

THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE.

THE LEADING AGRICULTURAL JOURNAL IN THE
DOMINION.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED)

JOHN WELD, MANAGER

AGENTS FOR THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME JOURNAL,
WINNIPEG, MAN.

THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE
is published every Thursday.

It is impartial and independent of all cliques or parties, handsomely
illustrated with original engravings, and furnishes the most
practical, reliable and profitable information for farmers, dairy-
men, gardeners, stockmen and home-makers, of any publication
in Canada.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.—In Canada, England, Ireland,
Scotland, Newfoundland and New Zealand, \$1.50 per year, in
advance; \$2.00 per year when not paid in advance. United
States, \$2.50 per year; all other countries 12s.; in advance.

ADVERTISING RATES.—Single insertion, 25 cents per line,
agate. Contract rates furnished on application.

THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE is sent to subscribers until an
explicit order is received for its discontinuance. All payments of
arrears must be made as required by law.

THE LAW IS, that all subscribers to newspapers are held respon-
sible until all arrears are paid and their paper ordered to be
discontinued.

REMITTANCES should be made direct to us, either by
Money Order or Registered Letter, which will be at our risk.
When made otherwise we will not be responsible.

THE DATE ON YOUR LABEL shows to what time your
subscription is paid.

ANONYMOUS communications will receive no attention. In
every case the FULL NAME and POST-OFFICE ADDRESS MUST
BE GIVEN.

WHEN A REPLY BY MAIL IS REQUIRED TO URGENT
Veterinary or Legal Enquiries, \$1 must be enclosed.

LETTERS intended for publication should be written on one
side of the paper only.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS.—Subscribers when ordering a change
of address should give the old as well as the new P.O. address.

WE INVITE FARMERS to write us on any agricultural topic.
We are always pleased to receive practical articles. For such as
we consider valuable we will pay ten cents per inch printed
matter. Criticisms of Articles, Suggestions How to Improve THE
FARMER'S ADVOCATE AND HOME MAGAZINE, Descriptions of
New Grains, Roots or Vegetables not generally known,
Particulars of Experiments Tried, or Improved Methods of
Cultivation, are each and all welcome. Contributions sent us
must not be furnished other papers until after they have
appeared in our columns. Rejected matter will be returned on
receipt of postage.

ALL COMMUNICATIONS in reference to any matter connected
with this paper should be addressed as below, and not to any
individual connected with the paper.

Address—THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE, or
THE WILLIAM WELD COMPANY (LIMITED),
LONDON, CANADA.

But, enough of argument. If you hadn't a garden this year, you will have next; and, an orchard, let us hope, may soon be an anticipative delight. Anyhow, whatever one has or has not, there is a spice in the very atmosphere of these mellow days, an inspiration in the gloaming, and a picture of healthy, happy brightness and content in the faces of children tripping home from school, and of the barefoot lad tracking through the dewy meadows, which gladdens the heart with the milk of human kindness, even though the cow's mess is settling daily in the pail. As the high lights of midsummer revolve from us in the eternal circuit of the seasons, let us glory in the hum, the halo and the harvest of these busy, golden days.

Tariff Principles and Expediency.

The earnest representation of Western opinion to Sir Wilfrid Laurier on his Western tour, in favor of lower tariff, has thrust this subject prominently to the fore, and the Premier's promise of further inquiry, with a view to probable revision downwards, gives it the point of an issue. Happily, opinion no longer cleaves strictly according to party lines. In both our great political bodies there are now all shades of opinion, from high protective tariff, down to tariff-for-revenue-only, and even free trade. It is thus possible to discuss the tariff as a mere economic question without suspicion of political bias. Thus viewed, public attitude naturally resolves itself mainly into three positions: (First) that of the great unorganized primary or basic industries, such as agriculture, the price of whose commodities is for the most part regulated by the value commanded by its exportable surplus in world's markets, and which protection cannot largely benefit in a direct way; (secondly) that of the secondary industries, such as most branches of manufacturing, which, owing, in some cases, to incomplete supply of the home market, and in others to combination, maintaining higher prices in the home market than can be realized abroad, have much to gain by protective tariffs on their products; and (thirdly)

those broad-minded citizens who, while recognizing the rock-bottom equity of free trade, perceive, nevertheless, the expediency of a young country hastening the development of some respectable-sized cities, and providing a reasonably wide variety of employment, so as to appeal to the diverse inclinations of all its citizens. They realize that manufacturing industries are a good thing for a country—providing they do not cost too much—and, perceiving that such industries are handicapped at first in a scattered population, where they must compete against vast, highly-specialized foreign companies with expert selling organization, they are willing to assist in establishing these industries with a moderate protective tariff, more especially since the cost of thus stimulating them is in some degree returned through the quickening of basic and subsidiary industries by remunerative local markets for certain minor lines of produce, such as fruit, vegetables, eggs, butter, and the like. While there is a tendency in many quarters to magnify this indirect benefit out of all proportion to the facts, there is no doubt it exists. The protective system bears hardest on the producers of such staples as wheat and cheese. They sustain a full share of the burden of protecting other industries, but receive little or nothing in return. Thus, the exporting industries—the foundation of a country's material development—are restricted in their growth.

