

STOOPING TO FALSEHOOD

We notice that the Press Bureau of the protected manufacturers is still turning out reading matter in the form of "boiler plate" for country weeklies throughout the West, and we also notice that there are a number of these country weeklies limp enough to act, either consciously or unconsciously, as tools in the hands of the Protectionists. One of the latest articles which has been turned out from the protectionist Bureau contains the following sentence: "The Grain Growers' Guide for some time back has been as good as urging the settler to refuse to pay what he owes to the implement companies." This is a cold blooded and deliberate falsehood which has not one vestige of foundation. The Guide has never encouraged, either directly or indirectly, nor have we even suggested that any farmer should attempt to evade his just debts. We have repeatedly stated that all contracts legally made should be carried out, and that if the farmer has made a bad bargain he must suffer the consequence. But we have done all in our power to assist in making the future better and to protect every farmer in every possible way, without doing any injustice to the implement companies. The above falsehood issued by the Protectionists, is, however, quite typical of the unscrupulous methods to which they will stoop to keep the farmer paying tribute and to maintain their unholy influence over the politicians.

MASSEY-HARRIS FIGURES WRONG

The publication of the letter from the Massey-Harris Company two weeks ago has brought some further information to hand on the same subject. The Massey-Harris Company quoted Finance Minister White as saying that the cost of producing a binder at Brantford was either \$7.00 or \$9.00 higher than the cost of producing the same binder in Chicago. In reply to this, we wish to quote Hon. Arthur Meighen, a colleague of Mr. White's in the cabinet. Mr. Meighen, when he was in the opposition, was very strongly in favor of lower tariff on agricultural implements. In fact, on January 18, 1911, he delivered the ablest speech in favor of lower tariff on agricultural implements that has ever been delivered in the House of Commons. The following is an extract from his speech:

"Let me give you a few figures to show that the conditions of manufacture at the present time do not warrant a very material duty of any kind, particularly as respects the articles manufactured by the International Harvester Company, binders, mowers and reapers. I wish I could extend it more, but my proof extends to that, and I gathered my proof from what may be called the very camp of the enemy himself; I go to the officers of the International Harvester Company, and I take the very evidence of an official, Mr. Metcalfe, before the Committee of Ways and Means of the House of Representatives last year, and I think I will convince the House that there is very little, if any, difference in the cost of production of these machines on this side of the border and in the United States. At pages 7323-4 of the Tariff Hearings of the United States I read the following. Mr. Metcalfe was the representative there for the purpose of giving evidence on behalf of the International Harvester Company:

"Mr. Cumpacker: Do you manufacture any cheaper in Canada than in the United States?"
 "Mr. Metcalfe: They do not."
 "Mr. Cumpacker: As cheaply?"
 "Mr. Metcalfe: Comparatively."
 "Mr. Cumpacker: Can you manufacture cheaper than the English manufacturer or the German manufacturer?"
 "Mr. Metcalfe: I think they can, otherwise they could not compete with them in Germany and England."

"So that Mr. Metcalfe is on record in admitting that there is comparatively no difference in the cost of manufacturing on the other side of the line and on this. He further admitted that the relative cost of manufacturing on this side of the line and in England and France is in favor of Canada, so that from that point of view there is little to be said in favor of an increase at all events in the duty on these agricultural implements. Mr. Metcalfe is further on record as stating, in the plainest language, that they produce in this country for export abroad, and it is only

reasonable to argue that it is just as cheap to produce those articles on this side as on the other, as otherwise they would manufacture for foreign export on the other side and not on this, since they have factories on both. On page 738 of those tariff hearings, Mr. Metcalfe answered the chairman as follows:

"The Chairman: The International Harvester Company has a plant at Hamilton, Ontario?"

"Mr. Metcalfe: They have one there."

"The Chairman: Are you exporting from Canada?"

"Mr. Metcalfe: They are."

"The Chairman: To what countries?"

"Mr. Metcalfe: All the foreign countries and particularly to France. We are very much interested at the present time in the treaty between Canada and France."

"So that the proof is absolute that if there be any difference in the conditions of manufacturing between this side of the line and the other in relation to these articles, that difference is almost inappreciable."

It will be seen that Mr. Meighen gives the sworn evidence of one of the officials of the International Harvester Company to the effect that the cost of manufacture in Brantford is as low as it is in Chicago. This is better evidence than Mr. White produced in the House of Commons, and may be taken, as Mr. Meighen says, as absolute proof that there is no difference in the cost of manufacture of agricultural implements in Canada and the United States. It is equally safe to assume that the Massey-Harris Company can manufacture as cheaply in Toronto as the International Harvester in Hamilton, so that, from the standpoint of cost, there is absolutely no reason why there should be any tariff protection for agricultural implements in Canada.

