

# The Grain Growers' Guide

Winnipeg, Wednesday, April 12th, 1911

## WHERE THE FARMERS STAND

We are giving this issue over largely to the opponents of reciprocity. We desire that our readers, the farmers of Western Canada, shall be in full possession of all possible facts in relation to the reciprocity agreement. If, when they have studied these facts, they are convinced beyond any reasonable doubt that the agreement will not be in the interests of the farmers of the Prairie Provinces, then they can reasonably oppose it. Three out of the four correspondents in this issue who oppose reciprocity, it will be noted, base their arguments largely upon the claim that The Guide is supporting the Liberal party. Just how they arrived at that conclusion we cannot say. Last summer and until the reciprocity agreement was announced, The Guide was regarded as a bitter opponent of the Liberal government, because we denounced in unmistakable terms the government's tariff policy which was robbing the people of Canada for the benefit of the privileged few. We stand now exactly where we did then. The fight put up by the organized farmers, in which The Guide assisted in every possible way, compelled the government to make the reciprocity agreement with the United States. Mr. Glen Campbell, M.P., and Mr. W. D. Staples, M.P., were loudly in favor of the farmers' demands so long as the farmers were pounding away at the government. Just as soon as the reciprocity agreement is secured and the farmers are in favor of it, these two gentlemen proceed to oppose it. This gives a fair indication how much sincerity there is in their attitude.

**THE ONLY HOPE OF ANY RELIEF FROM TARIFF OPPRESSION, IN SIGHT TODAY, IS THE RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT. THE GOVERNMENT WAS FORCED INTO THE AGREEMENT BY THE FARMERS. IF THE FARMERS NOW REPUDIATE THE AGREEMENT WHAT POSSIBLE EXCUSE CAN THEY HAVE HENCEFORTH FOR DEMANDING TARIFF REDUCTION.** If, however, the farmers unanimously accept the agreement they are then in a much stronger position to demand general tariff reduction. There are a few farmers in Canada that honestly believe that protection of natural products helps them, and for this reason they endorse protection generally. Now, if all bogus protection is removed from these farmers by the ratification of the agreement then every one of them will join hands in demanding that protection be withdrawn from other industries. The government says there will be no further reduction in the tariff, but the people will have something to say about that. The farmers of Western Canada have studied the agreement in detail and know that it will be of great benefit. There is only one danger in sight and that danger is that a few party politicians will endeavor to induce the farmers to vote against themselves. That is what some of the Western members are trying to do today. These men oppose the agreement for no other reason than that it was brought forward by their opponents. How much bigger men they might have been had they acted as Mr. Haultain, the Conservative leader in Saskatchewan, acted. Mr. Haultain was big enough to place principle and the good of the country above party allegiance. Mr. Staples and Mr. Campbell place party always first. These two men could have supported the reciprocity agreement without endorsing any other single plank in the government platform, and by so doing they

would have made themselves big men in Western Canada. They have deliberately chosen to throw the interests of the Western farmers to one side, if their criticisms and charges and accusations against The Guide and the organized farmers amount to anything. The farmers of the Prairie Provinces today are capable of doing their own thinking. Day by day it is being driven home to them that they must make their own political policies and then elect men who are pledged to support them. By their very attitude Mr. Campbell and Mr. Staples are hindering the farmers in their fight to secure general tariff reduction.

