

The Grain Growers' Guide

Winnipeg, Wednesday, September 3rd, 1913

NO REPLY FROM C.M.A.

We have as yet had no reply to our last letter to the president of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. We presume that the intervening time is being used by the Manufacturers' Association to prepare a case in favor of Protectionism that will completely annihilate the Free Traders of the Prairie Provinces. We are anxiously awaiting the arrival of their first article for the debate and hope that they will give very complete answers to the few simple questions that we propounded in our first letter to their president. Our readers may look forward to an interesting time when the manufacturers open up the artillery in the Protectionist citadel. The annual meeting of the Manufacturers' Association is to be held this month in Halifax and we hope that they will show their loyalty to Great Britain by advocating Free Trade with that country.

ELEVATOR INTERESTS ACTIVE

The Calgary News-Telegram is now performing the part of chore boy to the private elevator interests of Alberta. Day after day it has been devoting from two to six columns in attacking the Grain Growers' Grain Company and the new Alberta Co-operative Elevator Company which has just been organized. The News-Telegram professes to have the interests of the Alberta farmers closely at heart and imagines that some dire calamity is about to befall them at the hands of the Alberta Co-operative Elevator Company. The worst that it has against the Grain Growers' Grain Company is a suspicion that it might aid the co-operative elevator company to more efficiently serve the Alberta farmers. In referring to the Grain Growers' Grain Company the News-Telegram describes it as:

"A concern which is practically private in its character, though touted as a farmers' company, and which is dominated by a half-dozen grain operators who, so far as we can learn, never wanted the government system in Manitoba to succeed."

This is the same kind of malicious falsehood which the elevator combine in Winnipeg used four years ago when they attempted to put the Grain Growers' Grain Company out of business.

The editor of the News-Telegram, of course, knows that this description of the Grain Growers' Grain Company is a falsehood, but there have always been editors willing to prostitute their pens to the base purpose of the monied interests. The News-Telegram also endeavors to convey the impression that the Grain Growers' Grain Company is "a Manitoba Company" and thus hopes to stir up provincial jealousy. The Grain Growers' Grain Company has over 14,000 shareholders, all of whom are farmers in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and there are more shareholders outside of the province of Manitoba than within it. The Company has not even a Manitoba charter, but is incorporated by special act of the Dominion Parliament, with the same power to do business in one province as in another. No shareholder may hold more than \$1,000 worth of stock and no shareholder has more than one vote, regardless of the amount of stock he holds. The board of nine directors is elected yearly at the annual meeting, which is attended by more shareholders than the annual meeting of any other corporation in Canada, there being 600 shareholders present last year, holding proxies to the number of several thousand. The Grain Growers' Grain Company, in the seven years of its existence, has had a tooth

and nail fight with the elevator interests of the West, but has succeeded because the farmers had faith in, and supported, their own company. As a result of the Grain Growers' Grain Company being in the field the Western farmers today, generally, are getting at least 5 cents per bushel more for their wheat than they would get if the grain business was still in the hands of a private company. There is no one factor in this country that has proved of so much benefit to the farmers of the Prairie Provinces as the Grain Growers' Grain Company. The big interests in Alberta, as in the other provinces, are becoming alarmed at the success of the various farmers' organizations, and they will stoop to anything to cause strife and jealousy in the hope of stirring up trouble in the ranks of organized farmers. We believe, however, the farmers of Alberta have their eyes sufficiently wide open not to be led astray by this new attack of the private elevator interests.

HOLDING UP CALGARY

The Dominion Government has proposed that the city of Calgary donate free one of their parks in the centre of the city as a site for an armory. The park is valued at \$150,000 and the Government argues that if the site is donated free that \$150,000 more will be spent on the armory building than otherwise would be spent. It seems that the railway companies do not have a monopoly of the system of holding up the Western towns for free sites. That park in Calgary will do more good as a children's playground than ever it will as an armory, but if the armory must be built, let the Government pay for it, as it does elsewhere. The fact that the Government is willing to spend the extra \$150,000 on the building, provided they get a free site, is simply a species of graft and bribery and we hope the people of Calgary will not fall for it.

