



## 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.

## WHY I AM A FREE TRADER

Editor, Guide:—Just a few reasons why I am a free trader and not a protectionist.

Because I do not believe in having to sell my produce in an open market in competition with the world and having to buy my necessities in a market that is practically closed to all outside competition; too lop-sided an arrangement altogether.

Because if it is fair for me to compete in an open market, why is it not fair for the manufacturers?

Because on account of this market in which I have to buy my necessities being closed I have to pay a yearly toll of about \$200 in tariff tax.

Because only a very small proportion of this yearly toll goes to the revenue, the bulk of it going into the manufacturers' pockets.

Because under free trade, in order to keep up the revenue, I should not need to pay a yearly toll of \$200, but not more than \$40 or \$50 per year or perhaps less.

Because under no protective tariff is it possible for me to get any more for a bushel of wheat or a pound of beef eaten in Toronto or Hamilton than if eaten in England or France.

Because the home market is no higher priced to me than the foreign and it is absolutely impossible to legislate so that it will be, and even if you could legislate so, it would not be fair to other consumers.

Because the home market's chance of catching up with the increased production in this country is so very remote that I do not care to rely upon a home market only.

Because I do not believe it is at all necessary for me to pay \$200 per year for this home market even supposing it was any better than the foreign.

Because under free trade our home market would be just as good if not better. Would free trade close up all our factories? Would there not be as many fishermen, miners, lumbermen, railway men, etc., to eat our wheat as there is now or maybe more?

Because, if our factories, after 30 years spoon-feeding, are too weak to stand free trade I consider Christian burial the best for such weaklings. How many of us, if we had to pay-feed calves to the same extent to make steers of them, would not knock them on the head?

Because it is absolutely impossible to control the output on the farm, whereas the manufacturer can control his output as well as his price. A farmer cannot get a sure profit on his outlay, whereas a manufacturer can figure up prime cost and then add his profit. A farmer is dependent on the elements for a good yield, and then is dependent on how the world's supply pans out for his price; therefore necessities should be at rock bottom prices, which they would be under free trade.

Because as this is to a very great extent an agricultural country the cheaper you run your farms the better for the bulk of the nation, as the more prosperous the farmer the more prosperous the nation.

Because under free trade combines and mergers would not flourish as well as they do under protection.

Because as the object of protection is to do away with competition we have to buy an inferior article, as protection encourages careless slipshod workmanship. How many of us, for instance, have bought a pair of boots for which we have paid a good price and then had them wear out in two or three weeks.

Because under free trade our manufacturers would have to pay more attention

to the workmanship of an article and less to lobbying for more duty.

Because internal competition does not pan-out under protection, whereas under free trade we should have both internal and external competition.

Because protection depreciates the value of my land as it hinders me from making as big an income as I should under free trade. The value of farm land is largely due to the income a man expects to make off it.

Because free trade is better for the fisherman, miner, lumberman, railway man, policeman, soldier and sailor, in fact all wage earners.

Because protection increases the cost of living to all these men, as well as their clothes and necessary tools in their various trades.

Because under protection the price of wheat, cattle and hogs bears no relation to the price of the manufactured flour, bacon, etc. If it did, why can you buy Canadian flour, bacon, etc., cheaper in England than in Canada? Because even if protection raises the workmen's wages (which is doubtful), it does not raise them in proportion to the duty he has to pay and it would need to raise his wages so that he got a fair return for his work plus the duty, or what better off is he?

Because under free trade the purchasing power of the dollar would be vastly increased to all consumers.

Because the only beneficiaries under protection are the boss manufacturers. Do they represent more than half a million of the 7½ millions of population? Then why in the name of common sense, common justice and fairplay levy a toll on the seven millions to help the half million.

Because under free trade our railways would get their supplies cheaper and would be able to lower their freight rates.

Because under free trade ocean freight would be cheaper as there would be back carriage.

Because under free trade our manufacturers would get their raw material cheaper, which would cheapen their produce.

Because under free trade our government would have to spend less time trying to legislate fairly between the different manufacturers, as what is raw material to one factory is very often a finished product to another.

