



## NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS

This department of The Guide is maintained especially for the purpose of providing a discussion ground for the readers, where they may freely exchange views and derive from such exchange the benefits of experience and helpful suggestions. Each correspondent should remember that there are hundreds who wish to discuss a problem or offer suggestions. We cannot publish all the innumerable number of letters received, and ask that each correspondent will keep his letter as short as possible. Every letter must be signed by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication. The views of our correspondents are not of necessity those of The Guide. The aim is to make this department of great value to readers and so letters not of public interest will be published.

## THE BUGBEAR OF SOCIALISM

Editor, GUIDE:—In your issue of November 10th, Mr. J. L. Sparrow, of Sedgewick, Alta., contributes a letter, which contains some excellent remarks on co-operation. It seems such a pity that a man of intelligence and sympathy like your correspondent should display a pet prejudice, without explanation or apology, as he has done in a certain paragraph of his otherwise admirable letter. He says, "I get the impression that your paper is inclined to develop along Socialistic lines for the interests of the farmers. I hope this is not so, and that you will confine the paper to the co-operative idea, which is really the secret of all the big successes in the world today."

Now, I am an ordinary ignorant person, who cannot see any difference in principle between Socialism and co-operation. Co-operation, which is the secret of big success, appears to me to be only an incipient voluntary Socialism. In other words, when co-operation becomes general and the co-operating majority decree that, for the safety and welfare of society, scrambling, commercial, competition must cease, then we shall have rank, red, bull-scaring Socialism, which will not, from its having been under the cacophonous name of co-operation, when in its transition stage, lack anything of the monstrosities ascribed to it by the quasi-sage councillors of mankind.

The question arises: Should THE GUIDE remain in the hazy plane of obscurantism, doling out morsels of truth in the terms of our ignorance, or should it proclaim the eternal verities in the concise language of clarified thought and with pure logic?

Another phase of the question is: Should the producers of agricultural wealth let a shibboleth mar the development of the solidarity of labor? Socialism is the only solution of the great problem of poverty and riches, and organized Socialism does not advocate the abolition of peasant proprietorship, so it is the clear duty of THE GRAIN GROWERS' GUIDE and F. of L. to identify itself with the ideals of the awakening masses.

It is also the duty of men like Mr. Sparrow, leaders in their own little sphere, to cast petty prejudice aside and realize the responsibility of their position. True, their antipathies cannot stem the oncoming tide of progressive thought, but they retard its action.

It is to be hoped that THE GUIDE will not turn blind. We have a surfeit of blind guides.

JOHN CAMPBELL.

Lloydminster, Alta.

[Note.—Here is another reader who deals with a complex subject. Educational work is needed, and our correspondent has presented some thoughts for those who disagree with him. Let the campaign of education proceed, but the farmers of the west must not lose sight of the vital problems that are near at hand, and in need of solution. Our readers are not a unit on the views expressed in this letter, but they are one in the determination to correct the present marketing systems and to secure fair treatment for the producer.—Editor.]

## ON FARMERS' PROTECTION

Editor, GUIDE:—In your issue of January the 5th Mr. Copeland calls attention to a fact that should cause others, who have the welfare of the Grain Growers' Association at heart, to pause and consider if this should not be changed. Wolves in the guise of sheeps' clothing

have caused many well meant efforts to go astray. What folly is it to allow your opponent full access to all your meetings and debates if that knowledge is used for your destruction? Do the elevator or manufacturing interests allow an outsider to attend their meetings? I should say not. Then why allow others than farmers to become members? It is time for such foolishness to stop. Remember how hard it has been to attain our present position, and do not allow anything that is likely to injure our association's future usefulness to creep in.

The report of the stock shipper's meeting is another case in point. Last year the shippers solemnly declared that by July, 1909, all stock shipped into Winnipeg would be sold, fed and watered—and not "off cars." Have they kept to that agreement? The cattle and pigs are still being sold in the good old way, possibly because there is less trouble in dressing them when the beasts are starved empty. Who is to blame? One of the chief causes is a certain prominent member, a paid official of the C.P.R., who, whatever he may state to the meeting of the shippers, will do his very best to counteract their efforts behind their backs. If he did not do this, his position would soon be filled by another. The railway company would stand for nothing else. Remember the arguments he used in Ottawa last winter against the interests of the Alberta ranchers. Is it not folly to allow such people access to your plans before you attain your objects? Read Mr. Copeland's letter over again and see if he is not right.

