

# A Poser for Mr. Rogers

(By The Guide's Special Correspondent)

Press Gallery, Ottawa, March 17

Practically no progress has been made with the reciprocity debate this week, the discussion having been headed off by motions on the Farmers' bank, the capitalization of railways and other subjects introduced by members of the opposition.

D. D. McKenzie, of Cape Breton, got the floor on Tuesday night long enough to conclude the speech which he had begun on the previous Thursday.

Gov. H. Bradbury, of Selkirk, Man., who is to be the first of the Western conservatives to speak against reciprocity, was expected to have the floor on Wednesday, but he was given time to think things over again by a motion asking for the appointment of a royal commission to investigate the organization and incorporation of the Farmers' bank.

It was all very well, he said, to tell the Nova Scotia farmer that he could sell his cow of his pig in England, but it would be much more convenient for him to sell them at Boston. To show that the farmers of the West also desired reciprocity, Mr. McKenzie read the resolutions passed by the executive of the Manitoba Grain Growers' association, and referred to Mr. Scallion's manifesto to show that conservatives as well as liberal farmers are in favor of the pact.

He also quoted from Hon. F. W. G. Haultain's speech in the Saskatchewan legislature, and pointed out that of the 51 members of parliament, Dominion and provincial, representing Saskatchewan, there was only one, R. S. Lake, of Qu'Appelle, who was opposed to reciprocity.

Hon. Right, Rogers, of the Manitoba government, paid a visit to the conservative headquarters here this week, and told interviewers that there was "no sentiment in favor of reciprocity in the West, except among Grits who want to sacrifice their citizenship in an effort to get their party out of a hole."

"And what about Haultain, is he one of those?" Mr. Rogers was asked, but that was a poser which even he could not answer.

# Reciprocity Debate

(By The Guide's Special Correspondent)

Press Gallery, Ottawa, March 17

The fact that the Canadian representatives in the recent reciprocity negotiations with the United States absolutely declined to enter into any discussion as to free trade in manufactures, is the only important point that has come out in the reciprocity debate this week. The statement was made by Hon. W. S. Fielding on Wednesday, in reply to a question by R. L. Borden, who called attention to a statement made by President Taft that he had instructed the United States commissioners to offer "free trade in everything."

"At the very earliest stage in the negotiations," said Mr. Fielding "we certainly gave them to understand that we could not undertake to have any free trade in manufactures, speaking generally. There are certain articles which are on the free list, and which were the subject of discussion, but speaking generally, we gave them to understand that we were not prepared to deal with them on the basis of free trade in manufactures."

This statement by the finance minister has been given a great deal of prominence by the Eastern liberal papers, and was no doubt intended by Mr. Fielding as an answer to the declaration of the opponents of reciprocity that the present arrangement is the thin edge of the wedge that will eventually bring down the whole structure of protection.

The government certainly does not intend at present to reduce the tariff on manufactured articles to any appreciable extent, but what public opinion may persuade them to do in the future remains to be seen.

**No Reduction on Implements**

It is clear from this as well as from a somewhat similar statement made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in his speech last week, that it is not the policy of the government to make any reductions in the duties on agricultural implements or other manufactured articles, except the small concessions included in the reciprocity agreement. This fact was distinctly stated by E. W. Nesbitt, the liberal member of North Oxford, at a meeting at Woodstock a few days ago, and Glen Campbell, of Dauphin, Man., brought this speech of Mr. Nesbitt's to the attention of the house on Friday, and asked Sir Wilfrid Laurier if that gentleman had the authority of the government to make such a statement.

Sir Wilfrid replied that the statement made by Mr. Nesbitt was quite consistent with the policy of the government. "We have undertaken," said the premier, "to have reciprocity in natural products, not in manufactured products. At the present time our policy is before the house to have reciprocity in natural products and I shall be very glad if we have the assistance of our friends that far in favor of the farmers. I doubt very much if we shall. We will see afterwards what we will do afterwards."

Thereupon, W. D. Staples, the conservative member for Macdonald, Man., rose up in his wrath and smote the government. The Grain Growers' Guide, and various other people who favor reciprocity.