Because such inconsistencies as this, viz., wagons are protected 25 per cent, whereas buggies are protected 35 per cent (why I can't comprehend) would be done away with under free trade.

Because under free trade we should not need an army of so-called tariff experts.

Because if protection is right and all goods should be made at home, why should not Manitoba have a tariff against Ontario and Ontario against Manitoba? If it is not right to allow Americans, Englishmen, etc., to sell their goods in Canada, why is it right to allow Toronto to trade with Winnipeg, or why should I not be compelled to buy only in my own village? We have a blacksmith. Why should he not make all my implements? That would keep the money at home, surely. Why should he not be compelled to buy all his clothes, flour, etc., made in his own village or on my farm? It always seemed to me that Robinson Crusoe on his desert island was the only man that ever carried such phrases as "Canada for the Canadians," "Patronize home industries," "Keep the money at home," etc., to a logical conclusion, and he only did so because he could not help himself. Robinson Crusoe kept all his

money at home; his home industries were the only ones patronized. He was an ideal protectionist, perfectly self-supporting and self-contained. He never had the slightest interference from any outside competitor, never exported or (what is far worse in a protectionist's mind), imported a solitary article, did not even need a scientific tariff, never had his natural resources exploited by foreigners, never had to worry about trade with his neighbors for fear of annexation, political or commercial union, his railway traffic was never diverted north and south instead of east and west, but simply had to follow the policy of "let well enough alone." What a paradise according to our protectionist friends; and yet, poor foolish man, he left this protectionist paradise at the first opportunity. Now what constitutes a really prosperous nation? Is it not one in which all classes have equal chances? Is it not one in which no class has the power to levy toll on other classes? Does protection tend to evenly distribute wealth? Certainly not, and I do not claim that free trade would. But I do claim that free trade would give far more equal chances of an even distribution of wealth than protection does. Free trade would lower the toll paid by farmers, fishermen, miners, lumbermen, etc., and as they are far and away the biggest proportion of the people the more prosperous they are the more true prosperity in the nation.

C. S. WATKINS.

Langvale, Man.

## FARMERS MUST PULL TOGETHER

Editor, Guide:—Thank you "Farmers for Parliament," in your recent issue is the only solution of present conditions. Meeting Laurier or Borden or going down to Ottawa begging is all useless unless we head such delegations with a Cromwell. Let us organize and nominate and elect our own men, plain honest everyday farmers. The populists of the United States made one great mistake. When that party had gained in strength sufficiently to indicate success, professional politicians from all classes jumped in, and by shouting louder than anybody else secured nominations, some being elected. But working only for their own interest and at the next elections inducing the party to fuse with the Democrats so as to get into office, every honest farmer saw at once that his own party was ruined. We have now reached that critical stage. Already locals are organized in some towns composed mostly of middlemen and politicians for no other purpose but to get into office. If we nominate attorneys, doctors, preachers and real estate sharks simply because they reside on a farm and call themselves farmers, we had better stay out of politics altogether. If we nominate a real farmer it makes very little difference what party he comes from. The real question is this: Shall corporate greed and special privilege rule the country or shall the common people's interest be taken into consideration? Both the old parties stand for the corporations and elect their servants to office. We, the common people must elect workmen or real farmers to serve us.

T. K. ROGUE.

Millet, Alta.

## FARMERS FOR PARLIAMENT

Editor, Guide:—After reading your letter published in your issue of June 21, headed "Farmers for Parliament," I felt bound to write to you and express my appreciation of the views expressed in regard to election of professional men. I think that there are a great many farmers who would be fully competent to take charge of our affairs in Parliament but who are not able to go to the expense of advertising themselves the same as the party nominees. I beg to suggest that a good way out of the difficulty would be that the local associations, in each constituency should each select a member and have them all meet in some centre to discuss and agree upon the nomination of a member of the association to be put up for election. If more than one was nominated let the merits of each be discussed and put before the meeting and a vote put to decide which should be the one selected. As a member of the G. G. A. I would do my best for the election of any member of the association who was decided upon even though he was a stranger to me personally, as I am confident that the association and Grain Growers' Guide are to be depended upon to do their best for the class which they represent.