Wawanesa, Man.

OLIVER KING.

## SERVANTS AND MASTERS

Editor, GUIDE:—I have just become a subscriber to your paper, first one to hand. To say that I am pleased with it is to put it mildly. You certainly are not afraid to champion the cause of the farmer. I think there is no doubt that in a great measure credit is due THE GUIDE for bringing the question of government-owned elevators to almost a surety, and scaring the life out of the bogy "constitutional difficulties."

The "willingness" of the government to come to time, when it couldn't help itself, is only a proof of what the farmers can do by united effort. If the working-man and farmer would only realize that their interests are identical and work together, it would not be long before we could change the color of things in this country, as far as politics are concerned, instead of getting down on our knees and praying for our rights as we have to do now, and with no likelihood of getting anything except what the government like to hand out. We could make them realize that they—the government—are the servants, and not the masters, and would, of course, have to legislate as the people directed.

I notice a letter by Mr. Mabey in which he blames your paper for not being more radical in its views. He complains that THE GUIDE is not advocating anything to help the farm laborer or one who works for wages. While in a sense that may be true, still we all know that when the farmer is prosperous the effect is felt all over, by better conditions generally and better wages. In fact, there are "good times."

Then I think that we should not lose sight of the fact that government ownership of elevators is at least a step in the right direction, and we should help along

the good work with all our might to the end that ultimately we will see added to the list of publicly-owned enterprises, railways, telegraphs, coal mines, and all public utilities.

CHAS. TOWER.

Ingelow, Man.

## THE BETTER PLAN

The following letter has been sent by the Grain Growers' Grain Co. for publication in the Guide.

Gentlemen:—In reference to my car of wheat, No. 90652, shipped from Claresholm: I wish to say that I received a grade better than I was offered here, and also ten (10) cents more per bushel on 1,080 bushels, or \$108.00 on my car more than I could get by selling to the local elevators. I cheerfully recommend you company to any of my brother farmers. Wishing you every success.

JOHN STEVENSON.

Claresholm, Alta.

## NON-PARTISAN FARMERS

Editor, GUIDE:—I think every sensible person will agree with "New Reporter" where he says in your issue, January 5: "The great benefit would be to get the Grain Growers' organized on political matters and educated to take their right place by having their own representatives in rural districts."

Why? Because our financial position—and thus our general welfare as a class—very chiefly depends upon our political actions. If we unite our votes, we can have our just rights. If we divide them we fail, hence the political muddle—or to be strictly accurate the "Partisan Muddle." The chief need of the farmers is that they be educated and organized into Non-Partisanship in their politics.

As at present farmers consist for the most part of liberals and conservatives. We should all be independents, instead of virulent partisans. Hence the political muddle. Hence the party journals that now exist for the specific purpose of exciting partisanship of the worst kind. May common sense hasten the day when non-partisanship in political affairs will take the place of present campaign bigotry.

Some of us farmers and a few journals have worked many years for this end, and for a long while it seemed, almost without any encouragement of any kind, but it does seem to me that farmers and others are fast losing their political bigotry, and that the time is at hand that liberal and conservative "bossism," demanding its partisan pledges of its candidates to stand in with its leaders (who stand in with the privileged monopolists) will find themselves up against the Grain Growers' vote.

Yes, farmers are beginning to see that nine-tenths of them in the past put partisanship above good and clean government. The great majority of farmers are fairly decent citizens and would not be guilty of taking a bribe, or looking for a political promise of some future lucrative job; they would inwardly despise and vote against the candidate whose agent offered it.

If, instead of us having governments run by the political machines, if farmers who have been hitherto held up by the machine and clique bosses, will fully make up their minds to vote only for candidates who are true patriots, daring to stand for the common good, it is plain to be seen that the results from such a government would return to every honest toiler and producer a hundredfold more benefits than the paltry job, bribe or petty office in which benefit, not only the dastard, but the fair and decent citizen would likewise equally share.

