

# THE CORNER STORE.

Helwig Bros., Weekly Store News

## Ladies' White Lawn and Mull Blouses.

GOING AT LESS THAN HALF PRICE.

These Blouses are slightly soiled, and for quick selling we have put them away down. Regular price \$1 and \$1.50. Your choice **50c**

BRING US YOUR FARM PRODUCE.

# HELWIG BROS.

GENERAL MERCHANTS.

### J. J. DONNELLY ON RECIPROCIITY.

The following is a report of a speech on Reciprocal Trade with the U. S. made by J. J. Donnelly, M. P. for South Bruce, in the House of Commons—

Mr. Chairman, before dealing with the principal effects of the proposed tariff changes now before the House, I wish to make a short reference to the conditions which led up to the present situation. The Payne-Aldrich Bill, which came into effect in the United States in the year 1909, provided for a maximum and a minimum tariff. The minimum tariff, which was the regular tariff, was considerably higher than the Canadian tariff, but was still 25 per cent lower than the maximum tariff. The maximum tariff was to be applied against all countries which, in the judgment of the president, discriminated in tariff legislation against the United States. The President of the United States took the ground that the terms of the French treaty, which a short time previously had been arranged between Canada and France, discriminated against the United States, and that therefore unless certain tariff concessions were made they would impose their maximum tariffs on all imports from Canada. Our Government became alarmed, they sent representatives to Albany and then to Washington, and finally agreed that if the President would refrain from using his big stick, thirteen classes of articles would be placed upon a list advantageous to the United States, and assured the President that they would later on consider a broader tariff agreement with the United States. The changes in connection with the thirteen classes of articles may have been unimportant. The objectionable feature of the whole transaction was that our government assented to the principle of being dictated to from Washington in the arrangement of tariff legislation. In the fall of 1910 negotiations were again resumed, and in January of this year the Hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) went to Washington and arranged the present pact. There is a difference, however, in the way that the measure was submitted, in the two countries. In the United States the question was submitted to the House of Representatives and to the Senate not as a party measure in the same sense that it is submitted here. It was dealt with more upon its merits. The Democratic Party or the Republican party did not depend upon the result. But the situation here is very different. An agreement of great national importance is entered into by two members of the cabinet without consulting the people, without consulting the members of the House who represent the people, and we have been told by one Liberal member of the House that it was only submitted to the members of the cabinet for their consideration for about one hour before it was brought down to this House as a government measure on the same day. Theoretically, the government supporters are free to support or oppose it, but they are aware that such opposition might lead to the defeat of the government that they were elected to support. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated that the government will stand or fall by this agreement. The Minister of Finance stated that Parliament is bound to accept the agreement entered into by these two cabinet ministers. The main principle of the proposal is, that we should open our market and let in a long list of articles mentioned in the agreement, mostly natural and farm products, and that the Americans should open their market to us on similar terms. With regard to the United States lowering their rates of duty upon Canadian products, I have no objection to make. I realize that the United States tariff is a subject for the United States government to settle. If they really want to secure our products they will grant them free entry. The indications are that in the near future the Democrats will be in control and we will then receive many concessions proposed by this agreement without sacrificing our home market. It has been stated by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) that eighty per cent of all our agricultural products are required to supply our home market, and I am not aware that this statement has been successfully refuted; while the remaining 20 per cent find a ready market under present conditions. Why, then, should we open up our home market to the competition of half the civilized world in order that we

may get into a market that already has a surplus of the principal products included in the pact? During 1908 the United States exported the following:

Wheat.....	151,000,000 bush.
Oats.....	2,333,000 "
Barley.....	8,262,000 "
Oil Cake.....	89,303,000 "
Flax seed.....	437,000 "

While there is a decrease in their exports of grain there is an increase in their exports of grain products. In 1908 they exported \$42,000,000 worth of meal and flour while in 1909 they exported \$66,000,000 worth of the same commodity, an increase of \$24,000,000, showing that they approve of the principle of sending out all their exports as far as possible in the shape of the finished product. The same condition exists in regard to live stock. While there has been a decrease in their exports of live stock there has been an increase in their exports of beef and pork. In 1905 they exported beef and pork to the value of \$133,000,000. In 1908 they exported \$172,000,000 worth, an increase of \$39,000,000.