## THE POLITICAL SALARY GRAB

The legislators of Manitoba got away with their \$500 salary grab without any trouble. We cannot cease expressing our admiration of the patriotic and statesmanlike way in which the Liberal and Conservative members acted in the deal. There was no petty quarrelling; no sparring for party advantage; no long-winded speeches for the benefit of their faithful followers. The fact that these men were simply "casting their pearls before swine" to give six weeks work for \$1,000 was apparent to the dumbest one among them. Then of course there was the usual suit case grab that is pulled off at the first session of every new legislature. Our readers probably are not aware that each one of the members got away with a handsome suit case at the expense of the people. It's a wonder they don't provide themselves each with an automobile. Probably they will get to that soon. Ordinarily political parties in the legislature of Manitoba oppose each other. When they do occasionally agree it is upon some great crisis or upon some trivial matter. Now, the salary grab was a great question of national importance. It was the greatest effort of the session and no party bickerings could be allowed. Even the most rabid of party politicians can agree unanimously when the greatest of all questions—their personal pockets—are under discussion. But when any little question such as the welfare of the citizens of the whole province is at stake, of course the parties do their best to divide the people. It all depends upon who is to suffer. The legislators in all got away with \$20,500, and a fine suit case each, in addition to the regular salary of \$1,000 per year at which they were hired by the people. Not bad for forty-three days work. The people should be glad they stopped working when they did. If they continue to make this grab for the five years they are in power it will mean \$102,500. Yet we are told that the Initiative and Referendum are not workable because they are too expensive. If the Initiative and Referendum were on the statute books of Manitoba that \$102,500 would more than cover the cost for five years of people's legislation. If ever the people of Manitoba needed an object lesson of the value of Direct Legislation they have it now.

After Mr. Staples has misrepresented The Guide in the House of Commons and has made intentional and deliberate false statements about the efforts The Guide is making to secure relief for the common people from the exactions of Special Privilege, he then asks us to publish and send forth to our readers the abuse we publish in this issue. Will Mr. Staples still say that we dare not publish anything opposed to our views? Will he still declare that The Guide is one-sided and partizan? Or will he be man enough now to admit his mistake?

## MR. STAPLES IS PERPLEXED

We apologize to our readers this week for devoting two pages to a letter from W. D. Staples, M.P. It is one of the most abusive letters we have ever published, and contains very little argument of value. Were it not that Mr. Staples is a public man and a member of the House of Commons, we would have consigned his letter to the waste paper basket. He could have put his arguments into one-quarter of the space and given more room for others. The Guide stands upon its own record, and Mr. Staples must stand upon his. He has abused The Guide and misrepresented it in the House of Commons on different occasions during the present session. We merely publish his letter to show that we are not afraid of abuse no matter where it comes from. He says he is opposed to paying dividends on watered stock and wants a reduction on farm implements, cement and oils, but that he is a protectionist. It would be well for him to learn now that in future protectionists will not prosper very much in rural Canada. He is sure that the gospel preached by The Guide means ruin for Canada. The farmers of the West do not think so. He puts into the mouths of Fielding and Laurier, statements coined by himself. We are not dealing with Fielding and Laurier at the present time. We have dealt with them before; we are dealing with Mr. Staples just now. Mr. Staples is sure that reciprocity will not give the Western farmer any better price for his wheat, nor his oats, nor his barley. If this is so, does he think the Western farmers are fools enough to send their grain across the line and take a lower price for it? He need not worry about trade going south of the line. It will not go there unless it is profitable. Not only the grain growers but the live stock raisers are going to lose, according to Mr. Staples. Prices south of the line, he says, will be lower than in Canada; then what earthly harm can come from the agreement? The farmer will not ship to the American markets unless he wants to, and certainly the Canadian farmer can meet all comers at home. If all these evils he predicts would result from lowering the United States tariff, it would have been done long ago. Mr. Staples might look across the line and explain why the farmers of the Western States are frequently opposed to reciprocity. That might help him some in his arguments. Mr. Staples undoubtedly considers his argument in regard to Argentine wheat the strongest objection possible to be found against reciprocity. Let us examine it. Argentine is nearer to Liverpool than to Canada and has already an immense trade and a return freight from Liverpool. Argentine wheat on the average is 5 cents per bushel inferior in value to Canadian wheat. It costs from as low as 8½ cents on the all-water haul in certain parts of the summer to as high as 20 cents by all-rail in winter to take wheat, per bushel, from Fort William to Liverpool. The Liverpool market regulates the Fort William market as well as the markets of all other big exporting countries. The Liverpool market averages at least 10c per bushel over Fort William the year round, unless affected by speculation and unnatural causes. Thus, according to Mr. Staples, the Argentine shipper would sacrifice 15c per bushel on his wheat and would also lose by having no return freight for the sake of flooding the market of Eastern Canada when he could more easily and cheaply ship to Liverpool. The Canadian farmers could injure the wheat farmers of other countries