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 each other 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 immense 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.

RE SIR EDMUND'S ADVICE

Editor, Guide:—According to a newspaper report there was an annual meeting of the Bank of Commerce on January 10 last; the profits for the year were 18.38 per cent. on paid up capital. The president in his address, among other things, said that the exports of the Dominion during the last fiscal year were $301,358,000, while the imports were $391,803,000, leaving a balance of trade against us of $90,445,000, and then proceeds as usual to hand out advice to the farmers thus: "We know that in almost all parts of Canada the majority of farmers produce very much less per acre than would be possible with greater effort and with the necessary labor available." Then he prates about our "duties to the state," "that the overwhelming bulk of our people share in our prosperity which is the result of our combined effort to make profitable the natural resources of Canada; and that it is regrettable (I suppose he was thinking of the farmers' delegation to Ottawa in December) that instead of throwing our hats in the air (those that have them) and congratulating ourselves on our prosperity, we agitate merely that we may still further profit as individuals." Now it will be evident to all who have read the address that all that bothers him is that the banks, railways, mergers, corporations, etc., flourish and pay large dividends, and the individuals toil and moil and skimp that these dividends may not shrink. He talks of our duties to the state as if the state was some abstract being different from the individuals that compose it, or perhaps, which is most likely, he means by the state himself and the other big capitalists of modern feudalism and that the rest of us were only born for their advantage and to be exploited by them. He knows, or he ought to know, that if we get more for what we do export and pay less for those articles which we import, the balance in trade of $90,000,000 against us would be reduced or even turned in our favor. He, however, avoids hinting at that and only tells us we should work harder and produce more. He is not concerned whether we receive value for what we produce or not, but is quite satisfied with things as they now are, knowing full well the unlawful privileges which he and others have obtained through collusion of a Conservative government first and the incompetence of a Liberal one afterwards. He regrets that the balance in trade is against us, but forgets to tell us that the exorbitant profits with which the corporations burden us nearly all are exported to foreign shareholders or are carried by Canadians to Brazil or Mexico to exploit the natives. He should think of the heavy loads with which the individuals of the West are burdened when the C.P.R. obtained from the crown these favors among others: "The Canadian Pacific Railway, and all stations and station grounds, workshops, buildings, yards and other property, rolling stock and appurtenances required and used for the construction and working thereof, and the capital stock of the company, shall be **forever free** from taxation by the Dominion, or by any province hereinafter established, or by any municipal corporation therein; and the lands of the company (25,000,000 acres) in the Northwest Territories, until they are either sold or occupied, shall also be free from such taxation for twenty years after the grant thereof from the crown."

The C.P.R. was not content with obtaining an exemption for 20 years from the date their grant was earned (which was manifestly the intention of the parliament that gave them the grant), but by the aid of corporation lawyers and the subserviency of the government have so managed that though the grant was all earned in 1885, they will be practically exempt till 1923—38 years instead of 20. As soon as the people awake to the enormity of this injustice they will arise and demand its repeal, because common sense teaches all men that the exemption from taxes **forever** is beyond the power of a party delegated with power for a few years, and the extension of time from 20 to 38 years is simply the juggling of interested lawyers. We badly want the Initiative and the Referendum.

P. McKENNA.

Copeville, Alta.

THE FRUIT INTERESTS

Editor, Guide:—It would look more reasonable if the real estate and fruit men of British Columbia would spend their money and energies in the production of fruit instead of booming the prices of fruit lands so high that the fruit cannot be put on the market at a fair price, and trying to show what big prices the newcomer is justified in paying for fruit lands. Of course the second party either has to sell at a profit and fool someone else or get a big price for the fruit raised on such high priced land. But little of the land is in use, for only fifteen per cent. of the fruit used in Alberta last year could be obtained in B.C. at a price at which it could be profitably handled. It looks to the consumer of B.C. fruit who lives on the prairie that it would be about as reasonable to put down the price of fruit land as it would be to put up the tariff to make the fruit business pay in B.C. The organized farmers of Alberta have been trying to promote a growth as well as a more convenient and economical exchange of natural products between British Columbia and Alberta, and have spent no small part of the scanty supply of funds at their disposal to this end, besides a great deal of the time and energy of the leading men in their association. In 1906 the provincial government was induced by them to send a representative of the Alberta farmers into British Columbia to investigate conditions with a view to enlarging the trade between those two provinces. This commissioner found most of the B.C. people and a large proportion of the business interests anxious to assist in every possible way along such lines of development. Where the efforts were most conspicuous by their absence was among the real estate, lumbermen and fruit growers. Their first and last howl was, help us raise the tariff and we will then help in every way possible to enlarge our business with Alberta. At the same time both fruit and lumber were practically out of reach of would-be consumers. However, they obtained no promises to such blind and selfish requests, the farmers well knowing such a move would only make bad conditions worse. They therefore persisted in their efforts in season and out of season until in 1908 there had been considerable interest stirred up in both provinces which resulted in the calling of a convention of farmers and the business interests of the two provinces. It met in Calgary and accomplished a great deal of good work, some of the results of which are now apparent. The writer has failed to learn of any startling efforts being put forth by any of the above mentioned interests. He does know, however, when the 1910 Traders' Development convention was called and met in Vancouver that the fruit men especially were about the scarcest article there. I will say further that while the prairie people are paying five cents a piece for good apples instead of getting two for five cents, they will not desire very strongly to hold up the price by a tariff to suit the speculators and fruit men. Let them meet the consumers of fruit and get at the matter in a reasonable way, and there is a way if they go the right way about it without using the tariff prop.

D. W. WARNER.

Edmonton, Alta.

