



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 innumerable number of letters received and ask that each correspondent will keep his letters 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 no letters out of public interest will be published.

LANGLEY REPLIES

Editor GUIDE:—In his last letter Mr. Kirkham has descended from Hedy Writ and poetry, to rhapsody, and has buried the issue out of sight under a flood of raving invective. I am inclined to agree with him that on fundamental principles we have in reality no party distinctions; that the chief dividing line in politics is principally administrative. In a nation like Canada, with little or no history, where parties have been formed by compromise combination it could hardly be otherwise. But, while this is true enough it does not alter the fact, that party distinctions are sharply drawn, not that party feeling is strongly imbedded in the popular mind and no man who takes an active part in public affairs can shut his eyes to it. Mr. Kirkham conveniently shuts his eyes to facts that tell against him. He dwells with emphasis upon the fact that the farmers' vote is divided, but fails to note that the vote of the rest of the community is equally divided. Take his statement (I don't think it correct) that the farmers are 75 per cent of the voting power, it loses nothing of its proportion by being divided, because the rest of the community being divided in the same way the divided farmers' vote holds the same relation to the divided non-farmer vote. Its proportion is not altered at all; its power to dominate is there, why does it not dominate? Certainly, not because it is divided, but because it is not wisely used.

Every argument that can be adduced to show how the farmer can dominate political affairs outside the present parties has just as much force when used to show how he can dominate inside the present political parties. The latter contention has this political force, that the means—machinery if you like—are all there to his hand, while, if an attempt is made to form a farmers' party, it will be necessary to create new machinery, because however shocking it may appear to those who differ from me, no party can be run without organization, and to those opposed to it such organization will be a machine. I hold the opinion that a political organization by farmers, for farmers alone, cannot be created with any hope of successfully doing the work that lays immediately in front of us, because after we have freed the farmers from the clutches of the grain dealing combine there will remain a host of other things to do, such as freeing ourselves from the loan companies; protecting our interests in the right location of railways; maturing some workable plan of hail insurance; all matters involving the use of political weapons and, in the larger field of Dominion politics securing a more equitable tariff. To turn our attention away from these things in order to spend our strength in the doubtful task of creating a new political party does not appeal to me at all. It is contended we have no voice or say in the law making. Such a contention is silly. There is no power in Canada can prevent our voice being heard when we have made ourselves articulate; and apart altogether from politics a great field for our energies is opening out before us in the possibilities of co-operation that are patent to the gaze of every thinking man; matters that cannot be settled by votes, but must be settled by developing a business capacity and a sense of mutual reliance and mutual responsibility.

The reckless abuse of the men engaged in the work of government I should regard as hardly less than criminal were it not so palpably hollow and ludicrous.

To speak of political organization as "hell's faction machines devoted to Moloch," is worse than childish; it is driven. Even worse is the statement that the men who lead both parties have sold themselves to capitalistic greed. I pass by the gentlemanly suggestion that I am the paid champion of those who prey upon the class to which I belong. A man who can regard that sort of nonsense as serious argument places himself outside the realm of sanity, and is a fit companion to the unfortunate victims of hysteria. I know the prime minister of this province pretty well, and speaking of him in his public capacity, I say, without any hesitancy, he is a serious and clean-minded man, whose chief concern is to discharge the duties of his high office, not only in an acceptable manner, but in a way that shall be of real service to all classes of the community. And I should hardly say less of the man who leads the provincial opposition. We are, when the farmers' party is formed, to have trustworthy and intelligent farmer members. What have we now? Take two members of the opposition, Mr. Tate (Regina County), Mr. Riddell (Souris), and two members of the government side, Mr. Stewart (Cannington) and Mr. Finlayson (North Battleford). Each of these men have been earning their living up the farm for more than twenty years and were elected and elected by their neighbors because of that. To refer to these men as "sold to capitalist greed" is an insult to common sense and decency, and stamps Mr. Kirkham's letter, not as an argument, but as the slanderous wail of a political misfit.

But, Mr. Editor, there is no reason why our friend from Saltcoats and those who agree with him should wear out the knees of their pants beseeching me to let them go on. In spite of the wicked politicians this is comparatively a free country. The fact that in the place I occupy I shall do my little best to serve my fellow farmers should not deter men who are more ambitious to work in the way they consider best, let the men who want a farmers' party get to business. Each of them live in a constituency. Let them

stamp around there among their neighbors where they are known; there is quite a time yet before the election. Then, when the election is called let them offer themselves in their paraded purity as farmers' candidates, and the result will give the readers of THE GUIDE a chance to see what right these reckless slanderers of other men have to speak in the name of the truth-loving farmers of Saskatchewan.

GEO. LANGLEY.

Maymont.

