

FARMER MEMBER HITS BACK AT 'J.J.' FOR LETTER

Says Morrison's Advice to
U.F.O. Clubs is Unfair
and Unjust

"LEAVE US ALONE"

R. M. Warner of North Ren-
frew Stoutly Defends Stand
on Superannuation Bill

The first reply to J. J. Morrison, Secretary of the U.F.O., to be written directly to him is an open letter sent by R. M. Warren, M.P.P. for North Renfrew, and one of the big men of the U.F.O. movement. Mr. Warren defends the action of the Government and the U.F.O. members in support of the Civil Servants' Superannuation Bill, and asks "if it would not be possible for you to trust us to guide our little ship of State?"

Mr. Warren's letter follows:

"I am going to take the liberty of writing you again regarding the relations of our Government and the U.F.O. I would prefer talking this over with you personally, but would like to have this letter referred to our U.F.O. Executive when they meet.

Farmers "Worked Up."

"When I arrived home for the week-end, I found the farmers quite worked up over the circular sent them from the U.F.O. office regarding increased indemnity and the Superannuation Bill.

"Now, while it can be claimed that this is an entirely fair means of getting the opinions of the men on the back concessions, there is something to be said on the other side of the question, and it is this other side I wish to present to you.

No Robbery Contemplated.

"While the circular regarding the increased indemnity is fair in a sense, yet a man in the country could not read it without getting the impression that this new people's Government was about to steal some of the people's money, and that the U.F.O. were making a gallant effort to prevent the robbery. The circular is marked Urgent! Rush, and Speed is Necessary, all to the effect that we must stop these robbers before they get away with the plunder. In the circular no mention is made of the fact that all the other Provinces recognize the necessity of paying a much larger indemnity than that paid by the banner Province of Ontario, or that expenses of all kinds, including hotel bills, have more than doubled during the last years. It is a fact that every man in the House knows that he is bound to lose money if he tries to do the work that he ought to do, and would like to do, on \$1,400 per year. Politics has always been recognized as a 'rich man's job,' and while we know some men have grown wealthy in the game, we well know that it was not because of their indemnity.

Democracy and Living Wage.

"We had hoped that by electing men from the common walks of life to represent us in Parliament, we might succeed in bringing about a more democratic form of Government, but can you tell me how you hope to keep these men serving you if you refuse to pay them enough to live on. It is true that to many people on our farms, \$1,400 seems quite a sum of money, but they often forget that there is a constant, unavoidable, perfectly legitimate

drain on the resources of the public man which he does not face as a private citizen. It is a mistaken idea to imagine that his duties end with the session, for—if he is willing to do so—he could spend practically all of his time serving his people. It is a mistake to say that the members knew what the indemnity was before they went into this. Many of us did not know and did not care, for we were out fighting for what we considered a great principle, and the thought of reward was not troubling us. However, our Prime Minister has declared that no increase will be granted this year. He has taken this stand, believing it to be in the best interests of the people, and I feel quite confident that in this stand he will receive the loyal support of his followers. The circulars sent out to the clubs regarding the Superannuation Bill I consider entirely unfair, and unjust. In you present arguments against the bill and you do not even hint that there might be arguments in favor of it. There is not a club in the country that would not immediately pass a resolution condemning the bill after having your circular read to them, if it was the only information they had on the subject. On the other hand, there are few clubs who would not take an entirely different view of the question, if it was presented to them in its proper light.

\$2,000 is Maximum.

"You make no mention of the fact that all civil servants are obliged to pay into this fund, up as high as 5 per cent. of their yearly salary, which would mean that in the case of a man getting \$3,000, he would be paying \$150 yearly into this superannuation fund. You say, 'When a man is superannuated at, say, \$2,000 per year'—but you do not tell the people that \$2,000 is the maximum amount any man could get and that in the case of a man who had given only 10 years' continuous service at a salary of \$1,500 per year, his superannuation allowance would be only \$300 per year, as all servants entitled to superannuation get one-fiftieth of their salary multiplied by their years of service.

"You also intimate that all positions made vacant by putting this bill into effect would have to be filled by younger men. That is altogether incorrect, as a very large percentage of the positions would not be filled at all—in other words—the work would be carried on just as efficiently and much more economically by a reduced staff. Also you pick out 65 exceptional cases and hold 47 of them up as examples. That is unfair. To be fair you should cite some of the poorer paid employees as well. You might have told them, for example, of some quite capable men, with wife and children to support, who get \$1,100 per year. You might have mentioned a widowed mother of three children who gets \$18 per week to pay rent and support herself and family. You ask, Would farmers (living as they do) not have saved money on a salary of