

by selling their wheat at half the market price. They are as likely to do this as are the Argentine farmers to flood Canada. Again he is sure that beef will be shipped in from United States to our Eastern cities and ruin the stock raising industry. The Eastern stockmen favor reciprocity, and if they do not know as much about it as Mr. Staples then we are sorry for them. The dairymen of Eastern Canada are also in favor of reciprocity. Butter and cheese rules considerably higher on the average in the big Eastern American cities than in the Canadian cities. Other countries will hardly flood Canada's markets when Canada faces them all on an even footing in Britain. We will admit that the dairymen, and in fact all farmers, are handicapped by the enhanced price of everything we buy, due to the protective tariff, which Mr. Staples so strongly favors. If the Canadian farmer were able to buy all his commodities without paying tribute to Mr. Staples' friends, the manufacturers, he could then compete easily with any country in the world. Mr. Staples feels grieved over the suffering that will be endured by the fruit and vegetable growers in the event of reciprocity. Possibly the vegetable growers may suffer in some cases, but how many people suffer now under the tariff by which Mr. Staples says "we have prospered." In regard to that part he should read the memorial presented to Sir Wilfrid Laurier on December 16 last by J. E. Johnston, manager of the Norfolk Fruit Growers' Association. Mr. Johnston knows the apple business from beginning to end, and declares that:

"Had there been free trade in apples we would have been able to sell our whole crop (last year) 50c per barrel better than we did."

That would have meant \$18,000 extra profit to the members of that association alone, yet Mr. Staples is sure that this would ruin the fruit growers. In this issue of The Guide we publish a statement from the Assistant Secretary of the Nova Scotia Fruit Growers' Association. If Mr. Staples will read that he will see how reciprocity will "ruin" the Nova Scotia fruit growers. In regard to British Columbia it is possible that the fruit industry of that province might suffer slightly, though we doubt it. At any rate the fruit growers of Washington and other states south of British Columbia are protesting against reciprocity for fear they will be flooded with British Columbia fruit. Mr. Staples affects to be greatly concerned over the interests of the farmers. Both political parties have been in favor of reciprocity for the last generation. Mr. Staples was delighted when the delegation went to Ottawa and told the government that changes must be made. The Western farmers have unanimously endorsed the reciprocity agreement. Now, according to Mr. Staples, both parties and the farmers did not know what they wanted when they favored reciprocity. Surely Mr. Staples is a perplexed philosopher. He says:

"I would like to go further ahead and inquire where the farmers and the country will be at when a change in Uncle Sam's attitude takes place later on. Who knows how soon?"

By this he meant that the United States may put a tariff wall up against us in the future, and we will lose their markets, but he says:

"You know how markets once obtained can be held. Will not then the United States have our commerce in their grip?"

Thus Mr. Staples thinks that the United States will put her tariff up again, but that Canada cannot possibly rearrange her own tariff. Canada under this agreement can do just whatever she likes with her tariff at any time, and the United States can do the same, so if the "ruin" that Mr. Staples predicts comes, then we can reimpose our tariff. In the second last paragraph of his letter Mr. Staples hints as to what his remedy would be. He would compel Britain

to change the policy under which for sixty years she has led the world. He would have the British workmen compelled by tariff to buy Canadian wheat and to pay a higher price for it than they are now paying, in order that the Canadian farmer might have a few cents more to put into his own pocket. This is Mr. Staples' "splendid prospect." He thinks the Canadian farmers would fend themselves to such a scheme to rob the British workmen. How much better then would the farmers there be than the manufacturers whose actions they protest against? Mr. Staples knows that "tariff reform" in Britain is dead; he knows that the manufacturers of Canada are opposed to Free Trade with Britain as much as they are opposed to Free Trade with the United States. In conclusion Mr. Staples says:

"Keep down duties to the lowest point, consistent with retaining our industries, our people, our workmen in a reasonable Canadian standard of living, continuing in the work of preserving all the life blood of nationhood in Canada."

Now, what does that mean? We confess that we do not know. It may mean anything. If this is Mr. Staples' tariff policy he can change his mind every day and still be consistent. After Mr. Staples has made out his case against reciprocity, does he believe it? Certainly he does not, because we have it in his own words in the House of Commons on April 3 (and we ask our readers to remember that he wrote this letter on March 27), when he said:

"They (the government) either did not have this information, or else they should have communicated it to us in order that we might be able to reason out whether or not reciprocity is in the best interests of Canada, especially the Canadian farmers. Since the question came before the House I have been trying to get at the facts, but have not been able to do so simply because I do not know where to procure them."

Now, what do our readers think of a statement like that coming from a man who has just written the letter that we have published? One day he knows all about the reciprocity agreement, in fact he knows more about it than any farmer in Canada. Two or three days later he does not know anything about it. The Western farmers know, if Mr. Staples does not.

