

# The Mail Bag

## MISUSED GRAIN GROWERS' NAME

Editor, Guide:—Will you kindly insert in your paper this letter which we wish to send to the farmers throughout the West.

The Grain Growers' Grain Company Limited, for some time have had a working arrangement with two of the largest lumber companies in British Columbia, and have been dealing in lumber and building materials at prices which have been much lower than previously prevailed on lumber in the Western Provinces. This branch of our co-operative work has met with good success, and the fact has come to be widely understood among western farmers that this business is being carried on by our company.

It has recently come to our attention that parties in Vancouver are describing themselves as the "Grain Growers' Lumber Company," and are widely circulating their advertisements among the farmers of the West. The effect of this has been to create an impression among the farmers that in dealing with these people they are dealing with ourselves, as many specific instances of confusion have come to our attention. There is no doubt in our minds that the name of the Vancouver concern is calculated to create this impression. We, therefore, wish to state to our patrons in the West that we have no connection whatever with the Vancouver Grain Growers' Lumber Company, nor have they any connection whatever with any of the Grain Growers' movements in the West. All who have favored us with their business know that we have solicited business under the name of the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited, thru our co-operative department.

We are, yours truly,

THE GRAIN GROWERS' GRAIN COMPANY, LIMITED  
Wm. Moffat, Secretary  
Winnipeg, May 16, 1914

## SALE OF IMPLEMENTS

Editor, Guide:—I think your letterette "Discussion-Would Help," in issue of April 1, very opportune, but I fail to see how the leaders in our organization can placate the interests, because combines have never shown a disposition to be controlled by any moral code.

The joint proceedings of both mortgage and implement companies, for they usually work in concert, in winding up an estate of a mortgagor needs great amendments. The unrest among farmers is largely due to the high handed manner in which these companies conduct their business. Hard feelings are likely to be engendered and to thoroughly understand it, one has to appreciate the feelings, if he can, of the dispossessed, who has acted at least honorably towards his creditors and given the implement company the very last security he had and at their solicitation, namely, a second mortgage on his farm, expecting when he did so, that they would act towards him with at least the same honesty. But alas, he finds out, when too late, that he stands to lose everything he may have, for the implement company can, under present conditions, take both his homestead (after paying the first mortgage out on a forced sale) and the implements too, for which the land was given as security. At least this is the only interpretation you can put on their actions when they proceed to sell the said implements at their price and without any consent of yours, sending the customers they found to haul them away, while no accounts have as yet been rendered. This is not gossip, but actual experience. First of all I think it should be made quite clear to the companies that they must give a statement of accounts within a certain specified period after a forced sale, just the same as they are compelled by law now to give so many days notice of their power to foreclose. Then it should be impossible for any implement company holding a second mortgage as security for implements sold on credit and who, after foreclosure of the first

mortgage, become possessed of the estate, usually at half its value, to be able to sequester the implements, and so indemnify themselves for interest and costs of sale proceedings, while mortgage companies should have no power to seize at less than the assessment value, or as much more as agreed by enactments. And we should have no sale of implements in this province on notes carrying interest. The whole business as it is now, is much too arbitrary, it threatens the very existence of the rural population, and this will be so while capitalism has its present powers. These require limiting if the many are to enjoy those rights that are their's in justice. Why, in a young and virile province like this, should such things be? Have we at Regina a sinister element covertly opposed to the economic emancipation of the masses?

TOM MOORE, Sec. Treas.,  
Lloydminster Constituency Sub-Central  
of Grain Growers' Association,  
Forest Bank, Sask.

## LESS CROP AND MORE PROFIT?

Editor, Guide:—It is a serious question whether we farmers do the right thing in growing such large crops. Nearly every man of us likes to say we have

he can get done by it. And I would like to ask both Mr. Gabriel and Mr. Kirkham what they would expect a third party to be able to do for us at present?

Now, I haven't a doubt that both these gentlemen are—certainly I am—acquainted with men who believed in Reciprocity as firmly as they believed in anything in this world, or any other. Yet—who, when election day came around, went and voted against it for the sake of the "Dear Old Party"?

This being the case, where is the third party to come from? Certainly not from the party whose ranks are as loyal as this. Then all there is left for it to be made up of is the naturalized Canadians who as yet haven't any Canadian party and who believe in free trade, and the Liberals who have been dissatisfied because the Laurier government did not, in their opinion, go far enough in the direction of free trade. So that our third party will simply split the vote that believes in taking the shackles off trade, and put the new men who have no experience of Canadian politics but who know that Free Trade would be a good thing for the country fighting against the ones who are trying to have trade as free



A Summer Scene near Kenora, Lake of the Woods

so many acres in crop, and we struggle to seed all land we possibly can—in fact we put in quite a bit that is not well cultivated, and we would be better off to fallow instead. The desire is to have big crops in acreage, and so we hire help to assist in this endeavor, buy more machinery and horses on time than we can afford.

