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.

GOVERNMENT BY THE PEOPLE

Editor, Guide: — In your issue of April 12 Mr. W. D. Moore says our present "party system is best." Now, with one proviso he would be right. If these parties were giving us representative government we would not be wanting or needing a farmers' party. But where the nomination of the public servants is left to a party machine (such as we have had hitherto) or for some political boss, as is always the case in rural constituencies the (almost) aggregate outcome is misrepresentative, in spite of the system which is supposedly by, of and for the people. To use Mr. Moore's own words, "one is struck at the lack of thought" that he cannot see how misrepresentative our party system is. It is Mr. Moore, I venture to think, who is "ignoring history." How can any honest person not "condemn a system" of favors to the few at the expense of the many? Doubtless if Mr. Moore will honestly look the system in the face of the history of both parties in Canada, and both parties in the United States, he will speedily come to stand for a popular, patriotic government in lieu of this "root and branch" misrepresentative system. If I understand the late Goldwin Smith's meaning, "he was willing to trust the evolution" from ignorant partisanism to intelligent future action. Forming a new party would be evolution. Standing shoulder to shoulder at the Ballot box instead of splitting our votes would be evolution sense. Mr. Moore says "a new party would not materially differ from the present parties," and so on all through his letter. Well, if we adopted the same methods under the present stage of the evolution of the present parties; if we call our conventions and allow the same methods of selecting our candidates; if we allow ambition, selfishness and corrupt bribery; if we are not going to prohibit all improper methods of calling conventions and making proper selection of, and pledging our candidates, and making them accountable to the electors, then Mr. Moore is no doubt right. But then my intelligent readers are all tired of misrepresentative governments and are hungering for a popular Direct Legislation government. M.P's. who will be accountable not to the political bosses of the faction-machines, but to the majesty of all government—the people's rights and liberties. And if we are to speedily get this evolution to a Direct Legislation of popular government, we must bind ourselves together with a single purpose in all our needs and duties, be they political, social or educational, as we have done—to our credit—in our past economies. It is not to our credit to stay with such misrepresentative parties. We have been fooled by them far, far too long. It is time to select honorable, true men, who will not be accountable to the old parties. The bare idea of a few delegated party men being sent to a convention to nominate a candidate that the party bosses have already picked out before the people's will has been consulted—and in the selecting of candidates the people never have been consulted—and even the few delegates who attend have been delegated by the political bosses' local party clique. Honestly, Mr. Moore, do you think such "party system" best? Do you think the system can be made representative without a new party? Then I say to you, after my fifty years study of politics and the history of politics in all countries, I am sure the party system of every country but Canada and the United States has given way to a system of numerous groups, and even on this continent the dual system is in its death throes of insurgency, because it is not responsible to the people, but to the machine that elected it and maintains it as long as it fulfils its promises by the aid of ignorant partisanism and a multitude of shiftless electors. The evolution of Goldwin Smith's ideal was by education. It must come by the people having absolute confidence in themselves through the overthrow of the dominance of the irresponsible machine and substituting the full force of the responsibility of the people in the administration of their own affairs.

We cannot at the same time have government by the people by the bosses of any party. The people must do their political work, or sure thing the commercialized bosses will rule the country, and we must do it very differently than the present parties make their selections or else it will be as Mr. Moore says, "not materially differ from the present parties." All we farmers ask you is equal opportunity to every person, and favors to none. Our platform is the Square Deal. I admit "it would be sectional" if none but farmers joined the new party, but Mr. Moore has no right to say "it would be selfish, incohesive and unserviceable." It is only parties that stand for privilege to the few at the expense of the masses that his adjectives apply to, but every honest man should join a Square Deal party, because amongst "a nest of traitors" it takes men of ability to run such a party. Leaders who can keep the marauding trusts under control and dare to end the worst party system of legalized thieving in both Canada and the United States that the whole political history of the world has ever exhibited. Where is this marauding of the public treasury and the exploiting of the producer and consumer going to end if we do not get a new party that will determinedly enact the honest laws that will give us a square deal? A square deal party cannot possibly "be sectional." The marauding trusts and corporate interests have got control of legislation and therefore the great masses of the community are living—or rather existing—under their tyranny of privileges, franchises and charters, granted by the existing "sectional" Grit and Tory legislation of misrepresentative acts of "boss-machine-system." Mr. Moore, you should be able to see that the party system we have is not responsible to the people. Our aim should be to destroy that which is not just to all the people.

F. KIRKHAM.

Saltcoats.

RELIEVES IN GUIDE AND COMPANY

Editor, Guide:—I should like to say a few words in behalf of your most valuable paper, the Grain Growers' Guide, and the altruistic nature of its works and the unselfish, inspiring and uplifting influence it has sent forward. It is, I believe, the only paper in Canada that dares to speak the truth and that is forming the right kind of public opinion and is the best discriminator of the right kind of news in the interest and work of educating the farming class. I consider it worth many times the price of the present subscription. I believe it to be the best asset the Grain Growers have today.

Just a few words for the Grain Growers' Grain Co. I must say it is the only company where a farmer is sure of getting the full measure of satisfaction when shipping his wheat. From personal experience I can say truthfully I have found them to make just and complete adjustments whenever errors and mistakes have been made. I have been shipping to the Grain Growers' Grain Co. ever since they were incorporated, and hold stock in the company and have always got the best results from their handling of my grain and the very best treatment and courtesy from its management whenever I have had occasion to meet them in my business with them. Trusting that the Grain Growers' Guide and the Grain Growers' Grain Co. will continue to move things.