THE WITNESS IN TROUBLE

In another column in this issue we publish an announcement by the Montreal Witness, making a special offer to secure new subscribers. This great Democratic journal, published in the stronghold of protection and Special Privilege, has fought a good fight for democracy and a square deal for the last sixty years. It has been going behind every year and a deficit has been made up by the publishers from revenues secured from other sources. Advertising patronage is what all newspapers must depend upon, and this has been withdrawn from the Witness at the dictation of Special Privilege, and objectionable advertising has been refused. The Witness now frankly states to its readers that they must support it and help secure additional subscribers in order that they may secure a greater advertising revenue, or they must sell out their paper to interests that are opposed to democracy. The Witness has been making a strong fight in favor of the reciprocity agreement and for Free Trade, and is one of the very few influential journals in Canada today that is free to publish the truth and advocate a square deal. Like The Guide, the Witness must depend upon its readers to increase its circulation and in its hour of need, and throws itself upon the mercy of its friends. We ask for the Witness substantial support from our readers.

Some of the opponents of the reciprocity agreement have asked why the agreement was not made with an importing country such as Germany. It takes two parties to make a bargain.

HARMONIOUS FOR PROGRESS

The provisional directors of Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company and representatives of the Grain Growers' Grain Co. met in Regina on April 6 to discuss the possibilities of working together for mutual benefit and in the interests of the farmers of Saskatchewan. At the conclusion of the meeting the following statement was given to the public:

"The policies of the Grain Growers' Grain Company and of the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator Company are found after full discussion to be in complete harmony. Instead of competing with each other as some have prematurely feared, a basis of co-operation that will preclude the least suspicion of rivalry was suggested and will doubtless be agreed upon as soon as the new company is permanently organized." (Signed) T. A. Cressat, president; N. E. Baumgart, director, for the Grain Growers' Grain Co.; J. A. Maharg, provisional president; Chas. A. Dunning, provisional secretary, for the Saskatchewan Co-operative Elevator company.

This statement will cause a feeling of satisfaction generally. These two organizations by working together can improve the grain marketing conditions in Saskatchewan. It would be unfortunate if two concerns working for the same end should enter into a rivalry.

In Paris on April 3 Sir Thos. Shaughnessy, president of the C.P.R., gave an interview to the correspondent of the Toronto Globe, in which he said:

"It is very nice to hear all these purposes of avoidance of war, but one is inclined to question whether the suppression of war is good for the world. A war now and then acts after all as a sort of clearance of the surplus population."

This is a most remarkable statement from a man holding such a prominent position. He would have a war occasionally to reduce the population. Would it not be cheaper and more humane if every nation should shoot off a certain portion of their citizens every ten years and thus save the expense of a war? Or if the railways were not compelled to protect the travelling public would not the toll from accidents be sufficient to reduce the "surplus population?" Sir Thomas might have some difficulty in deciding just what portion of the population was "surplus." The peculiar brutality of the financial mind is amazing.

Glen Campbell, M.P., bases his opposition to the reciprocity agreement upon a statement, purely his own, that the president and secretary of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association are Liberals. Now, how the political leanings of these two men (if they have any) can affect the price of grain to the Western farmer is a problem that only Mr. Campbell can solve.

Will our readers please be careful to address all letters to us, "The Grain Growers' Guide, Winnipeg?" They frequently go astray if otherwise addressed. Do not consign cars of grain to The Guide. "The Grain Growers' Grain Co., Winnipeg," is the correct address when shipping grain. If all our readers will follow this direction they will save us a lot of unnecessary correspondence.

The plea which Mr. Fielding made to the manufacturers at Montreal shows the grip that the protected interests have upon the country. It is most humiliating to see a handful of financiers and corporation magnates dictating the fiscal policy of Canada and compelling the common people to bend to the burden.

The Railway Commission has fined the Canadian Northern Railway \$200 a day for violating the Railway Act. That is a good start. There are some men on the Railway Commission who would improve our railway system considerably if they were given an opportunity.

Editorial
handed
incl. 1
"Recip
pleasur
public
times b
even
seem o
who v
differ
his bel
trayer,
and al
people
done f
Mr. B
on the
here v
plank
ration
little
which
or rath
you, as
partia

Also
govern
princ
intern
mand
appeal
machin
becaus
associ
shillit
crated
and de
power.
Conser
years
for D
termin
encour
Did y
Laher
whole
for, a
again
Schaff
"

the
min
men
ern
gov
ste
at I
the
teri
boa
H
anato
the V
have
the al
ite at
the G
far t
urged
last.
comm
but n
or th
point
copy
reade

Th
char
the
cold
to en
sight
point
(Con
resol
porte
tur
wo