**Mr. Staples Speaks**

Mr. Staples said: "I don't believe the farmers of the West have been justly used by the government in this matter. The hon. member for Regina was very prompt this afternoon to rise and read a telegram and state that he had not received an intimation from a single person in the West that they were opposed to the reciprocity agreement. I venture to say that if the farmers of the West are assured that by the passing of this reciprocal agreement, as the member for North Oxford states, there will not be a reduction in the tariff on the articles they use, then you would soon find the farmers of the West adopting a different attitude and sending a different kind of telegram. The farmers of the West are being misled, and only one side of the story is going out to them through a paper called The Grain Growers' Guide, edited by a man who is here at the present time, lobbying with the liberals in this house. It is easy for him to make a strong appeal through that journal to the conservative members of parliament to vote for the government on this particular question, but I wonder if The Guide will tell the people actual facts, that this government does not intend to reduce the duty on agricultural implements. If the farmers knew that, we should be getting a different kind of resolution from the various associations, from that which, I venture to say, has been prepared by R. McKenzie, the editor of The Guide, and R. C. Henders, who is president of the Manitoba Grain Growers. They have been disseminating this resolution at all their meetings, and every day I get in my mail a copy of the resolution (liberal cheers). I admit it, but just wait a minute," said Mr. Staples. "It is the same resolution all through, word for word, syllable for syllable, and it is sent out by that association to the farmers. I tell you, sir, that if the farmers knew that this government was not going to make any reduction on agricultural implements there would be a different kind of letter and a different form of resolution coming to the members of this house. We have at last succeeded in getting from the prime minister an admission that he is not going to change the tariff, but, after all, his remarks today are not very different from those he addressed to a deputation from the Manufacturers' Association some time ago. The farmers of the West will find, I believe, that they are not going to get out of this agreement what they expected."

**Step at a Time**

Dr. Clark, of Red Deer, Alberta, remarked that like his friend, Mr. Staples,

he had had some conversations from the farmers of the West, and from all he could learn the farmers of the West had had well to heart that the best method of accomplishing human progress, whether in politics or anything else, was to take one step at a time, and that they had also a great belief in the proverb that half a loaf was better than no bread.

During the afternoon a number of resolutions both for and against reciprocity were read to the house. M. Y. McLean, South Huron, presented a resolution from the Seaforth branch of the National Council of Agriculture in favor of the agreement, and also a resolution passed at a meeting of the farmers of the Bruceville district in favor of reciprocity.

Dr. Daniels, of St. John, read the resolution of the Board of Trade of St. Stephen, N. B., against reciprocity and Mr. Crosby, of Halifax, presented another resolution against reciprocity from the Kentville, Nova Scotia, board of trade. As Sir Frederick Borden represented that constituency, and a liberal had recently been elected to a local house from the same district by acclamation he thought it was fair to assume that this resolution had been passed by liberals.

Sir Frederick thereupon rose to inform the house that the Kings County Board of Trade, which was representative of the whole constituency, including farmers, had passed a resolution in favor of reciprocity by 87 votes to 7. That, he said, about represented the feeling in Kings County, and the fact that a liberal had been returned to the local house by acclamation had been largely due to the announcement of the reciprocity agreement a few days previous to nomination day.

**British Columbia Resolutions**

Martin Burrill, of British Columbia, next read resolutions passed by three fruit growers' associations at Summerland, against reciprocity, and B. B. Law countered with a favorable resolution from the Yarmouth Board of Trade.

W. M. Martin read a telegram which he had received stating that the reciprocity agreement had been unanimously endorsed by 400 delegates at the convention of the Saskatchewan association of rural municipalities held at Moose Jaw on the previous day, and remarked that the man from

Saskatchewan who was opposed to reciprocity had yet to be heard from. Dr. Roche, of Marquette, Man., however, read a despatch to the Winnipeg Telegram from Fleming, Sask., saying that a resolution had been passed by the local Grain Growers' Association against the agreement.

A return laid on the table of the house a few days ago contained resolutions in favor of reciprocity from 25 local branches of the United Farmers of Alberta, as well as from the Calgary Board of Trade, the Magrath Agricultural Association, and letters from many individuals in different parts of the country. Practically no resolutions, however, were found in the return from Grain Growers' Associations in Manitoba or Saskatchewan, but on enquiry it is learned that members on both sides of the house have received large numbers of such resolutions, all favorable to reciprocity. These apparently have not been sent to the government, and consequently have not come before the house. It is expected that the liberal members will place the resolutions which have reached them on record at an early date by reading them in the house, but the conservatives are apparently reading the letters and telegrams and consigning them to their waste paper baskets.

