will swallow it. They are getting onto the game of the tariff medicine-fakir man. The saponeous compound within the covers of this pamphlet was concocted for and delivered upon the occasion of the visit of a delegation of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association to Ottawa to protest against reciprocity. The preamble sets forth in billion dollar terms the amount of Capital with a lag "C" represented by the C. M. A. We have a faint recollection that when F. W. Green, of Saskatchewan, on the occasion of the farmers' delegation to Ottawa made a somewhat foolish boast of the wealth which the delegation represented, Premier Laurier was quick to take him up on that point and to say that if the farmers were as wealthy as Mr. Green represented them to be they had not much room for complaint. Of course the farmers had not real wealth to one-tenth of the amount mentioned by Mr. Green, and no doubt the \$1,200,000,000 spoken of by Mr. T. A. Russell is principally water and not wealth. However, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and while the manufacturers talk in billions the poor little farmers cannot be suffering much; can they? We admit this delegation had a right to speak for capital, but when Mr. Rowley goes on to say that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association account for upwards of seventy per cent. of the artisans and workpeople who are dependent upon these Canadian enterprises, we think it is time to call a halt. The word "account" is delightfully vague. In this instance it is evidently used to convey the idea that this delegation was representing the interest of seventy per cent. of the artisans and workpeople, etc. Now, in view of the fact that the Canadian

Manufacturers' Association has openly boasted in a circular that it was owing to its efforts that the eight-hour bill was defeated at Ottawa and has persistently and consistently employed trained agents to oppose workmen's compensation bills wherever they have shown their heads in this Dominion, and also has been eternally and infernally active in striving to foster and encourage by all possible means the immigration of skilled mechanics to this country with a view to flooding the skilled labor market and thus reducing wages, in the name of outraged labor we protest against allowing a delegation from the C. M. A. to speak for us. On page 2, Mr. Rowley partially admits that the Canadian Manufacturers' Association was "formed to educate the people wrongly on purpose to protect the policy of protection." It was, as it were, conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity, but, of course, has always been anxious to prevent class legislation and has no sympathy whatever with trusts and monopolies. Far be it from such. Did someone suggest "mergers" and "agreements" between gentlemen? Well, of course, they are business of another color, at least in the eyes of the manufacturers. It is with a feeling akin to amusement that we read that Canadian enterprises are not yet so well-developed as those in the United States on account of their restricted markets. It has been said that you cannot teach an old dog new tricks, but, of course, the protected puppie never grow old, they are always infants, and therefore, capable of learning new tricks whenever it suits their purpose. It is rather amusing, though, to hear the advocates of protection protesting against restricted markets which it has always been their aim and object to obtain. Further on we learn that the products of the United States' manufacturers have been freely sold in this country, so that, after all, protection does not protect. If the tariff was abolished it would not close the factories and throw men out of employment because the goods are now being made on the other side of the line and freely sold in this country in spite of the protective tariff. On page 6 of this fearful and wonderful document we find it stated that farmers by the hundred thousands are annually leaving the United States and coming to our West. So they are, but Mr. Russell does not say why. Evidently these farmers are not looking for tariff, if they were they would stop at home, where they have twice as much tariff as we have in this country. What the American farmer seeks is cheap land and lower taxes, and if ever the time should come when land will be cheaper and taxes lower in the United States than in Canada there will be a real annexation scare with some bottom to it. Our good friend, T. R. Deacon, the friend of labor, presented a few facts and considerations from a Western standpoint which cover some two pages of closely printed matter which can be summed up in one sapient sentence: "Manufacturers will naturally go where the market is." We might add, "Tariff or no tariff." In making such a big fuss over such a little thing as reciprocity the manufacturers are merely living up to the principle laid down by their poet laureate: "The wheel that speaks the loudest is sure to get the most grease," but it remains to be proven whether 2,500 manufacturers can make a bigger noise than all the rest of the Canadian people.

F. J. DIXON.

Winnipeg.