It is clear, therefore, that a high-tariff policy tends to curtail a country's progress, the effect being in inverse ratio to the extent to which the community is naturally self-contained. It would be much worse for Canada than it has been for the United States, though it is burdensome even there.

The wisdom of our moderate protective system, as exemplified in the National Policy, most Canadians are disposed to concede, notwithstanding the incidental evils of economic waste, mendicancy, lack of enterprise, and injurious combination, toward which a protective policy always tends. These ills we have borne patiently for the sake of what we hoped would prove a greater good. The question is whether it is not time to begin a radical policy of gradual tariff reduction. The National Policy was to encourage and assist infant industries. Unless these industries have now reached a stage where they can weather the stress of foreign competition, the National Policy is condemned by its own poor fruits. To argue that they must continue to be protected for another thirty or forty years with a tariff ranging from fifteen to forty per cent., is to admit that these industries are a colossal burden upon the country's productive enterprise. An industry which requires tariff benefit equivalent to several times a decent annual profit, is hardly worth retaining on its present basis. It costs the country more than it returns.

An exceedingly strong case can be made out, therefore, by the monster delegation of farmers which is to wait upon the Dominion Government this fall so urge substantial tariff reduction. It is of the utmost importance that a strong representation should be made, for the influence favoring maintenance or increase of present rates is powerful, and not all of it above-board. As indicating the nature of this, we quote from newspaper despatches reporting the Canadian Manufacturers' meeting in Vancouver. Seconding a resolution recommending that the Tariff Committee of the Association consider means of conducting an educational protectionist campaign in agricultural districts, Mr. Robertson, of Hamilton, confessing that he was not a high protectionist, submitted that the constant reiteration of protection to the people of the Prairie Provinces was unwise. "If it is true that we want higher protection," he said, "for better's sake do not let us go into the agricultural districts and give the people the arguments on this unsatisfactory point. Why not show them the road for revenue?"

His suggestion, if offered as reserved, is more shrewd than candid. Mr. Robertson surely knows that, to increase or to present protective tariffs must tend not to improve but to decrease revenue by curtailing the volume of exports.

More sinister than the are the remarks of another member, reported as follows:

Mr. Saunders thought the present would be a very ill-chosen time for the association to assert itself on the tariff question. They should give the farmer of the Northwest some credit for good common sense. The time for the association to deal with the matter was when it came before the Dominion Parliament. They could supply the necessary arguments to the Cabinet.

Evidently Mr. Saunders regards lobbying with more favor than frank, open discussion on the merits of the case.

Another hint in tariff tactics was humorously suggested in rhyme by a Toronto member:

"We don't believe in kicking,
It's not apt to give us peace.
But the wheel that squeaks the loudest
Is the wheel that gets the grease."

There is no doubt whatever that the systematically organized Manufacturers' Association, with its astute tariff committee, has long been acting upon the very principle thus succinctly expressed.

Still another sidelight on methods of dealing with public opinion has been inadvertently furnished by the Toronto World, a newspaper whose editorial policy in certain respects we admire, but which has stooped to an action almost beneath contempt. Professing to be actuated entirely by a patriotic spirit, it commenced a campaign attacking the proposal to secure an improvement in the trade relations of the United States and Canada, and meantime began sending out to prominent manufacturers letters inviting "tangible" appreciation from beneficiaries of protection. Following is an extract of one of these letters:

"It appears to me that this is the time when all Canadian manufacturers and patriots should get together.

"The Toronto World, as you know by a perusal of its columns, is in the midst of a campaign in favor of protection. We have already published two articles of the series, and a dozen more are in process of preparation.

"If this campaign seems worthy of support to you, a monetary contribution will be appreciated and gratefully acknowledged. It is not for us to place a figure on the value of what we are doing; we are quite ready to leave it with our friends. We have no doubt that some of our good friends will contribute one thousand dollars in support of this cause."

The World has the effrontery to defend its course on patriotic grounds. Pleading poverty as a result of debt incurred in fighting commercial union in 1891-1893. Moreover, it maintains that its course is not affected by the subventions it seeks, since protection is its traditional policy. In other words, the World does not say, "Pay your money and name your tune," but announces "This is the tune we propose to play. If you like it, and want it continued in yet stronger tones, chip in."

While we are pleased to observe that, according to the World's own confession, its importunity has been unrewarded, still its request is significant as suggesting the motive of much newspaper and other writing supposed to be disinterested. In view of all these and many other facts, it behooves upright Canadian citizens to be on their guard against specious appeals, and to back up in no uncertain tone the organized demand of Canadian farmers for gradual but radical tariff reduction.

British Land Hunger.

Access to agricultural land is a live subject in Britain nowadays, and the political parties are taking advantage of the land hunger to bring forward various schemes. One of the latest is sponsored by the Land Union, and is designed to settle various classes of pensioners, such as retired policemen, soldiers and sailors, on small farms as owners. While it is desirable to increase the number of people living on the land, the success of such settlers as these, with absolutely no experience of land culture, is more than problematical.

Men are needed with a knowledge of farming methods, and there are thousands of such men in the agricultural classes who could successfully run small farms, if they were only given reasonable facilities to acquire land. The desire shown by the numerous applicants under the Small Holdings Act is for leaseholds, rather than for ownership. Only a very small percentage of the applicants wish to purchase land. Their capital is usually limited, and they prefer to use it for equipping and working holdings under municipal control.