

We farmers of Canada have first to learn that we shall never arrive anywhere by tamely following the bell-wether to the polling booth. We have got to vote for measures and not men, which I believe most Canadian farmers would do if they only once grasped the fundamental truth that about the only difference between a Liberal and a Conservative politician in this Canada of ours is that the one is in power and the other isn't. As far as parties are concerned, one cares about as much (or as little) for the real interests and wishes of the people as the other does. And the only way to make Parliament respect our wishes is to show our representatives that we mean to be represented. The time to do this is polling day, an opportunity that occurs to us only once in about five years.

It will be worth while to keep your eye on the doings of Parliament. I daresay that you know that one of the great conspirators against the world's peace—the Armstrongs of armor-plate fame—have recently invaded Canada. These people are worth watching. They are building large works on the south side of the St. Lawrence, near Montreal. Their Canadian board of directors is a strong one, that can match wits with the best in Parliament. Here they are: Sir Edouard Percy Cranwill Girouard, K.C.M.G., President; George Green Foster, K.C., Vice-President; Sir George Herbert Murray, P.C., C.B.; Saxton William Armstrong Noble, and Matthew Joseph Butler, C.M.G. Until their plans have been perfected, a thorough lobby of Parliament conducted, and the country "prepared" for the new venture—the most costly, needless and wasteful industry in the world—it is unlikely that warship building will be undertaken on a big scale. But, as I say, keep your eye on Ottawa and your ear to the ground, and presently you'll hear rumblings. The naval sentiment of Canada is going to be exploited as sure as a gun goes off on Parliament Hill at twelve noon every day and you and I and the other fellow are going to be separated from our hard-earned surplus.

The Ottawa "Citizen," which is edited by a soldier, who is first a humanitarian, with ample common sense, ironically pointed out the other day that the unexploited naval sentiment of Canada should prove as profitable to the Armstrongs as that in Brazil, Argentina, Turkey, Russia, Japan, Spain, Italy and the other parts of the world where the international armor-platers are successfully established. The question is, are we voters, who hold the key, going to let these people exploit us? Are we, in this twentieth century, going to let this hell-inspired organization place Canada in the same category with Spain, Russia and Turkey—a vassal of heathenish barbarism?

Trade papers in Britain, such as "The British Trade Review," commenting upon the armor-platers having "turned their attention to Canada," understand that Montreal "will probably become the centre of Canadian warship building." A good yield is no doubt anticipated. The first sod has been cut and the way will be paved for warship building to the limit of the people's willingness to pay. The selection of the eminent Canadians to look after the armament interests in Canada is in line with the international policy of the trust. In other countries where they have "turned their attention" the Armstrong-Vickers combine have not failed to secure the services of men high up. In Italy they are building battleships for the triple alliance; in Japan they are building for the powerful Asiatic fleet on the Pacific; in Russia they are securing a \$5,000,000 order for guns; re-building the navy in Turkey and in Spain; arming the South American republic with the most powerful battleships in the world.

For the home market the armor-platers have a distinguished retinue of shareholders to draw upon. According to the "Investors' Review," three Dukes, two Marquises, 120 Earls or Barons, 32 Barons, 30 Knights, 13 M.P.'s, 19 J.P.'s, 5 K.C.'s, 43 Military and Naval Officers, 4 financiers and 17 newspaper proprietors or writers.

Now there, brother Canadians, is a galaxy of talent hard to equal and very hard to get away from, and the only way to get away is by the ballot-box route, or they'll catch us as sure as a gun of Vickers-Armstrong accuracy.

Their aim in other countries has been unerring, and Canada with its wide expanse of tolerance for evil-doers is a good mark—a mighty good mark. She is high-up in riches and she stands well out among nations in capacity of politicians for graft, and if Vickers-Armstrong can't land a bull's-eye four times out of five—but what are we Canadians going to do about it? Are we going to celebrate The Hundred Years of Peace to-day, and to-morrow let them filch us for battleships which will be obsolete in five years, if not before they are launched? And if so, who is going to man those ships? It seems a question of not where will the money come from, so much as where will the men come from? Are we prepared to let our women do the hard

work, as they do in European military countries, while we men join the unproductive army and navy and eke out lives in gold braid and idleness?

Then keep your eye on Ottawa and regard with suspicion all talk of the need for battleships, increased armaments and the like, whether it emanates from politicians or your respected newspaper. For that is the way the Armstrong-Vickers combination will start to "prepare" Canadian opinion for later filchings—first the spouting M.P. and then the chorus of newspaper scare-talk all down the line, until, like all good, forceful advertising, the people soon become to believe it. If they can get us to believe that American or Japanese farmers are wanting to fight us Canadians, our pockets can be picked with impunity.

The farmer's interests are all against war and the implements of war. What quarrels have we Canadians with any other country that we should dress up in uniforms and go out and blow each other's heads off? Don't believe in it. There's millions in it for the manufacturers of war supplies, but all scares of war between Canada and other nations will be manufactured scares.

One of the stock arguments for large armaments is that they promote peace. If your navy is strong enough, the enemy will not dare attack you. Which is right—if it is strong enough. The trouble is that the wise men who preach big navies are giving the same advice to the enemy. We must have a navy that one will not dare to attack. If his is ten ships and yours five, you had better have another five, and to be on the safe side, make it seven. You are now two ahead of the (imaginary) enemy, and he must proceed to make up the deficiency. And so on, ad infinitum. This is not a fancy picture. It is exactly the way in which the navies of Europe have grown to their present tremendous magnitude. All these countries would be just as safe as they are now if their navies were divided by ten, as they will be presently when "force ceases to rule the world, and right is ready."