Now, dealing with some of the different items I propose first to take up the question of wheat. There may be local conditions at some points near the border which might occasion an apparent difference in the price of wheat in favour of the American producer; yet, I see no reason to think that this agreement would materially increase the price of wheat. In some of the Liberal papers a statement is made that the removing of duty on wheat would increase the price of our Canadian wheat at least ten cents a bushel. In order to show the editors of these papers that their Liberal political friends who have made a study of this question do not agree with them, I will quote the remarks of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Gaitner) as they appear in 'Hansard' at page 5790:

"I do say, this, however, that so far as I have been able to examine that matter—and I have looked into it with some care—I cannot see any reason why we should expect any very great increase in the price of wheat for transportation to the United States. There may be a reason, and there may be an increased price, but I am not able exactly to find out how it will come about. We have heard a good deal about the benefits that would accrue to our farmers if they could get into the American market with their barley. While the price of malting barley is higher on the

American side of the line than on this side, there are many factors that tend to prevent our Canadian farmers from ever going extensively into the raising of barley.

Among them is the scarcity of farm labour and the general use of the self-binder and the fact that such barley can only be produced on very fertile soil and handled only under very favorable weather conditions. Twenty-five or thirty years ago, when farm help was plentiful, the farmer could cut his barley with the self-rake reaper, leaving it lie a few days, and thus have a fair chance of harvesting it while the grain was still dry and bright. A field of barley that does not ripen evenly, if cut with a self-binder will not produce good malting barley. In fact the length of time required to dry any barley cut with a self-binder reduces the possibility of its being of a high grade. The progressive farmer who is anxious to conserve the fertility of the soil, would prefer to feed his barley at home and get his return from the sale of his live stock and dairy products. Even if our farmers desired to ship their feed barley to the United States, they could not profitably do so and compete with American corn. In support of this statement I may say that last winter many of our stockmen in Ontario were feeding corn to their cattle although feed barley could be purchased at that time for about one cent a pound. With regard to hay, when making a comparison of the price of hay in the United States and Canada, it is always well to remember that on the other side the quotations are on the long ton, 2,240 pounds, while in Canada a ton requires only 2,000 pounds. I may say that so far as the people of Bruce county are concerned, they have higher ambition than to spend their time raising hay for the Americans. They raise hay, it is true, and we expect they will continue to raise hay, but they prefer to feed it to their stock and to maintain the fertility of their farms by the by-products. The people of Western Ontario and particularly the people of the county of Bruce, have for many years gone extensively into the raising of horses, which has proved a very profitable occupation. While fancy or select horses have found a ready market in the United States, the opening of the three prairie provinces has supplied the best market for the great bulk of our horses. Any person familiar with the horse industry knows that no matter how carefully the sires and dams may be selected, a very small proportion of the horses raised will be what might be called fancy horses, and it is easily seen how important it is to preserve the Western Canadian market for good serviceable blocks of horses. Our Liberal friends tell us that the West will soon be in a position to raise their own horses. Well, we have heard that statement for the last 15 years, but the demand has kept on increasing and in all probability will increase for many years to come, as only a small portion of the arable land of that great country has yet been brought under cultivation. I have been assured by men familiar with conditions in the West that if this agreement goes into effect our horses will be displaced in the prairie provinces by the cheaper horses in the Western states. I have here document No. 849, prepared by the American Tariff Board relative to the various commodities named in the proposed reciprocity measure, and at page 109 I find the following:

Prices of horses range from \$106 to \$125 per head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and North Dakota the range is from \$111 to \$126, and in Montana, Idaho and Washington from \$80 to \$108. In Eastern Canada prices of horses range from \$107 to \$139 per head, while in western Canada the range is from \$107 to \$156. In the great agricultural states of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, prices range from \$120 to \$124. In all the Canadian provinces, except Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and Nova Scotia, the prices are higher than in any of our states.