Another point which the Massey-Harris Company made in their letter, and which they allow Mr. White to carry the responsibility for is that the Canadian binder is provided with an extra knife and an additional pitman, valued at \$7.00, which extra equipment is not supplied with binders on the American side of the line. In this connection we publish herewith a letter just received, as follows:

"Girvin, Sask.,
 "Aug. 3, 1914.

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

"Dear Sirs:—I have just read the Massey-Harris letter in your issue of July 29th, and in it is a statement that is misleading, and that is that binders are furnished with extra parts, in Canada that are not to be had in the U.S. Every one that ever bought a binder in the U.S. also got with it, without extra cost, an extra knife, pitman and carrying trucks. If the hon. gentleman's investigation in regard to price is as trustworthy as the statement concerning the matter mentioned above, it is of little value to the people.

"Yours truly,
 (Signed) "E. E. GRAY."

While this evidence is not as conclusive as in the other case, yet it is good evidence that the Canadian manufacturer supplies no more equipment than the American, in the case of binders. We would be pleased to have any readers of The Guide, who have purchased binders both in Canada and the United States, communicate with us, and let us know the difference in equipment and the spot cash prices paid.

In the light of the above evidence, we will assume that it is the same binder sold on both sides of the line, and the cost of production in each case is the same. That being so, the Massey-Harris Company's letter admits that the difference in price between Winnipeg and Fargo is \$16.50, and between Winnipeg and Minneapolis is \$21.41. Even on the figures supplied by Mr. White himself, the American binder should be brought into Canada, if there was no duty, for at least \$16.00 less than the price at which the Massey-Harris Company are now selling their binders in Manitoba. The more evidence we get on the matter, the stronger the case grows in favor of free trade in agricultural implements. This \$16.00 is just so much money taken from the farmer and handed to the Massey-Harris Company. The country generally would be more prosperous if this money were evenly distributed among the

farmers who buy binders instead of all being collected together into the Massey-Harris' treasury. As we stated last week, we shall be pleased to give the Massey-Harris Company space to supply further information if they so desire.

COUNTRY ELEVATOR WEIGHTS

The following is an extract from the report of the Grain Commissioners, which will be of special interest to all farmers who patronize country elevators:

The legal inspection of scales in elevators is in the hands of the Inland Revenue Department, and the Board of Grain Commissioners has no means of supervising the actual weighing done in country elevators as it has in the terminal elevators. It is true the Board can investigate any particular complaint, but investigations under these circumstances are not very often of much value. The Board of Grain Commissioners believe that the first condition of accurate weighing is an accurate scale in the country elevator, and that the only method of securing accuracy of scales is a frequent and systematic inspection of scales. The Board further believe that this scale inspection should be accompanied by an inspection of the pits, garsies, spouts, and any other parts of the elevator that may affect weighing in any manner, and also an inspection of the method of record keeping in country elevators as regards weights and cars. The inspector of elevator scales should know not only scales, but also elevators and cars. The Board believe, therefore, that there should be created a special class of inspectors for country elevator scales, and that these inspectors should be subject to the Department of Trade and Commerce rather than the Department of Inland Revenue.

It seems a bit peculiar to have a Board of Grain Commissioners in charge of the grain trade, and yet to have such an important function as the control of the weighing in country elevators not subject to their control. If the Board is capable of performing its duties, it should have full control over all these matters relating to the grain trade, otherwise it should not have control of any of them. It would be a simple matter of legislation to correct this confusion.

If The Guide is performing any useful function for the farmers of the Prairie Provinces it is highly desirable that its sphere of usefulness should be widened. Judging by its reception in the past The Guide seems to be regarded favorably by a very large number of farmers. If the reforms demanded by the farmers are worth while, then the best thing to bring them about is to get more farmers thinking and working along the same line with the same purpose in view. In no other way can this be so well and so quickly accomplished as by increasing the number of farmers who read The Guide regularly every week. To enable those who are inclined towards this work to do it more effectively we are now offering a special rate of 25 cents to the end of the year. If you can't collect this from your neighbor, how would it do to make him a present of The Guide for this period, and if he reads it for a few months he will probably continue?

The French soldiers will fight with better spirit now that they are assured that the Franco-Prussian humiliation will be revenged. France will win back her lost provinces and will probably insist upon a war indemnity as large as she paid in 1870.

The emperors or diplomats who have caused the present war are the worst criminals that have ever assumed human form, and for their part in bringing about so much suffering and misery they should receive the severest punishment.

On account of the war situation and the calling of the Canadian Parliament to meet on August 18, it may be taken for granted that the western trips of both Premier Borden and Ex-Premier Laurier will be cancelled, at least for the time being.