



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 no letters not of public interest will be published.

NO CARS AT AYLESBURY

A correspondent from Aylesbury, Saskatchewan, writes on November 26: "I ordered a car six weeks ago and have not got one yet. Last week there were three cars left at Aylesbury for a week. When I ordered a car I was first on the list, and on Saturday I was sixth; and there were 142 names behind me, so I do not expect to get another car this winter. The elevators are full and when they do buy they only pay about half the market price for wheat and flax."

THE NEW HAND OF MR. BORDEN—PREMIER

Editor, Guide:—During the late campaign Mr. Borden and his supporters (the privileged capitalists and their tools, the self-seeking politicians) continuously told us that our farm interests and their interests are all the same; that both are the interests of Canada; that therefore we must pull together in unison. Well, while the farmers of the West are convinced of the truth of this everlasting axiom, it evidently, in the West, did not engender a feeling of security that Mr. Borden and his followers would act in accord with that great fact of mutual interests. Then we were also told that Mr. Borden is a man we can trust. Yet in the selection of his cabinet the outspoken, the governing, as well as the murderous, press of both parties have severely attacked him. Now, if our interests are the same—and we must bear well in mind that farming is the chief interest—is it to the interests of Canada that in forming his instrument of a government it includes at least a trio of the capitalists' attendants; a trio of nationalists and two trios of obsequious party politicians? But in this new-hand conciliation, where is the trio or even unit of the chief interest of Canada? In this, Mr. Borden's first act, he has thrown the national producers to the dogs. His cabinet is not a duly consorted junction of the chief interests of Canada. Wherein is the fulfilment of his loyalty to his own or his satellites' statements that ours and their interests are the same—the mutual interests of Canada? Mr. Borden would have covered himself with glory had he honorably taken a trio of genuine trusty farmers into his executive. It could then have been considered a cabinet in lieu of what looks more like turning out to be a cabal of the plutocrats. However, time will soon show whether Mr. Borden has made a bad or good beginning.

At the same time, the undersigned recognizes that Premier Borden is the pivot of the machinery of the whole cabinet providing he is the man we have so repeatedly been told we can trust. But what can the pivot, upon which the whole machinery turns, do against the soulless resistance and machination of a cabal that truly represents plutocratic and political exploitation of Canada's chief interest? If half that has been written of this new hand cabinet is true, then Mr. Borden has made a total surrender to the cursed game of class interests, sessional pelf and party plunder.

With Mr. Borden, plutocratically and politically discreet in the late campaign, it is no rare coincidence that the privileged interests stood loyally by him, hence the great relationship of

the cabinet to the privileged classes and partisan politicians. Mr. Borden must be judged by the choice of his associates, perforce of the eternal fact that men do not gather figs of thistles, nor grapes of brambles. Mr. Borden is at the "parting of the ways," and will be known through right or wrong, by either an exploiting instrument of self-seeking colleagues or by the men who will force a square deal.

However, there is in the speech from the throne some evidence of Mr. Borden's zeal to aid agriculture—both in production and in distribution—but no evidence that he will reduce the cost of living to the consumer by a zealous control of trusts and mergers. I regret that there has been no foreshadowing of some such significant industrial legislation. During the campaign it was Mr. Borden's policy to obtain the industrial vote. He certainly did obtain the workers' ballots all over the Dominion. Therefore he should give aid to cheapen food and clothing. He would thereby have earned the confidence of the consumers in a remarkable degree. The curbing of the trusts would be giving fair play to national industry, and it would have shown us he was moving in the right direction. However, we must hope that the establishment of a permanent tariff commission will accomplish what hitherto all tariff commissions have failed to achieve—the lessening of the peoples' burdens.

Yours in the cause of all workers,
FREDERIC KIRKHAM,
Salteoats, Sask.
November 21, 1911.

CALLS SINGLE TAXERS FOOLS

Editor, Guide:—We have enough trouble. Leave the single tax alone. All you can do is to assert this, that or the other. A poor man has a lot in the business part of the city; a wealthy man has another of equal value. The wealthy man, by the erection of a commodious house, augments his original area five times over. Neither can do business on a lot of itself. The wealthy man is doing a good business because of his ability to erect a large house. The poor man can do business under the canopy of heaven. And this is what you fools call "equity of taxation"! If you continue to advise this curse I, for one, will drop out. I am not a fool. You find fault with Sir James Whitney because he governs, and governs wisely. The three-fifths vote on the liquor traffic is some protection to decent people against anti-liquor fanatics.

Okanagan, B.C.

WHY BUY AN ENGINE?

Editor, Guide:—The subject of power, whether on a farm or in a factory, or any plant requiring power, is the most important branch of the concern. The Guide gives large space in the issue of November 15 to James A. King, in which he sets forth the superiority of traction power over horses on the farm, as he sees it. At the outset let me say this question has two sides to it, especially when we consider that in some localities only will the machine power work, on account of wet footing. There are very few districts but what are held up for this reason at some period of the year. The idea advanced by the selling agents that an engine will travel

and draw a load anywhere that horses can go was too absurd to be continued. Only last spring, which was considered a very favorable season, I witnessed two tractors idle for five days on account of rain; on adjoining land the horses went to work the day after the rain stopped, in the usual way. How much might be lost in those five days by those two engines to the owner, I leave Mr. King to figure. Mr. King says the engine must not only do more and better work than horses for one year to be a better investment, but must do it for a number of years, and here he conveniently stops, where he should say that at the end of that number of years—not a very large number of years, either—you may buy a new engine.