C. H. TROTTER.

Semans, Sask.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY  
REDUCED FARES

## Canadian Industrial Exhibition

WINNIPEG

July 12-22, 1911

From all Stations in Canada on the

## Canadian Northern Railway

Tickets on Sale JULY 10 to 21  
Return Limit - July 25, 1911

Full information from Local Agent or write

OSBORNE SCOTT - R. CREELMAN  
Asst. Gen. Pass. Agent - Gen. Pass. Agent

## GOOD ROADS

Editor, Guide:—I read with interest in your last issue a few chapters on good road-making and I would like to say a few words on this subject. Here road-building is done by the farmers partly in payment of taxes. Now this, I think, is one reason why we will not have very good roads; not that a farmer cannot do the work, but he hates to take the time because in many cases he is obliged to leave horses standing idle while he works on the road with one team. I have always thought that it would be cheaper for the farmer and better for the government if, every spring, a meeting was held of the ratepayers of every district and a plan of the roads produced showing what roads have been made, bridges, culverts, etc., built, and what roads are most speedily needed. Then to give the work over to a contractor who has either steam or gasoline power to do the work and who, by getting all the work of a district or more, could make it his business for the season, thus making it worth his while to carry all the necessary tools to do the work. To do work of a certain nature a man needs to be at it all the time, as he can work cheaper and better. It would do away with the farmers having to run around getting scrapers here, graders somewhere else and go to town for culverts, etc. One other thought is that the time must come when small wooden culverts will be a thing of the past since engines are travelling over the roads every day, to say nothing of the time lost in putting them in and the difference of appearance when they are constructed. I would like to see this idea taken up, as I see no reason why these contractors cannot do as well as the contractors who build bridges all over for the government; they would not have to move so often and there would be a uniformity of roads, not, as it is now, where some do the best they can, others let it go with as little work as possible. I think this should appeal to those who have autos, as they, above all, know what it means to have a nice, uniform piece of road.

RATEPAYER.

Olds, Alta.

## THE ONLY REMEDY

Editor, Guide:—Let us look after our politicians. How can we do that but by giving them a great helper and guardian in the shape of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. They have nothing now to guide them (only a few political bosses) and it is time the electors who put them there should have some influence over them, after putting them there and paying them. You know yourselves, you Grit and you Tory, the old medicine is no good, and the dope Sir Wilfrid Laurier gave us sixteen years ago has not taken effect yet. What assurance have we that the lovely prescription "Mr. Borden will offer us will operate in the next sixteen years if he had a hold of the reins. The West should let Mr. Borden see that it is solid for the Initiative, Referendum and Recall and it should be taken up strongly at every point where Mr. Borden holds meetings.

Gilbert Plains, Man. GEORGE LYNCH.

Nov

What in Nova Scotia years is the made in the are there ex but the st improving much mor are too pro Provinces parts of Ca Provinces Eastern Pr great exodi equally, the even the course there in one year and there rich withou methods are are develop fession. The dollar which Western li Eastern pe Somehow I with Easte 80 and 90 y and they a "ripe old restful in t from the A fabled "dis

Visiting Valley during gave me the ride on the Nova Scotia in full bloom must be seen Nature had dazzling whi an aroma w with a feelin stored for has been v last year t this summe apples in t Prospects a apples for ex over the rec a great impe in the valley, at from \$500 grain growe growers of N for the past But the tide is becoming ping points ganized co-o erected war be packed through one uniform pack better price foot to consociations th for marketin poses. This promise ever of the provin they must

De

But fruit many phases that possess variety of other Canada is taking place Nova Scotia provinces fr tributing w Lumbering, and manufa When the ha is removed, terminated, improved th bloom, and t Among its o suffers from Mackenzie a the provin antee upon r have in the province is r simplicity p it ever exist aggressive m Nova Sco number of s to confederat tributing at which way th the exodus o province has