

The Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine

PERSEVERE
AND
SUCCEED

ESTABLISHED
1866

REGISTERED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE COPYRIGHT ACT OF 1875

LIII.

LONDON, ONTARIO, APRIL 18, 1918.

1334

EDITORIAL.

A farm without a garden is not complete. Now is the time to plant early vegetables.

Farmers are on the long spring hike, and every day counts more than in any previous spring.

Plan to grow more roughage this year than ever before in order to save concentrates for human consumption.

A comparatively low price set for wheat makes wheat feeding to live stock more profitable than the use of the coarse grains, and so it goes.

Meatless days have been abolished for the time in the United States, and the sun is causing us to forget the heatless days. Spring is a welcome visitor this year.

The road to Paris is still blocked, and the road to the channel ports is still impassable to the Kaiser's legions. We at home must not forget those who have made it so.

Judging from the personnel of the Canadian Parliament one might think agriculture in this country was a third-rate or even less important industry. Of the 235 members, 39 are farmers.

Those growing silage corn this year should get their seed supply as soon as it is available, and should test before planting. Some 500,000 bushels of Southern grown seed is to be available.

The breeder of pure-bred stock should always remember that stock "well brought out" always pays for the extra feed in the sale-ring. There is no use of expecting top prices for thin stock.

With over seventy lawyers holding seats in Canada's House of Commons this country should lack nothing so far as laws are concerned, but unfortunately such circumstances are not very likely to make for increased agricultural production.

Canada can change the clock, but not the amount of daylight the sun will bestow upon this fair Dominion this year. Strange, is it not, that the producers in a season when production is the talk on every hand should be obliged to take the very thing they did not want?

A fair square deal for everybody by everybody will do more to bring about the unity necessary in order that the country can put forth its maximum effort in this time of crisis than can ever be accomplished by narrow and selfish campaigns to set class against class.

The perils of importing pure-bred live stock from the Old Land are many. Just recently a prominent American importer, Peter G. Ross, lost a consignment of over 90 head at sea. This continent owes a great deal to the courage of the men who yearly bring to its shores some of the best animals in the world for the improvement of our live stock.

Some few people still persist in calling the farmer a food profiteer, but their numbers are growing smaller daily and when all but the incurable cases have learned from their backyard gardens or otherwise that there isn't a fortune in farming, perhaps the institutions prepared to take care of those not capable or safe to take care of themselves may have room for these incurables. For the good of the great cause they should either be shut up or made to shut up.

The Personnel of Parliament.

The Farmer's Advocate has long contended that farmers were lax in their duty when it comes to selecting men to represent them in Parliament, and they are still all too indifferent if we are to judge by the personnel of the present Parliament of Canada. This article does not refer to the Government or to the Opposition separately, but to both collectively. We understand that the members of the new House, some two hundred and thirty-five listed, give their occupations or professions as follows: Lawyers, 73; farmers, 39; physicians, 23; manufacturers, 23; merchants, 22; brokers and agents, 17; publishers and journalists, 11; lumber operators, 7; military officers, 4; notaries, 4; educationists, 2; veterinary surgeons, 2; contractors, 2; and land surveyors, railway conductors, plumbers, conveyancers, ranchers and dentists, 1 each. This makes quite an interesting and fairly comprehensive list but the most striking point is the ridiculously large number of lawyers in comparison to the number engaged in some other industries. Thirty-nine farmers out of two hundred and thirty-five representatives, and these divided into two political parties, shows just about how strongly or weakly agriculture as a calling is represented at Ottawa. Manufacturers, merchants, etc., are well represented but even farmers should rather see more business men elected than such a preponderance of men of the legal profession, many of whom are elected to represent distinctly rural districts. Men whose natural inclination is, through years of close connection with farming, toward a higher development of Canadian agriculture are not numerous enough in our parliaments. Where lies the fault? Certainly not with the M. P., no matter what his constituency, but rather with the elector. All classes should be fairly represented and if they are not it is their own fault very largely. Labor has had a meagre representation always. There should be more men in parliament who have, through experience, a deep sympathy with labor. The average layman in looking over the list will say there are too many lawyers and all too few laborers and farmers in our parliament. He will say this not as a criticism of the men the country has elected, but rather as a criticism of his own lack of interest in selecting men from his own occupation to represent his party. This is not a party affair at all. Canada spoke out for Union Government, but the local organizations should see to it that rural districts are represented by farmers of the highest type and that towns and cities send their due representation of manufacturers, business men, lawyers, professional men, etc. It is worth thinking over. You may have nothing against the present members. They may be good fellows, anxious to do all they can for Canada, but the interests of all the people demand that all the people be represented in proportion to their numbers and importance to the country. A little less law and a little more agriculture and labor might help.