But, by all of us aiming for big crops we reduce prices to a low ebb. Better, I think, to do with less hired help and less expensive machinery, and to do land cultivation in summer time by fallowing instead of spring plowing or seeding on disced or stubble. We are likely to come out as well on the whole. If our crop is somewhat less, our wage bill will be also less, and machine men will not be running around threatening law suits.

T. M.

Pondurn, Sask.

## AGAINST THIRD PARTY

Editor, Guide:—Having read the two political letters in your issue of the 15th, I can't help asking the authors to tell us what they want. I take it that no man wants a third party—or any party, for that matter—merely to have a party; that he wants a party for the good or bad, as the case may be, that

we can, instead of uniting with them to fight those who believe in having protection as high as they dare. The result of this will be that we will, by splitting the vote, elect at least five protectionists for every one third party candidate we elect.

If we get good and busy from now till the election and get a third candidate in every constituency, we can send down a majority of protectionists from the West, and so have our loyalty and self-sacrifice held up as an example to the world. We need have no fear of trouble about getting the funds to run the third party. When Rogers and Company see what we can do for them I have no doubt they will, thru the medium of the Family Herald or some other Conservative paper that poses as an Independent, put up ten times ten thousand dollars.

The third party is a pure case of "Heads I win, tails you lose," in favor of the Conservatives. If we lose we lose everything, and if we gain they lose nothing, for there is no possibility of electing a third party candidate in any constituency that without him would not elect a Liberal. And there are great possibilities for electing Conservatives by having the Free Traders fighting among themselves.

This is the situation as I see it, but I would like very much to hear from others.

WALLACE GOURLAY

Landis, Sask.

## CAMPAIGN FUND CONTRIBUTIONS

Editor, Guide:—You ask letters from your own readers re the above subject. Both you and Mr. Thomson diagnose this disease of our body politic well, and prescribe some good remedies, but, I understand, you ask us to propose one. I think the use of buildings for nomination, registration, public speaking and polling, and officers' fees and expenses therefor, and a pamphlet, jointly gotten up by all the candidates nominated, and sent to all voters, should be paid for out of revenue raised by taxation, leaving candidates to donate their time and personal expenses for the chance of winning. This would compel "those who preferred to let others put up the money while they received a share of the profits" to bear their part. I also believe no political public meeting should be allowed unless the time was divided equally among all the candidates, or their substitute speakers. The opening speech at the first meetings to be decided by lot, and a closing answer allowed to the same one.

The pamphlet should give equal space to the logic of all, and be printed in such numbers of each language as had been indicated, thru previous enquiry, could be best understood by the voter it was to be sent to. And any voter leaving a meeting before all had spoken should be frowned upon. This would enable all voters to hear both sides, and probably insure that, ere long, they would do so.

W. B. HULL

Amble, Sask.

## FRIENDS FOR PEACE

Editor, Guide:—The following open letter has been addressed by the Society of Friends, at Coldstream, Ontario, to the Dominion Government, Colonel the Hon. Sam Hughes, minister of militia, and the people of Canada.

The Dominion Government proposes to give \$25,000 towards a celebration of the "Century of Peace" between Canada and the United States of America, a petty trifle compared with the vast sums spent to foster the war spirit. However, we are not complaining about the amount. How is it to be expended? We hear rumors of a great military display. We hope rumor is false, for that were a mockery, indeed. We strongly denounce such proposition as glaringly unfitting. It is proper that the hundred years of good-will should be celebrated by things that stand for good will and not by the things that stand for war. If we want peace we must foster the peace spirit among our own people, among the various nations, for history has abundantly proven false the statement that to insure peace we must prepare for war. It is also disastrously true that the vast preparations for war, as witnessed by all the armed nations of Europe, make the taxes a grievous burden, and keep the common people in eternal poverty and slavery.

The building of an international bridge between the two countries, and by the two countries, has been proposed as a fitting function for such celebration. That certainly commends itself as more appropriate. We favor the idea, and when completed let the chief executives of each nation meet in the centre with the warm handclasp of friendship. That would be an object lesson worth while. It would be a

Continued on Page 23

## 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. Every letter must be signed by the name of the writer, tho not necessarily for publication. The views of our correspondents are not of necessity those of The Guide.

BUSI

W  
pr  
self  
carry  
secom  
which  
time  
some  
can't  
profit  
Ver  
their  
three  
The  
busin  
tiquat  
many  
money  
band  
the w  
expen  
them  
tive  
there  
so the  
things  
the v  
busin  
lent  
doors.  
The  
to bri  
home  
facilit  
vatis  
compl  
a long  
they  
was  
spoke  
Kenne  
give  
The  
she p  
to re  
than  
V  
agree  
do yo  
She  
smile  
by he  
the w  
It,  
amou  
first  
cally  
with  
in a h  
Las  
diture  
curate  
house  
to co  
their  
nouri  
the tr  
hap-h  
witho  
tion t  
is the  
food  
actual  
take  
to kn  
their  
when  
value  
stuffs  
know  
the v  
In  
be pu  
the h  
train  
work.

AN

Des  
April  
himse  
feel i  
I dor  
views  
that  
men,  
tions  
time  
politi  
wome