AGREES WITH GUIDE

Editor, Guide: — In your issue of March 22 you comment on Mr. C. A. McGrath's Stratford speech, and characterize his conduct on the reciprocity agreement as the "disfranchisement of Medicine Hat constituency." I heartily agree with your conclusions. My Liberal friends here call me a Tory, so you can see that it isn't partyism that makes me disagree with Mr. McGrath. Our U.F.A. union here, 60 strong, voted to a man in favor of a resolution endorsing the reciprocity part, and forwarded a copy to Mr. McGrath, and there is no doubt that the vast majority of the farmers of Alberta are in favor of the part, but want free implements as well. Keep up the good work you are so ably doing, and in the not too distant future we will see the kingdom of Special Privilege and monopoly lying in the dust, and like the skunk that tried to stop the train, there won't be anything left but the stink they kicked up.

JAS. DARRAUGH.

Bowell, Alta.

HOMESTEADS FOR WOMEN

Editor, Guide:—The Grain Growers' Guide, according to its front page, stands for equity, and surely it is a worthy motto, a lofty ideal, well worth a man's or an association's very best efforts. Since coming home from the convention at Brandon I have been considering the questions that were brought forward, and there is a small question I would like to put frankly before The Guide readers. Is it just that the single women of Canada should be debarred from homesteading as they are at the present time? I understand that only widows who are the heads of families are allowed to locate as homesteaders at present; but why should not all single women, young or old, have the privilege as they have in Uncle Sam's domain? Consider, aye, Guide readers, look at the matter from the woman's point of view and be just. In every Canadian city there are hundreds of bright intelligent girls and women who are earning their living as stenographers, clerks and teachers, who would only be too glad to avail themselves of the privilege of homesteading in the West. These women are surely more valuable citizens than the drinking, swearing, carousing, cigarette-smoking young fellows who loaf about bar-rooms, and yet the latter have votes and homesteads, and the former have neither. In the Eastern Provinces young men are scarce and girls plentiful. In the West the case is reversed and there are probably five men to one girl in many of the frontier settlements. Now, if a girl could take up a quarter section alongside of her brothers there would be a good many more in the West, and the brother and the chap off the next farm would be a good deal happier and I think more prosperous men. If the farmers' wives, sisters and daughters, who want homesteads for women, will express their views in The Guide it will keep the ball rolling.

Pettapiece, Man. W. F. GRAHAM.

RECIPROCITY GREATLY NEEDED

Editor, Guide:—I have been reading your paper, The Guide, for a little while now, and think it is a very interesting paper, and no farmer should be without The Guide. I have also been reading your letters about reciprocity and also other people's views on it, and noticed that it is only the manufacturers and big interests that are against reciprocity, and I certainly think that it is the best thing that can happen the farmers of this country to get reciprocity ratified as soon as possible, for it will mean a sample market for the farmers in Winnipeg, which will certainly enable us to get better prices for our grain and stock as well. For it will then be in open competition with any country that wants to buy our grain and stock. One more thing I would like to see go through is the Hudson's Bay Railway, and I think that if the farmers all combine and stay together they can get nearly anything they want. I certainly think that they will be able to reduce the tariff on farming implements, which is greatly needed.

A. H. DETMOLD.

Duck Mountain, Man.

RECALL A NECESSARY REFORM

Editor, Guide:—At the last convention held by the United Farmers of Alberta every candidate for office had to pledge himself in favor of the Initiative, Referendum and Recall. As we go along events will show the importance of these reforms. As stated in The Guide of March 22 the electors of the Medicine Hat district have been disfranchised, so to speak, as its representative, C. A. McGrath, M.P., has declared that he will vote against the reciprocity treaty and thus directly oppose the wishes of the majority of his constituents. I will add to this that the Queenstown Union farmers living in the Medicine Hat district passed a unanimous resolution in favor of the reciprocity agreement and sent same to C. A. McGrath asking him to support it. McGrath returned the answer that "as he did not believe in it he would oppose it." Now whether McGrath has been influenced by the manufacturers or whether it is his honest belief, makes little difference. It shows a wrong state of affairs; shows that under our present political system the men elected do not consider themselves servants of the people who elected them, but their masters. The great majority of the voters of the Medicine Hat district are farmers, and those farmers want to see the reciprocity treaty passed because it is to their economic interests, but the one man, McGrath, misrepresenting them, rises up at Ottawa and says: "No, I don't believe in it and therefore you shall not have it." Now then, if we had the Recall in operation McGrath would have had to sign an agreement before he took office to the effect that any time he opposed the wishes and interests of his constituents he could be recalled. That would put him where he belonged—the servant and not the master.

JOHN GLAMBECK.

INDEPENDENT PARTY IMPERATIVE

Editor, Guide:—I should like to say a few words in reply to Mr. Kennedy's letter in your issue of March 29. Instead of forming an Independent Farmers' party, Mr. Kennedy strongly advocates continued support of the old parties, but advises farmers to flock to the party conventions and pledge the candidates in black and white. But if you elect a party candidate, the moment he fails to support his party on a serious question he becomes an independent anyway. Besides, we want as representatives farmers, men from our own ranks, not professional or business men from the towns; and farmers cannot absolutely depend upon controlling the party conventions to the extent of selecting their own candidates. Mr. Kennedy makes much of the financial difficulty. The present parties are financed by the wealthy interests who are opposed to the farmers, and they will not finance a party which is not loyal to them. Always the man who pays the piper calls the time. With organization and education going hand in hand through each constituency the cost of a farmers party need be very small. Every other farmer will be a supporter and canvasser. In any event, the farmers, to achieve their ends, must be prepared to make some sacrifices—they cannot expect absolutely "to create a new earth at a birth without labor or sorrow." Through an independent party we can concentrate the farmers' votes—Conservatives and Liberals alike are working enthusiastically for it here.