The Customs Tax on Farm Machinery.

During the fiscal year 1916-17 Canadian farmers, according to a statement recently made by the Minister of Customs in the House of Commons, contributed \$2,117,267 to the Federal Treasury in customs duties on agricultural implements and machinery, divided as follows: Threshing machinery, \$477,895; traction engines, portable engines, etc., for farm purposes, \$896,356; harvesters, reapers, etc., \$89,257; plows and parts, \$373,504; other farm machinery, \$280,255. These figures are of interest to all at the present time, for it is likely that a lively debate dealing with the duty on agricultural implements and machinery will take place during the present session of parliament. Duty on imported machinery enables the home manufacturer to charge at a rate on a level with the sale price of the imported goods in this country. The great bulk of the seeding implements and harvesting machinery now used

in Canada is manufactured or assembled in this country and the manufacturer, of course, reaps the benefit of the duty. The two million one hundred thousand here stated does not by any means represent what the customs duty costs the farmer. It would be interesting to know the whole amount. We are living in a time when greater production is necessary. We have a Union Government. It is an opportune time to discuss the effect of this duty on the finances of the country, on the manufacturing industry, and on Canadian agricultural production. All that is in keeping with the general progress of our country should be done at the present time to remove any handicap under which the farmer labors in his great efforts to feed the people of Canada and the Allied countries. If farm implements and machinery are placed on the free list then all raw materials used in their manufacture should come in duty free. Surely a fair basis can be reached on this important subject which we claim is one worthy of fair and unbiased discussion at the present time.

A Regular Pay Day For the Hired Man.

We have recently published several articles written by hired men, in which the writers have cited some of the drawbacks connected with their work from their own viewpoints. All agree that the hired man should be hired by the year, and, for married men, a comfortable cottage should be provided. All complain that the hours on the farm are long, but most realize that with chores to do the ordinary farm does not lend itself to short hours, particularly in the busy seasons. A few mentioned the point which we wish to discuss briefly, viz., that there should be a regular pay day weekly or monthly, preferably the former, for the hired man. We are inclined to favor this scheme. When the situation is studied from all its angles it does seem rather unfair to expect the hired man to come begging a little money on account throughout the term of engagement. No other business but farming hires on such a basis. All others pay weekly, bi-monthly, or monthly, and nothing pleases the help more than regular pay days. This would work on the farms too. The most successful employer of farm labor we have yet met hired his men by the hour, paid every week-end in full, fired the men at a moment's notice when they did not give satisfaction, and increased the allowance per hour to those who did their work well and earned the recognition. Farmers in the past have said that such a system would not work, but it does and men would rather work where they get paid regularly than where they have to beg money on account from "the boss." In the past it was thought that if a man was so kept "paid up" he would be likely to leave. If he is that kind of man, let him go. The farmer would be as well without him. We know that labor is scarce, but good labor is still honest and always will be. In the past farmers have not paid weekly or monthly, because the business often did not permit of it, or they thought it didn't. It takes ready cash and the farmer had to wait till fall until a part of the crop was sold or some pigs turned off and the man's time was out. Times are changing, however. Many more farmers have a regular income now than was the case formerly and in a far larger percentage of cases a little money is on hand, which could be used to pay the help weekly or at least monthly. Give the "pay-day" system a trial and you'll never depart from it. You will put your business "in right" with the hired help and will get men more easily and the help will turn out better than by the old system of a dollar now and then for overalls, shirts, and "cow-hides," the remainder "coming to" the man at the end of his engagement period.

What April was it Hindenburg was going to be in Paris?