

# WHEAT HIGHER IN CANADA THAN IN THE UNITED STATES

Wages Higher in Canada Than in the United States—Claim That the Protective Tariff Benefits Our Farmers and Mechanics Entirely Disproven

Rolla, N. D., Sept. 2.—To the Editor of the World-Herald: With the very large wheat yield this year in North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota and Canada, there never has been a more favorable time to compare the prices paid for wheat in the United States and Canada than now.

Grand Forks, N. D., is one of the two principal cities in North Dakota. It is about 135 miles south of Winnipeg, Can.

I quote the wheat market from the Daily Grand Forks Times of August 21, 1912, and inclose the market page of this paper for your inspection. The markets are substantially the same now as on August 20, 1912.

Wheat market August 20, 1912:

Cash wheat, Minneapolis, Minn., 95c.  
Cash wheat, Duluth, Minn., 96c.  
Cash wheat, Grand Forks, N. D., 86c.  
Cash wheat, Winnipeg, Can., \$1.06.

To import wheat from Canada into the United States, it is necessary to pay a tariff tax of 25 cents per bushel, and our farmers have been asked to believe that this tariff has protected them against Canadian wheat. With good crops in both countries, wheat never can be shipped from Canada into the United States, omitting the tariff entirely, without loss to the shipper.

On the present market, if wheat could come in to the United States from Canada without any tariff tax, the man who would try to ship wheat from Winnipeg (the greatest wheat market in Canada) to Grand Forks, N. D., would lose about 26 cents per bushel.

Allowing wheat to come in from Canada free, no one can ship wheat from Winnipeg to Minneapolis or Duluth, including shipping charges, without a loss of about 20 cents per bushel.

The eastern manufacturer wants the farmer to believe that he gets more for his grain on account of the tariff, so that the farmer will be willing to pay about two prices for the manufactured articles he buys. The truth is, the farmer is paying more for what he buys, without getting any more for what he sells, than as though there had been no tariff on wheat and corn.

In Canada \$16 will buy as good a suit of clothing, as good an overcoat, as good a dress or as good a woman's coat as \$30 will buy in the United States.

Counting wheat at \$1 per bushel in both countries, and clothing of the same quality, in trading wheat for clothing you have this result:

One suit clothing.....	16 bu. wheat
One overcoat .....	16 bu. wheat
One woman's coat .....	16 bu. wheat
One woman's dress .....	16 bu. wheat

Total ..... 64 bu. wheat  
In the United States—

One suit clothing.....	30 bu. wheat
One overcoat .....	30 bu. wheat
One woman's dress .....	30 bu. wheat
One woman's coat .....	30 bu. wheat

Total ..... 120 bu. wheat

Who gets the extra fifty-six bushels of wheat that the farmer in the United States pays for his four garments?

It is the local merchant? No.

It is the factory laborer? No. He gets an average of less than \$1.40 per day.

It is the manufacturer of the cloth and the manufacturer of the clothing who get the extra fifty-six bushels of wheat on account of the tariff. The farmer gets no more for his horses, cattle, hogs, wheat or corn than he would if there were no tariff on those products of the farm. Today a good span of horses is worth \$100 more in Canada than in the United States.

Wages are higher in Winnipeg than in Minneapolis, but for comparison we will call them the same—common labor \$3 per day in either city. In Canada the laborer will buy a much better suit of clothing for \$12 than he can get in the United States for \$18.

In the two countries, in trading labor for clothing, we have this result:

In Canada—  
One suit of clothing, 4 days' work.....\$12

One overcoat, 4 days' work.....\$12  
In the United States—

One suit of clothing, 6 days' work.....\$18  
One overcoat, 6 days' work.....\$18

Wages are much higher in Canada than in the United States and there is a large demand for labor.

Section men, who work on the railroads in Canada, are paid \$2.40 per day.

A resident of Saskatoon, Can., a place of 15,000 to 20,000 people, told your correspondent that the following wages are paid there:

Carpenters .....	55 cents per hour
Brick masons .....	65 cents per hour
Plasterers .....	70 cents per hour

From all this one must conclude that the so-called protective tariff does not give higher prices to the farmer or the laborer in the United States, but that it makes both pay more for living supplies.

This tariff puts the robber in the home, where he takes about 35 per cent more than a fair price out of every dollar spent for domestic supplies. It is not a protective, but rather a destructive tariff.—George T. Baker in Omaha World-Herald.

## WILSON ON FARMER PROTECTION

The theory, doctrine and claim that protection advantages the farmer, upon which the republican party has so persistently and insistently rung the changes, never met with more complete annihilation than they suffered at the hands of Governor Wilson in a speech he made in Pennsylvania the other day. The American farmer, Governor Wilson asserted, has never needed protection for the reason, which constitutes "an economical fact," that he has never needed protection, since his grains have been sold at prices established by the prices which his produce commanded in foreign markets.

