

### BROOKE COUNCIL

Inwood, Oct. 10th, 1925. Council met pursuant to adjournment. Members all present. Minutes of former meeting read and on motion of Johnston-McVicar, were adopted.

Mr. John N. McEachern, owner of the 6 hf lot 7, con. 10, made application for a loan of \$800 under the terms of the "Tile Drainage Act."

Wilcox-McVicar, That application be entertained and bylaw be prepared to impose a special drainage rate on said land and Reeve authorized to issue debentures to the amount asked for.—Carried.

Bylaw to impose a tile drainage rate upon the hf lot 7, con. 10, submitted and read.

Johnston-Wallis, That bylaw be read a third time and finally passed.—Carried.

McVicar-Johnston, That Council open as a Court of Revision on bylaw authorizing repairs to the Hazen drain, Reeve in the chair.—Carried.

One appeal.—Mr. John N. McEachern, owner of the 6 hf lot 2, con. 1, said: "Consider my assessment, it is high as my land drains by the way cannot use this drain satisfactorily."

Wallis-McVicar, That assessment be made by the Engineer be confirmed and Court closed and bylaw read a third time and finally passed.—Carried.

Johnston-Wallis, That Court of Revision of the drain be reopened.—Carried.

Mr. Wm. W. Taylor, playing the 6 hf lot 8, con. 10, submitted and read.

The additional assessment made by the Court of Revision order to drain this lot it necessary to construct a drain along the south line and the drains into this drain, as it be impossible to drain the account of ridges.

Wilcox, That Court adjourn open at two o'clock p.m., Nov. 14th, 1925, in Code's Court.—Carried.

Johnston, That the following orders be paid:—

- rep. bridge... \$ 8.00
- 6-7 sideroad dr. 1.57
- supplies... 21.28
- ch. gravelling... 10.00
- ch. gravelling and furnished... 15.40
- ed. Orange Award dr 5.00

- Alvinston Free Press, bridge cards... 3.50
- Alvinston Free Press, Hazen dr 12.00
- Rob. Alderman, dragging and cutting weeds... 7.25
- A. W. Griffith, gravelling... 14.00
- Chas. McCarter, cutting weeds and brush... 7.50
- F. Pavey, work on new road... 15.00
- Wm. Leitch, supt. .... 24.00
- A. E. Loosemore, selecting jurors... 4.00
- John R. McVicar, ditto... 4.00
- Copper Metal Culvert Co., pipe culvert... 22.40
- A. E. Sutton, rep. culvert... 1.50
- George Higgins, 12-13 con dr. 14.00
- Amos Kelly, sheep killed... 13.00
- John N. McEachern, tile loan 800.00
- Geo. Hansford, cut weeds... 1.25
- Peter Campbell, ditto... 15.00

- Peter Campbell, grading... 7.50
- Ed. Kidd, access bridge 12-13 con. road drain... 85.00
- Brooke Municipal Telephone System, advanced... 500.00
- J. Armstrong, sheep inspector... 3.50
- Wilcox-McVicar, That Council do now adjourn to meet in Alvinston Saturday, the 14th day of November 1925.—Carried.

W. J. Weed, Clerk.



"Start a group of people moving into Canada, of people whom profitable work can be found, and all the pressure that now beset our country will be well on the way to—  
—What Everybody Says.

Fine—let us do so! But to be sure we begin by doing some clear thinking—some straight and sure road to our goal, let us think—on these two important questions:

1. What class of immigrants do we want? How are we going to attract them?

#### Valuable Lessons to be Learned from Past Failures.

Heretofore we have always taken it for granted—without much careful thought, perhaps—that it was farmer immigrants we most wanted,—people who would settle on our vacant land in the West, and produce more from the soil.

And complaints being loud and numerous that farming in Canada was not as profitable as it should be, we have tried to convert an unattractive situation into an attractive one by lowering the tariff on manufactured goods, in the hope of thereby lowering farm production costs, and so increasing the farmer's net.