## HEATING LAST YEAR'S RECORD

(Red Deer Advertiser, January 6, 1911)

Rosalind of Old Jersey, the Champion milk and butter Jersey cow of Canada, bred and raised by C. A. Julian-Shorman, Red Deer, is making gratifying progress in her second official test. She completed a 12 months' official test February 21, 1910, giving 671.84 lbs butter in the year. She started another official test three months from that date on May 23, 1910, and up to December 16, 1910, had given 493.47 lbs butter so that she has now more than qualified in less than seven months for a second year's official record. At the present date, she is heavy in calf and giving 1 1/2 lbs of butter a day. As in the past year's test Rosalind has been under the charge of Mr. Jack Jones and the record she has made coupled with the fact that she has never been off her feed, speaks volumes for his capabilities as a herdman.

# The Grain Bill

(By The Guide's Special Correspondent)

Press Gallery, Ottawa, March 17

The grain bill was considered by the senate in committee of the whole on Wednesday, March 15, and the discussion showed that the lobbying which has been done by the representatives of the Peavy interests has had its effects on the senators, several of whom spoke against the clause which prohibits companies or persons interested in terminal elevators from dealing in grain or owning interior elevators. As a result the bill was referred to a special committee to give all interests an opportunity to be heard.

Senator Lougheed, of Calgary, leader of the opposition, said the bill, like other legislation resulting from agitation, was most drastic and likely to be unjust to vested interests. A company having country elevators, he said, had to have terminal elevators, just as railroad, had to have terminals. In addition to destroying a large part of the business of the grain companies which had terminal elevators, this clause would force the Quaker Oats Co., of Peterboro, to sell out either its terminal elevators or its Peterboro business.

He thought the bill should go to a special committee in order that the vested interests might be heard. Senator Beique, of Montreal, supported the appointment of a committee, and Senator McHugh, of Lindsay, Ont., who was of the same opinion, said he could see no reason as long as good grain standards were maintained, why a company should be forbidden to mix its own grain. However they mixed it, they would have to accept the grades given them when the wheat came out of the elevators.

**History of Fraud**

Senator Douglas, of Tantallon, Sask., said the handling of grain in Canada had been a history of fraud, and there had to be drastic treatment to cure conditions. As long as the same people owned country and terminal elevators and dealt in grain they would be able to so juggle and mix it that the reputation of Canadian grain in England would be injured. Someone must be defrauded when an elevator company sent out half a million bushels more No. 1 wheat than it had taken in. He

favoured hearing all interests before a special committee.

Sir Mackenzie Bowell approved of the appointment of a committee and said the law should protect the Grain Growers without the confiscation of property. Senator Watson, of Portage la Prairie, also spoke in favor of a committee and said the remedy for most of the grain handling evils would be the establishment of a sample market, and to have all Port Arthur and Fort William elevators owned by the railroad companies. Senator Campbell, of West Toronto, favored a committee and said there was no objection to mixing before the government put its grade stamp upon the wheat, but after that there should be no mixing.

## Committee Appointed

Sir Richard Cartwright said the discussion had developed the fact that there was difference of opinion over only two or three clauses and he would agree that a committee should be appointed to take evidence on them. He would refer to that committee clause 122, 123 and 242. These clauses covered the powers of the commission, the provision that terminal elevator companies could not deal in grain or hold country elevators and specified offences and penalties. The remainder of the bill was not controversial. It was the result of long experience and was now working well. He would commend to the careful consideration of the committee the three clauses referred to them, as they were the device of men who had experience in the operations of grain men. He would say that so far the modes of inspection had not been able to cope with the resources of gentlemen operating terminal elevators. Sir Richard moved and it was resolved that the bill should go to a special committee for the purpose of taking evidence and reporting to the senate, and that the committee consist of Senators Lougheed, Young, Davis, Douglas, Kirchheffer, Talbot, Bostock, Power, Beique, Roche and Jones. The committee will meet to take evidence on Tuesday, March 21.