ORGANIZE WHOLE COUNTRY

Editor GUIDE:—The organization movement now going on among the farmers of Western Canada shows that the farmers are at last awakening to the realization that they are being robbed by the wholesale and that something must be done to stop it. But while the majority now joining the organizations no doubt understand that more can be attained by organized efforts, and that great benefits will accrue to them from co-operative buying and selling, I think it is safe to assume that the great mass, as yet, has little or no conception of the underlying causes which is separating them from the things that rightfully belong to them, or preventing them from getting the full product of their toil. And it is up to those of us who have made a thorough study on this subject to enlighten them on the right track.

It is an historical fact that in every period of the world's history, where a certain class of the population have held the economic power, that same class have also dominated the political situation. Throughout Europe we find that in the middle age the tillers of the soil were miserably paid, ignorant peasants; serfs, with no property and less rights. The great barons or nobles were their economic masters and political rulers; they were the police, jury and judge over the peasants.

When the French revolution finally gave the death blow to feudalism, a new class came into power and they in turn controlled the nations economically and politically. It is true that the masses in some of the countries, and as years went by in most of them, was given the right to vote; but so skilfully did the ruling class manage this; so well did they succeed in keeping the masses in ignorance, and divided among themselves over minor issues that the people in general, up to date, have received little or no benefit from the franchise. In the United States we see that the Standard Oil, railroad, sugar, steel and other great combinations of capital not alone rule the country financially, but are absolute masters of the political situation. Such men as Taft, Roosevelt, judges and senators are either members of that class or puppets in their hands, and no man could hold an office of any importance in the United States today unless the trusts will it.

Over here in Western Canada with its rich soil and natural richness, is such fine picking for the capitalist class that they are swarming in from all directions, getting control of everything in sight;

not forgetting to fasten their fangs on the provincial and national government. Whatever this new Canada has been to the settler it has certainly been an Eldorado for the capitalist. First of all he has grabbed up millions of acres of the best land for a few dollars per acre and resold at a great profit, after the homesteaders have failed, and proved what the country was good for. The railroad companies have also reaped a great harvest. Trusts are all getting enormously wealthy at the expense of the settler. Since these gentlemen have what the farmer must buy they can charge whatever they feel like. On the other hand railroads charge so much for freight and the elevator trust pays so little for the farmers' product that there is little left for the farmer after paying notes and buying the necessities of life.

In short, the combined capitalist class have the farmer just where they want him, that is, to toil from morning till night, year out and year in, in order that the capitalist class may revel in luxury and have a fine time. Now, then, if it is an absolute, indisputable fact that this class, who rule economically, who oppress and rob the farmer, are in absolute control of the political power in our provincial and national capitals, in short they are behind the government, how then can the farmers expect any relief from that direction? It ought to sound reasonable to any man who will look into it that before the farmer, as a class, can expect any lasting relief in his condition he must oust the capitalist class from the government and get control of it himself. As long as you allow the capitalist class to control the political power they will care little for farmers' organizations, resolutions, protests, and co-operative enterprises; these things may annoy them and at times they might throw you a few crumbs to keep you quiet, but they will manage to keep on your back and get back at you.

As the farmers and laboring class constitutes the overwhelming majority in these new provinces and have a constitutional right to get control of the government any time they see fit, it should be very easy to accomplish and we have no other choice. It is either this or forever remain oppressed and robbed. We are now laying the foundation for a great commonwealth. It remains for us to say if it should be done right or wrong, and on our action will depend the future happiness of our children.

Now, fellow farmers, this may sound new and radical to some of you. Perhaps you feel like calling me names, but, nevertheless, it's true and I challenge anyone to show me otherwise. From now on we should loose no time to get every farmer into our organization. As soon as an organization or local is fairly established send a few of your best organizers and speakers to the neighboring district and start another, until every district throughout the country has been organized.

Discuss economics and things for the farmers' welfare in these locals. Buy and sell co-operatively whenever you can. Every dollar saved in this way results to the farmers' benefit and happiness. But do not forget for a moment that the class who stand between the farmer and the full product of his toil have control of your government and that they will fight tooth and nail any move the farmer makes towards shaking them off his back. The farmer, as a class, must stand alone, fight his own battles and be satisfied with nothing less than the control of the government. The sooner he realizes this all the better. The "great" look so to us only because we are on our knees. Let's rise!

JOHN GLAMBECK.

Member of Queenstown Local No. 160
United Farmers of Alberta.
Gleichen, Alta.

DON'T WANT CHANGE

Editor GUIDE:—Re Mr. E. A. Partridge's article in the June 15th issue of THE GUIDE. I would like to state that I for one of the shareholders of the Grain Growers' Grain Company, do not approve of his idea of paying dividends on the co-operative plan. Shares in this company were sold around here on the promise of large dividends to shareholders and nothing was said about co-operation.

What I would like to know is who would stand the loss if the company fails? Would the people who did not ship grain



Sir Wilfrid's Pre-Election Tariff View