READY TO HELP

Editor, Guide.—I have noticed several statements of Col. Sam Hughes in your columns which indicate a gross ignorance on his part of the average Western farmer, or else is a malicious libel, and, as the wife of one of "these fellows" who "are hanging around the blacksmiths' shops," I think I speak for the majority of farmers' wives when I say, that, if by "wearing long boots and cleaning the cow stables," we could help our men folk to put an end to the oppressive system, of which the above "military gentleman" is a representative, we would consider it a privilege, and when we have the franchise it will be our pleasure to use the same in delegating such men to their right when our husbands have to leave the farm for a short time it will not necessitate our donning the "long boots."

MRS. F. B. SULMAN.

Blackfoot, Alta.

A HARD LESSON

Editor, Guide.—Having spent two or three months visiting in New York and New Jersey, I was much interested in the manner in which reciprocity and the tariff was handled by the press and the people, and cannot but feel that the well-informed and thinking part of the people are friendly to reciprocal relations between the States and Canada. The verdict of the people at the last election is evidence sufficient that they are determined to have a revision of the tariff, and that downward. The tremendous growth of combined wealth, the outcome of the protective policy, has been an expensive lesson to the laboring and producing classes. The theory of protecting the infant industries, giving employment to home labor and keeping the money at home and making a fine home market for the farmer, was a plausible one. But the application proves very different. Where the most manufacturing is, land is suffering the worst. The protected manufacturers can pay a rate of wage the farmer cannot. The consequence is, he takes the best half and finally takes the farmer's sons and daughters, and the hundreds of vacant farms of New England and the Middle States is proof conclusive that the protection of one class is at the expense of another and a very numerous class. Having owned and farmed land in New Jersey, eighty miles from New York City, from boyhood until forty-five years of age, I have experienced some of the vicissitudes I allude to above. Am now living in Canada and like it, but I feel a keen interest in the situation. Can Canada afford to go through the same experience the States have—build up combinations and monopolies at the expense of the plain people, the laboring producing classes? I think not. The people will rise up and put their stamp of disapproval on it, just as effectively as was done in the States last fall. I firmly believe it will be of great advantage to both countries, and the leaders that stand sponsor for the pact are competent to look after our interests and will.

BENJ. B. HURSH.

Maroon, Sask.

Editor, Guide.—It is ridiculous and at the same time amusing to note what strenuous efforts are being made by the capitalistic interests to flood the country with poisonous literature concerning our Grain Company and "its ally, The Guide." I would only refer to one of many instances, namely, an article appearing in The Winnipeg Saturday Post, to which article that worthy paper devoted the best part of its front page. I may state that I, like many other farmers, have of late been generously supplied with copies of different papers which I never heard of before; and some of them have their most important articles marked with a blue pencil (invariably those concerning the Grain Growers' Grain Company). Now, these papers, or their dominating factors, take it upon themselves to warn us innocent farmers (it is very touching to note how many devoted friends we farmers really have outside our own circle) who have invested a few paltry dollars in Grain Growers' Grain Company's stock, or who are thinking of investing, against our company that these papers claim is endangering the safety of our good money entrusted to it in "good faith." Good and well. But do these supposed friends of ours suppose that we "innocent" farmers will accept their generous advice without a discount? Do they give no credit for being so near sighted and for knowing only so little (what a monstrous mistake) or is their own thinking box a little out of order, or are they a bit rattled? No doubt, if our Grain Company keeps up its pace it will soon have a monopoly on the grain trade in Canada, and our friends opposite know what a monstrous calamity that would bring about. Just think of it, farmers—a farmers' grain company having a monopoly on the grain trade of these very same farmers. Could anything be better for these farmers? Let us, just for an experiment, make it a monopoly for 1911, by shipping all our grain to our company. When Mr. Partridge and his farmer friends, five years ago, started this company they realized that the relief from the oppression of the grain monopoly then, was to get into the game ourselves and it has proved clearly that they were right. So far our Grain Company has only secured a share of the grain trade in Canada (a goodly share I'll admit) and if that has had such a good influence on our market