The reader will agree with me if he has had practical experience, that a judicious investment in horses has no depreciation on capital account, because a man who buys four horses, say two of them mares, will, with ordinary management and breeding, reproduce their numbers, or more, in the natural life time of the four. This is no supposition on my part. I have seen it done repeatedly; in fact, most of my neighbors have done this very thing, eliminating entirely any chance for depreciation, and therefore no need of a re-investment for power in a few years, as is the case with a tractor.

There are some advantages which the tractor has over the horses, such as working long days or all night; the rest are of a trivial nature. The cost of fuel and oils and repairs amounts to more than the cost of horse feed and so forth, in Manitoba. The greatest difference in doing good work is generally in favor of the horse. For instance, the horse power provide no heavy wheels to overpack the land in strips up and down the field. These strips, generally from two to three feet in width, pack the land so hard (if it contains the least bit of a clay tendency) that the seeder will not penetrate far enough to cover the seed sufficiently; then, if there should be a heavy rain, the water often remains on this hard portion of the field and does serious damage to the young grain. Last year in this vicinity the grain was at least one foot shorter on every track made by an engine than it was between the tracks, and the yield was consequently cut down.

Mr. King then admits that he has not told us all the facts about this business—a very truthful statement. He did not show us how it would affect us economically, if we were all to take his advice and buy traction engines and discard the horses. Mr. King knows that the horse is the only opposition in the field against machine power. Now what would happen if the horse were discarded for farm work? It means that the whole supply of farm power would be thrown into the hands of manufacturers. I need not ask what has been the farmers' experience in regard to manufacturing combinations; look at the way the Cockshutt Plow Co. treat us, as the editor ably shows in November 15 issue. Where would the prices of engines go in the hands of a manufacturers' association, whose motto is to collect all the traffic will bear, with the horse gone and no alternative left to the farmers of this country? To anyone who thinks they might deal kindly and reasonably with us, I have but to refer them to the prices of repairs of any machine at the present time; those prices bear absolutely no relation to the cost of production whatever.

Farmers will certainly make a sad mistake and play into hostile hands when they exchange their mode of power, giving up the horse industry and thereby depriving themselves of creating their own power, as well as losing one of the most profitable branches of farming.

I was surprised when I got to the end of Mr. King's letter that it was not marked advertising as the editor is very watchful in this regard. However, Mr. King's letter leaves the reader with the impression that he is in some way connected with the selling of engines and will go to any length in statement to make a case for the Big Business interests.

Sincerely,
A. J. BOUGHEN,
Dauphin.

RAILWAY CHARGES

Editor, Guide:—In your last issue I see that the Winnipeg board of trade demands the removal of the cement duty and a large reduction in our Western freight rates, so that the freights in the Western provinces shall not exceed those charged in Ontario and Quebec. I think it would be wise for the Winnipeg board of trade to include in this resolution, "as cheap express rates as they have in the East, more rolling stock on the C.N.R., and the improvement of the road-bed." If the C.N.R. would bring the road-bed up to a good level grade they could have three times as many cars on a great portion of their railway lines and handle their freight business much faster and give to the public a much better and quicker service than we ever have got. Early last fall I interviewed our member, Mr. G. E. McCraney, in regards to him doing all he could to get the rest of our Western members to assist him in getting a reduction of freight rates, express rates and a proper railway service at the same rates as the Eastern provinces had, and in answer he said it would give him much pleasure to take the matter up with the rest of our Western members, for it was time the Western people had cheaper express and freight rates, also better railway service. To make this movement effective, every board of trade in Western Canada, every Grain Growers' organization, should assist by taking this matter up and sending in strong resolutions to our Western members and the government, demanding of our government to give to Western Canada as cheap express rates, as cheap freight rates as they have in the Eastern provinces; also a good railway service. The past six years has proven to the people of the West that the railways have had a much larger freight business than they could deliver in any reasonable time. I have done a lot of shipping and it was very slowly handled on account of the amount of work the railways had to do. These high transportation charges and poor railway service take millions of money from the Western farmers that ought to be left with them to improve their farms, which would improve the whole Western country.

THOMAS LAWRENCE,
Hanley, Sask.

SINGLE TAX

Editor, Guide:—Being interested in this financial conundrum of the age, and more interested in the expressions of opinion in its evolution, and to gratify the many inquirers, we are constrained to simply give our opinion on the subject of "Single Tax," not because we have much experience or are qualified to write up the subject, but because of a few very pertinent cases where an unearned increment has been filched out of our neighbors and our hard work and industry, and gone to make fat a few extortionate speculators. From our knowledge of the prime promoters of the single tax, we do not assume for a moment that they thought that it would do away with all barriers to prosperity, but that the present land system is one of the most persistent interferences to equity to all classes of legitimate industry. Henry George refers to land in the city of New York being held at \$15,000,000 per acre, and another writer says that there is land in the heart of London worth just as much, and that these lands have no improvements upon them. Just think of such circumstances! For hundreds of years these blocks of land, lying idle, adding nothing to the progress of the city or state, veritable clogs to the economic progress, a sort of vagabond land as far as public benefit is concerned. It would have been far better for those cities if that land, as valuable as it is, had been buried under the glaciers of Greenland. Those lands for generations have been in the way and costing the citizens immensely to carry on business about them. Take the adjoining acre of those lands worth \$15,000,000 for land. From time to time up-to-date improvements have been placed upon it until today there is \$15,000,000 worth, making a total of \$30,000,000 invested in such a way as to be a public benefaction to the city or state, and this has been going on for generations. It pays its quota of taxes and helps bear the burden of the city's