The question for Canadians to consider is: Do we need to multiply before we divide? It doesn't look like it. We have two training ships lying at anchor now with disbanded crews. Britain's experience also furnishes a negative answer. She has had no great naval war since her struggle with Napoleon. Still for all these years, spurred on by the greed of the armor-plate scare-mongers, she has gone on building bigger and stronger ships and consigning them to the scrap heap, without trying them against an enemy. Then why should Canadians worry?—and why should they be stampeded into utterly useless and wasteful expenditure by a body of men whose interest is purely and selfishly commercial? Canada needs industries, but she doesn't need the devil's works which the Armstrongs have come here to start up; neither does she need her young vote corrupted by the erection of useless armories all over the country. As Harold Begbie wrote:

A Fallacy sat on a Statesman's knee,
And said with a glance askew;
"What in your heart do you think of me?
And what am I worth to you?"

The Statesman, being alone, spoke free:
"Don't publish this interview.
You are worth a great many votes to me,
But I don't think much of you."

The Fallacy hopped from the Statesman's knee,
And winked as it bade adieu.
"If Voters were thinkers and saw through me,
They would think still less of you!"

Northumberland Co., Ont. W. L. MARTIN.

The City, the West or the Ontario Farm?

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

In your issue of February 5 there appeared an article entitled, "Believes the City a Money-maker." The writer deals with the subject of young men leaving the farms and going to the cities. Now, as that is a problem that I am at present studying, I thought I would write some of my opinions. There is no business that can at all compare with farming, to my mind. But I am in the difficulty that Mr. Robinson mentions, i.e., lack of capital. Six years ago I landed in Canada with a determination to learn the business of farming, and in due time own a farm of my own. I stayed with my first boss for five years, each year seeing an increase in my wages, until I was receiving the maximum wage paid in that section. Last March, finding it impossible to go higher in that part, I answered an advertisement in your paper and as a result moved here, and am receiving the maximum wage paid here. Now, see my position. If I continue working for my present wage, I might, in the

course of ten years, save enough money to make a respectable payment on a farm, having enough left to purchase the necessary implements and some live stock. After a few years I might, with strict economy, pay the balance on my place and be my own boss, for I hardly consider a man his own boss until he has all his debts paid up. Now, that prospect does not appeal to me very much, and I am now debating in my own mind whether to go to the city or head for the West. I have talked with a number of farmers, and the most of them say, "Go to the city, and don't farm, for on the farm there is lots of hard work and mighty poor pay." You might say, if I went to the city I might get a little more a month, but I couldn't save as much. Perhaps not, but see the opportunities that exist in the city—opportunities of education and the chances of getting to the top which do not exist on the average farm. I read an article some time ago in which the writer stated that, finding himself in my position, he went to the city and in five years made enough to come back to the country and start farming. Now, I would like to hear from some who are in a like state as myself and also from some who have tried the city. It may be that the discussion will prove of value to some of your readers. I, for one, would be glad to have some light on what Mr. Robinson terms a "perplexing subject."

Oxford Co., Ont.

A HIRED MAN.

THE DAIRY.

Keeping a Dairy Record.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

A good many years ago I found that it was a good thing to keep records of all my farm operations. They may seem trivial at the time, yet some day are sure to be of value, and are a great help and satisfaction in clearing up difficulties that frequently arise. It requires only a small amount of work to keep them, if the work is done regularly and systematically. From the very fact that records are kept at all makes one careful of details and interested in making the things, of which the records are kept, turn out the best. It helps one to have a firm grasp on his affairs, and to know just where he stands in all his work. He knows whether he is running his farm, or any branch of his farming, at a profit or at a loss.

In no branch of farming are records of more importance than in dairying. It is of actual money importance to know whether a cow is making a profit on the feed she consumes, or is eating more than she is worth. It is also a good thing to know when cows are bred, and when they are expected to freshen. The creamery man knows to a fraction of a pound what he is taking in, and what he is selling. He must keep accurate accounts. He would not know just where he stood, and would be involved in all kinds of difficulties if he could not give a definite account of every item of his business at any time.

What is true of the creamery, or any business operation, is similarly true of dairying. The trouble with many dairy farmers is that they do not know just how their business stands, and do not seem to care. They may be losing in some operation and yet not know it, simply because they have no definite knowledge of profits and loss of the operation. Their cows may be making them money, or they may be eating more feed than they pay for. In my experience I have found it a very easy matter to keep a reliable dairy record, and to know just how each cow is standing all the time.

The first essential in keeping a record of this kind is a pair of scales with which to weigh the milk. There also ought to be another set of scales to weigh feeds. A chart placed on the wall of the milk-room receives the daily record of the amount of milk given by each cow, with the total for the month. These month totals are credited each month or week to each cow in a book, and on the same page she is charged with her feed for the time.

If whole milk is sold, the debits, and balance are simple. If the milk is made into butter, either at home or is sold to the creamery, from the butter-fat test of each cow her actual producing power can be determined. It is necessary to weigh the milk at each milking and record it on the chart. With feeds the weighing need not be done so often. For instance, if ground corn and linseed meal are the heavy diet, the mixture for one feed may be weighed and then measured, and the same amount measured out for each feed till a change of ration is desired. By this method the quantity of feed each cow consumes each week may be determined approximately, and the account entered in the dairy record book at the end of each week. When the ration is changed a new weighing may be made for a single feed, and the account of this made at the end of each week till the ration is changed again.