At page 110 I read that the average price of horses per head in Montana is given at \$80 and in Saskatchewan the average price of horses is given at \$156 per head. I wish also to call attention to the American view as put forward in the 'Saturday Evening Post' of March 25, by Senator Beveridge, of the United States who writes:

"Take horses and mules. We now ship to Canada every year thousands more of horses and mules than Canada ships to us. Canada has an under supply of horses and mules; comparatively we have an over supply. So the free interchange of horses and mules between this country and Canada means an enlarged market for the horses and mules raised by our farmers. And our farmers want that enlarged market, do they not? Why, then, should we make it hard for them to enter that market with their horses and mules?"

In reference to the position of the cattle and meat trade, should we enter into this proposed agreement, I find in the Toronto 'Globe' an article extolling the benefits that will accrue to the United States from the pact, and there is something in that article that our farmers should reflect upon. The 'Globe' is giving a statement of the conditions in the United States, and it says:

The meat trust has taken toll of the people without mercy, and the cost of living has been forced up so high that the farmers also, and in some measure the consumers, have revolted, and demanded the removal of the food taxes that were used to make great fortunes for the manipulators of the markets. On the one hand the trusts were able to depress the farmers' selling prices, and on

the other to compel the consumer to pay enhanced prices for their food supplies. The secret of the meat trust's tremendous power lay in the fact that the farmer was selling cattle at prices arranged by a little group of men who controlled practically all the packing houses in the United States, while the consumer was buying meat at retail stores similarly controlled by the trust.

This is a fair explanation of the conditions existing in the United States and if it means anything, it means that the meat trusts had got practical control of both producers and consumers there, and the result of entering into this agreement would be simply to extend the scope of their operations. They have now their machinery in very good order to control the ninety millions of people in the United States, and it will be a very simple matter for them to extend their operations to the seven or eight million people in Canada. The last census showed that the State of Pennsylvania had a slightly larger population, and the State of New York a much larger population, than had the entire Dominion of Canada, so that for the meat trust to extend their operations to Canada would be nothing more to them than extending their operations into another state.

In regard to the hog industry, I wish to say that our farmers have made great progress during the past ten years. Canadian bacon has gained an enviable reputation in the British market. Now, if this pact goes into effect, the result will be an interchange of hogs—whether our hogs go to the United States or the United States hogs come here, the result will be that the identity of Canadian bacon will be lost, for the Americans produce sixteen hogs to one produced in Canada. Even should the agreement be revoked—as our Liberal friends seem to think, would be such an easy thing to do—it would take years to establish Canadian bacon in the position it occupies to-day.

So far as I am aware the farmers of Western Ontario have not been asking for reciprocity in hogs or hog products. The very opposite is the case, for, as a matter of fact they have been asking for increased protection in hog products. I have a copy of a petition which was sent to me during the last session of parliament, and was presented to this House early in that session. This is not in any case a partisan document, and it was prepared at a time when there was no talk of reciprocity, but when the farmers were simply looking at it from a business standpoint of view. I will read the petition to you so that you may see what their view is:

To the Premier and members of the Dominion Parliament of Canada, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sirs.—In view of the enormous quantities of hog products being imported into Canada from the United States during the last few years, and in constantly increasing quantities which in most cases is being slaughtered on the Canadian market at a time when there is no local occasion for it, the only apparent reason being a glut in the United States market, thus enabling our Canadian packers and dealers to get supplies at a considerably reduced price, the effect of which they use to reduce the price to the producers here without, as experience shows, reducing the price to the consumer, and whereas Canada is capable of producing an abundance of pork products for the home market as well as for export and are anxious to be relieved of the great annoyance and loss of this periodical slump, therefore we humbly petition and strongly urge your honorable body to increase the tariff on pork from two cents to four cents, and we hereby request our representative to both advocate and support such a measure at the approaching session of the House; believing that producer and consumer would be greatly benefitted by a more uniformly even fair price.