The prices the farmer receives, he continued, in further impressing his position as to the controlling relation of "an economic fact" to the question, are not established by protection. They are established by your (the farmers') abundance, which you ship to foreign countries. From recognition of the absolute cogency of this reasoning and the unassailability of the conclusion there is no escape.

But Governor Wilson did not stop there. Turning to the disadvantages to the farmer involved in "protection"—high tariff—he affirmed that meantime everything used on the farm, everything the farmer needs, a great deal of what he eats but does not himself produce, including meats, bears a heavy duty, "which brings about the interesting result that you (the farmers) are paying for the wealth of the United States and getting nothing equivalent, so far as the tariff is concerned." A bomb, verily, of concentrated fact and logic Governor Wilson hurled into the protection camp in the above exposition. He not only proved that the farmer is not protected, but demonstrated, to the contrary, that he was mercilessly preyed upon for the benefit of the favored few; that the agricultural interests, considering their immensity, have been and are being made the chief source for glutting protection vampirism.

His proof on the one point and his demonstration as to the other refute in a nutshell every contention that has been advanced in exploitation of protection as the "farmers' friend." They are so clear and convincing that it is impossible to comprehend how any farmer gifted with even the most elementary ability to grasp them can fail of understanding that the tariff is his worst enemy. It is difficult to conceive how he can fail to recognize that just in proportion as he accepts the high tariff doctrine he becomes the dupe and the tool of the special interests and engages in cutting his own purse and throat and the purses and throats of the masses—is guilty of economic suicide.—Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch.

## TARIFF MAKES LIVING HIGH

The real facts about the present tariff are being published by the New York World in a series of articles based upon information

gathered by the tariff reform committee of the Reform club of New York, a non-partisan organization.

There are about 22 million households in the United States. That not one of them escapes the greed of the tariff-protected manufacturer will be very plainly seen by comparing export and domestic prices on articles of common use in the home.

Nearly everybody is familiar with the discrimination that has been practiced by the "Watch Trust" against the American consumer, resulting in some merchants buying Elgin, Waltham and other American watches cheaper in Europe than the trust sold them here and shipping them back to this country. But clocks are too bulky to make this practice profitable, and the American is helpless.

## THE KITCHEN FEELS IT

The American family meets tariff discrimination at every turn. To get breakfast they use a kitchen coffee mill which is offered for export at ninety cents, but to the American purchaser not under \$1.13—one-fourth added to the price—while the tariff permits the American manufacturer to do business without competition from abroad.

The oil heater on which the workingman's family might make a hasty cup of coffee and boil the eggs for breakfast—if they could afford eggs—is sold for export at \$2.20, but for the "protected" American purchaser the price is 40 per cent higher, or \$3.08.

A 2-quart aluminum coffee pot, on which there is protection of 45 per cent, is sold in this country for \$1.50, which is 44 per cent more than the American manufacturer asks for it for export to any place not under protection's wing.

On Monday morning the American mother puts the wash boiler on the tariff-taxed cook stove. A Peekskill, N. Y., manufacturer quoted the tariff reform committee's "export agent" \$15 as the foreign price for the stove he charges \$20 for in this country because the government has decreed a tax of 45 per cent on cook stoves.

## TAX THE BABY CARRIAGE

If the American mother wishes to let her baby sleep in the baby carriage in the yard she meets the tariff tax again. For Newfoundland a leading American manufacturer quoted \$9.50 for his baby carriage, but for all those who enjoy the blessings of "protection" the wholesale price is \$12.67, or one-third more. By a duty of 45 per cent the American baby is often "protected" out of having any carriage at all. For the poor the protective tariff has made a go-cart a luxury.

Tuesday is ironing day, which the kind hearted protectionists have tried to make happier for the house mother by compelling her to pay nearly a third more for her flatirons, as is proved by the export prices quoted by Philadelphia manufacturers. The heavier the iron the greater the weight of protection, as it is fixed at four-fifths of a cent per pound. The set of sadirons these honest Quaker City people offer for export at ninety-three cents they will sell to the "protected" Americans for \$1.23.

## MORE OF THE KITCHEN GRAFT

The meat chopper costs just double the export price, the slaw and vegetable cutter and the potato shredder cost two-fifths more than they would sell for across the line in Canada, and the pots and pans of aluminum come 50 per cent dearer. It is chiefly due to that 45 per cent duty.

Even the vanilla flavoring extract for the cornstarch pudding costs the American family a third more than for export to the foreign family.

The children's clothes have to be made, and the domestic sewing machine is handy. It would be just as handy, however, if the American family could get it for the export price, \$18.62, instead of the \$30 or more they have to pay. The \$11.38 extra charged his wife for this machine is a week's wages for many millions of American workingmen.—Kansas City Times.

Mr. Perkins is becoming more and more a load to Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Taft is beginning to feel the weight of J. Pierpont Morgan's indorsement. The trust magnates are a liability instead of an asset in a campaign.

Mr. Roosevelt continues to call Woodrow Wilson "Doctor." Let it go at that. Dr. Wilson seems to be purging the body politics of a lot of deleterious matter—hence the scolding and the fulminating.