Has that plan gotten us anywhere?

In 1924, despite tariff reductions made ostensibly to benefit agriculture, there were actually fewer farm immigrants than in 1923! And when, against the total immigration for 1923 and 1924, we offset the total emigration from our towns and cities, we find that the country has suffered a net loss!

So, obviously there is something wrong—somewhere—in the plan we have been following,—either in the assumption that it is farmers we most want, or in our method of attracting them. Perhaps it's a combination of the two.

#### Population Increases Should be Properly Balanced.

In shaping our policy as above, we have certainly overlooked one very important point. Farmers as a rule don't sell to farmers, but to town and city folk. So when we try to increase farm population by methods that operate to decrease town and city population, we are actually making things worse for the very people we are trying to benefit. We are curtailing a domestic market that our farmers can control, and we are increasing their dependence upon an export market over which they have no control!

#### An Alternative Plan that Promises Better Success.

Let us now go back to the beginning again, and start from the alternative assumption that it's primarily town and city population we want to attract.

**Wrong Right?**

Have we been lowering our tariffs for 63 countries to attract immigrants to their countries?

ADEN	Japan
ALGERIA	Latvia
ALGERIA	Luxembourg
AUSTRALIA	Madagascar
BELGIUM	Malta
BOLIVIA	Mesopotamia
BRAZIL	Mexico
BRITISH EAST AFRICA	Netherland East Indies
BRITISH GUIANA	Newfoundland
BRITISH HONDURAS	New Zealand
BRITISH WEST INDIES	Nigeria
BULGARIA	Norway
CHINA	Paraguay
COLOMBIA	Persia
CZECHO-SLOVAKIA	Peru
ECUADOR	Poland
EGYPT	Portugal
ESTHONIA	Roumania
FINLAND	Russia
FRANCE	Samoa
REPUB. OF GEORGIA	San Salvador
GERMANY	Sarawak
GOLD COAST COLONY	Serb-Croat-Slovene State
GREECE	Seychelles
GUATEMALA	Sierra Leone
HOLLAND	South Africa
HONDURAS	Spain
INDIA	Sweden
IRISH FREE STATE	Switzerland
ITALY	Tunis
	United States
	Uruguay

And now even the United Kingdom has begun to protect her home markets.

63 Countries have been making it more difficult for Canada to sell in their markets, while Canada has been making it easier for the whole world to sell in hers!

Have they all blundered? Has Canada alone shown wisdom?

Obviously the way to attract that class is by switching from a policy of lower duties to one of higher duties. The one thing above all others that the immigrant wants is the assurance of a steady job at good wages. Give him that, and he will come in his thousands,—yes, in his tens of thousands! And in a policy of higher tariffs he will have his guarantee that steady work at good wages will be awaiting him.

"Yes," you say, "but what about our farm population? We want it to increase too!" Of course we do! But with town and city population increasing, can farm population do other than increase, in proportion? With more customers for farm produce, and with a higher purchasing power per customer due to higher wages, isn't it inevitable that a domestic supply will be forthcoming to meet a domestic demand, particularly if we protect farm products in the same way that we propose to protect manufactured products?

#### A Precedent That Shows What Can Be Done!

We have tried the plan of lower tariffs, as a means of attracting farmer immigration, and we see that it has signally failed, and we know the reasons why it has failed.

Why not now try the alternative plan of higher tariffs, as a means of attracting urban immigration, when it seems perfectly clear that it must bring farmer immigration in its train?

Even if the latter were mere theory, that would be no valid reason for rejecting it in favor of a policy we have tried, and found to be barren of results.

But we know that it is far beyond the theory stage. The United States offers a practical demonstration of its success! By the plan of higher tariffs, to benefit all classes of population, the United States has managed to attract the biggest and longest sustained immigration movement the world has ever known!

What better example does Canada want?

# VOTE CONSERVATIVE

## FOR HIGHER TARIFF AND FOR LOWER TAXATION

Liberal-Conservative Victory Committee, 550 Bay St., Toronto