And as in duty bound, your petitioners will ever pray:

### PLEURO-PNEUMONIA AND BRONCHITIS

Brought Mrs. Baker to Death's Door. Father Morrissey's No. 10 Saved Her.

Of the many hundreds of cures wrought by Father Morrissey's No. 10 (Lung Tonic) few are more remarkable than the saving of the life of Mrs. John S. Baker, of 164 Rockland Road (North End), St. John, N.B. She wrote on Oct. 16, 1909:

"I wish to express my gratitude that I am living to-day, saved from the grave by Father Morrissey's No. 10 (Lung Tonic). This time last year I had pleuro-pneumonia and bronchitis, and had been given up to die, and had my lungs tapped in the City Hospital, and never expected to walk again; I was continually getting worse every day. I came home from the hospital, and everyone was watching for me to die. I tried everything but there seemed to be no cure for me.

"I began taking Father Morrissey's No. 10, and the second day I could eat without pain. I used 22 bottles of No. 10, as I was run down right into consumption, and for six months was just a shadow until I began to use it, and now I am in good health, and surprised most of my neighbors by gaining as quickly. I feel it my duty to publish it everywhere I can, as with all I can say I cannot recommend it too highly—it was a life saver to me, and I am very thankful to recommend it, as it is worth all it is said."

Father Morrissey's No. 10 is very different from the many preparations that simply relieve a cough. No. 10 relieves the cause of the cough, restores the membranes of throat and lungs to a healthy condition, and tones up the whole system, giving strength to resist future attacks.

Trial bottle 25c.—regular size 50c. At your dealer's or from Father Morrissey Medicine Co., Ltd., Montreal, Que. 92

# KODAK



## Take a Kodak

with you and when you return let us develop your film and print your pictures We do good work.

SCHEFTER. THE GROCER.



Waltham Elgin and Swiss Watches with Dust Proof Screw Bezel Cases, guaranteed to give satisfaction. Also an assortment of Ladies and Gents' Fobs and Chains, Neck Chains and Lockets, Bracelets, Collar Pins and Sets. Fine Gold Wedding Rings in Stock and made to order. You will save money on every article you buy from me. Watches, Clocks and Jewelry repaired.

Chas. Wendt's MILDMAY.

### CANADIAN PACIFIC HOMESEEKERS' EXCURSIONS

TO Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta  
Special Train leaves Toronto 2.00 p.m. on  
APRIL 4, 1911 MAY 2, 1911 JUNE 19, 1911  
JULY 11, 1911 AUG. 8, 1911 SEPT. 5, 1911  
Second class tickets from Ontario stations to principal Northwest points at  
**LOW ROUND-TRIP RATES**  
Winnipeg and return \$33.00, Edmonton and return \$41.00, and to other points in proportion. Tickets good to return within 60 days from point of date.  
**TOURIST SLEEPING CARS**  
on all excursions. Comfortable berths, fully equipped with bedding, can be secured at moderate rates through local agents.  
Early application must be made  
**ASK FOR HOMESEEKERS' PAMPHLET**  
containing rates and full information.  
Apply to nearest C.P.R. Agent or to R. L. Thompson, Dist. Pass. Agent, Toronto.  
**ONLY DIRECT LINE NO CHANGE OF CARS**

J. A. Johnston, Local Agent.

### Fall Term Aug. 25.

**CENTRAL Business College**  
STRAITFORD, ONT.  
**COMMERCIAL SHORTHAND AND TELEGRAPHY.**

The tuition for six months is \$55 and one year \$85. Investigation will prove to your satisfaction that there is no better Business College in Canada.

Get our free catalogue NOW.

D. A. McLaughlin, PRINCIPAL.