JOHNSON GRAHAM.

Beinfait, Sask.

PERMANENCY OF OFFICE

Editor, Guide:—There is an idea growing in the minds of quite a few of the people that when a man serves the people one year or one term, as the case may be, as an officer he then should not be re-elected to that office, but there should be a new man elected in his place so that all may have a chance to the office; an idea that I think is wrong in our association, for if we want our work or endeavors to succeed and keep our association progressing and getting stronger and able to do more for us we must keep our best men to the front, those that are the best qualified for the position, and when a man has intelligently and rightly filled an office for one term he is better prepared to fill it for the second for he has the experience of one term to start with; he is used to the work of the office; he knows what is to be done and how to do it and he therefore is in a better position to serve us than one that has never filled the office. It matters not how well one may be fitted to fill an office, for they cannot fill an office for a time without becoming more acquainted with the workings of that office, they know the requirements of that office; they know where the different records are filed away and can refer to them at once if required without having to hunt for them, and therefore can do more in less time than one not conversant with the office, and the longer one fills an office the better he is qualified to fill that office, provided he is energetic and persevering. Now, from the foregoing argument one might conclude that I was in favor of one continuing to fill an office because he had filled it, but such is not the case in every instance, for sometimes when one is in office for a time they get careless and neglect their duties or perform them in a careless manner; in such cases I think it proper to introduce him to his successor, the idea always being to get an officer that will attend to the office in the best interests of those who require the office. In electing our officers we should be very careful in considering the requirements of that office and endeavor to get one that will fill the office in the best interests of his constituents, or in other words a man that has the interests of his fellow beings at heart and that will do everything in his power to further their interest.

W. E. KEEFER.

Ashville, Manitoba.

TAXING LAND VALUES

Editor, Guide:—During my travel through the province of Manitoba I have had an opportunity to discuss Henry George's single tax theory with a great many farmers. The sentiment is generally in favor of the idea of taxing land values, but I frequently meet with objection that the man whose land is mortgaged would be worse off under the single tax than under our present system. The contention is that the man who is working the land will have to pay all the taxes whereas the owner of the mortgage will escape. Those who make this objection apparently do not realize that the man who works the land has to pay the taxes at the present time, and that he pays more taxes now than he would have to do under the single tax system. Under that system all taxes upon food, clothing, fuel, implements, etc., which fall so heavily on the farmers, whether their land is mortgaged or not, would be abolished. The necessary revenue would be raised by a direct tax levied upon the land according to its unimproved value. By this process all the indirect taxes which increase the price of the articles which the farmers have to buy would be destroyed; they would be able to purchase clothing, implements, etc., cheaper on that account, therefore there would not be such pressing need for them to mortgage their land in order to obtain capital to work it with. The direct tax upon the value of land would fall lightly upon the farmers because the unimproved value of their land is very low when compared with the value of land in towns and cities. On the face of this it is evident that the farmer whose land is mortgaged would, under the single tax system, have to pay less taxes than he does now and consequently would be able to discharge the mortgage more quickly.

F. J. DIXON.

Minitonas, Man.

THE ANNEXATION PERIL

Editor, Guide:—Re reciprocity, more in particular the old annexation war horse that has been trotted out to frighten the timid and the weak into believing that somehow, should it pass, the U.S. would come up here and eat them all up, boots and all. What are the facts? Some time ago the people of Cuba were under bondage to the Spaniards. The U.S., believing in a square deal as between man and man, intervened and routed the Spaniards out at a cost of millions in money and a sacrifice of countless lives of its soldiery. It whipped Spain as she deserved, to a frazzle, then after sanctifying the pest spots like Havana, making ever after impossible the scourge of yellow fever, what did she do? Demand that Cuba be annexed to the U. S.? Nothing of the kind. As soon as she was sure that conditions were ripe for self government she quietly withdrew her military occupation and left a most thankful people in entire possession and control of their own. The same policy has been planned

Sixty Years of Protection in Canada, 1846-1907

By Edward Porritt

Western farmers at the present time are intensely interested in the tariff, and are anxious to secure information upon tariff matters. The above mentioned book by Edward Porritt is the best work on the subject. Mr. Porritt is a British Free Trader, and was for two years a lecturer in Harvard University on political economy and Canadian constitutional history. In 1905-6 he travelled with the Canadian tariff commission and has devoted a great deal of study to the Canadian tariff and the abuses which have followed protection. Mr. Porritt's book is entirely non-political and is a study of the tariff history of Canada for the last sixty years. It is written in a most interesting manner and at the same time contains exact information on trade and manufacturers and the methods by which tariffs are made. Every farmer who is interested in tariff reduction will find Mr. Porritt's book the most valuable one that he can secure. He will also learn how the manufacturers lay aside politics in their efforts to have the tariff burden increased. If every farmer in Canada would read Mr. Porritt's book, the "system of legalized robbery would come to an end inside of one year. The book contains 478 pages and is fully indexed. It will be sent to any reader for $1.50 postpaid.

BOOK DEPT. - - - GRAIN GROWERS' GUIDE, WINNIPEG