NO DEFENCE POSSIBLE

The Edmonton Bulletin, owned and operated by Hon. Frank Oliver, ex-Minister of the Interior, recently took The Guide to task in the following editorial article:

THE GUIDE AND FREE SPEECH

The Grain Growers' Guide has repeatedly attempted to defend the Dominion Government for granting a \$15,000,000 bonus to Mackenzie and Mann by attacking the Liberal opposition in Parliament for not opposing it. When it has been demonstrated that the opposition did oppose it by voice and vote on four separate amendments, and finally voted directly against it without amendment The Guide replies that inasmuch as the Liberals did not oppose by obstruction, their opposition was insincere. Readers of The Guide will please remember that The Guide unhesitatingly and completely endorsed the action of the Government in abolishing parliamentary free speech by establishing closure. With the establishment of closure it has ceased to be possible for the Opposition in Parliament to obstruct to any beneficial result. Having endorsed the abolition of free speech, The Guide is not now entitled to claim protection to the public interest by the exercise of that right which, by its approval, it helped to abolish.

The statement that The Guide has attempted to defend the Dominion Government for granting a \$15,000,000 bonus to Mackenzie and Mann is absolutely untrue, for every reader of The Guide knows that we have repeatedly condemned this action as one of the rottenest pieces of legislation ever passed by the Canadian parliament. We did, however, make it clear in our previous article that the Liberal party offered no bona-fide opposition to the Mackenzie and Mann \$15,000,000 graft, and we

quote the following from the Winnipeg Free Press, the leading Liberal paper in Western Canada, under date of June 3, 1913:

"But when the party in opposition agree with the Government in fixing a day for prorogation which allows of only the most perfunctory discussion of the proposed expenditures of such huge magnitude, and means that the money will be voted at a high rate of speed, they are not standing up to their work. The responsibility for the immense outpouring of the money of the people of Canada will rest mainly, of course, upon the Government. But the party in opposition cannot, in the circumstances, expect the people to hold them guiltless of their share of that responsibility."

The Free Press, of course, puts it mildly, but it shows very plainly that a frame-up was made between the Liberal party, the Conservative party and Mackenzie and Mann by which the Liberals were not to obstruct the passage of the Mackenzie and Mann bill, nor to force the closure upon it. The Government, of course, as The Free Press says, must take the larger share of responsibility, but the Liberal party did not earn any glory for its share in the transaction. The Guide did endorse the closure and still heartily approves of it. The closure should have been in force at Ottawa years and years ago and we will venture that no Government will ever dare use it to restrict full and free discussion on any important measure. If so, more harm will be done to the Government than to the Opposition.

FARMERS AND CITY LAND VALUES

On the Saskatchewan page of this issue is a note signed "F.W.G." which brands as misleading a recent editorial in The Guide dealing with the injustice contained in our land system, of permitting the owners of vacant lots to appropriate increased land values which they have done nothing to create. The case was cited of a man who bought two lots in Saskatoon for \$40 and after ten years' absence from the city resold them at a profit of \$62,460. It was claimed that the owner had done nothing to earn that sum, and that it rightly belonged to the people of Saskatoon who, by making their homes and engaging in business on the land surrounding these lots had made them valuable. Our critic does not defend the system which allows the speculator to reap where he has not sown, but claims that it is the farmers outside Saskatoon, and not the residents of the city, who have created the value and are, therefore, entitled to it. We will not quarrel very much with our friend on this point. If he believes that land values should belong to the community which creates them, instead of to speculators and landlords, and that they should be taxed into the public treasury to be used for public purposes, he believes in the Taxation of Land Values, which is what we were advocating. We still believe, however, that the high value of Saskatoon lots is due to the fact that there is a large population in the city. It is true that if there were no farmers in Saskatchewan there would be no Saskatoon, but it is equally true that though there were twice as many farmers in Saskatchewan there would not be any lots worth \$31,250 each unless there was a city of considerable size built around them. In the cities where there is a large population, land has a high value and there is need of large revenues for public improvements, education, fire protection, lighting and the preservation of law and order. In the country, where population is scattered, land has a small value and there is need of smaller revenues. If the unearned increment which