Now, we farmers have before seedling starts, more time to think than during the busy summer and autumn. Will all my readers put down their thoughts on a bit of paper and tell the editor of THE GUIDE what they intend to do next polling time? Don't write your thoughts too hastily; try to think only for the good of the entire community. Reason it out with due deliberation; then write and say "I have come to the conclusion to be non-partisan in future."

FREDERICK KIRKHAM.

Saltcoats, Sask.

## OPPOSES CANADIAN NAVY

Editor, GUIDE:—In view of all that has been said and written about a Canadian Navy it seems to me that the farmers the ones on whom the brunt of the burden will fall—are not being asked for their

opinion of this Naval policy. I do not think that any of the present premiers or M.P.'s or other "bo-faluting moguls" who do the nation's thinking (unasked) were elected on a pledge either to build battle ships or contribute towards the building of same, or contribute a battleship or even a rowboat to the mother country. I believe that all this naval howl has sprung up fungi-like in a very, very short time. I do not believe that the real needs and lack of protection for Canadian people have created this sudden demand for a Canadian navy. Now let us look a little into the weird mysteries of past naval prestige. Great Britain has a gigantic navy costing the people millions of dollars each year. What do the people get in return for this enormous tax? First they get the privilege of reading in the big dailies in glaring headlines that "Dreadnought so-and-so can, with one of her turret guns, fire a projectile weighing about 1½ tons a distance of 22 miles." Now my farmer friends, let me ask you to read between the lines. This is what you will see, namely, that it takes about 1,500 pounds of powder to discharge one of these big guns. You are taxed to pay for this powder, my friend. Then again, your sons are called upon to man these huge instruments of pillage and murder.

Now, my farmer friends, the only thing a battleship can do is murder, and this murder in nine cases out of ten is not only murder but mutilation as well. Let me ask you to take a sober second thought then see if you will lend your aid to this scheme of murder, mutilation and destruction of property which our representatives at Ottawa are trying to force upon us. No, no, my farmer friends, frown it down, discourage it in every way. It is against our best interests, it is opposed to good religion, it is detrimental to good citizenship, it is a clog on the wheels of Christian progress. It is sired by individualistic selfishness and should be damned by public opinion. This navy they are forcing upon us, stamp it out!

H. G. AHERN.

Claresholm, Alta.

## ANOTHER MISSIONARY WON OVER

Editor, GUIDE:—Please find enclosed \$1.00 for GRAIN GROWERS' GUIDE. I have been receiving sample copies, and it has interested me very much. I think the Grain Growers' Grain Company is a great thing and will soon be victorious all through the western provinces. I have not shipped any grain through it, but expect to next year, when I intend also to join the association. There are many others around here who intend joining another year. Wishing THE GUIDE and the Grain Growers' Association unlimited success, and with thanks for sample copies.

THOMAS RIDLEY.

Grayson, Sask.

## MR. CURRAN'S LOGIC

Editor, GUIDE:—I read with interest an article by Mr. F. J. Collyer, in your issue of January 5th, and, while agreeing in the main with his views therein expressed, I take exception to his proposition contained in the concluding paragraph, namely:—"to provide storage and shipping facilities for our own grain."

Now, I cannot see why we should not ask the Government to supply such storage and shipping facilities, and for these reasons:—Is not the farming class the greatest wealth producer of this province, or, for that matter, of this country? Does not the success of every line of trade and business, profession and manufacturing depend upon the success of the farming class?

Is not the agricultural class the fundamental factor in our national structure?

Then why should we not ask the Government to give us something that we believe will better our condition, and indirectly, the condition of every other avenue of trade and society?

That was a beautiful idea of co-operation, but I doubt its feasibility. To be thoroughly effective, co-operation should include all the units which are interested thereby. If every man who grows and markets grain, had as broad and liberal a mind as I believe Mr. Collyer possesses, then the idea of co-operation in this respect would assume huge proportions.

But why should twenty-five or thirty per cent. of the farmers put themselves in a position of possible sacrifice, for the benefit of themselves, and the rest of the hundred, when at the present time