

tained, the soil in the root zone is firm and capable of exerting the maximum capillary force, while the looser particles above it prevent alike evaporation of moisture and the blowing of the soil—a result certainly that is to be much desired.

But there are other practical phases to the question. The power required to pack soil to the depth of the furrow is to be considered. A sub-surface packer needs much horse-flesh in front of it, and horses are usually at a premium in the seeding season. It requires, too, to be used at the proper time, and that, again, is a question on which men may differ in opinion and the result be affected thereby. Finally, there is the question of cost.

It is difficult, therefore, to state, generally, which type of implement is to be preferred. The superintendent of one of our experimental farms states that results as satisfactory as are possible with either type of packer may be obtained by frequent shallow cultivation. He has been experimenting in moisture conservation for years, and has some ground for the observation.

Our columns are open for further discussion of this question than appears in this issue. It is a matter worth considering further, since more of these implements will be purchased next season in the West than have been purchased hitherto. The experience of farmers who have used them is invited.

### Regina Convention

Perhaps at no convention ever held in Canada in the interests of agriculture has the program been so comprehensive and so intensely practical as that arranged for Regina next week. Scarcely an intelligent farmer, no matter what his specialty, can absent himself on the plea that his branch of the farming industry has been neglected. Naturally, much attention is given to grains and methods of improving the quality and yield. But livestock and other branches of the farming industry are not forgotten. Experts and recognized authorities have been secured for all discussions.

The program augurs well for Saskatchewan agriculture. Those who attend will not regret that they have spent money and time in taking advantage of such a treat.

"I am very pleased with your valuable journal."—H. Woolsey, Manitoba.

"THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE is the best farm journal I ever read."—T. H. Truscott, Saskatchewan.

"I have been very much pleased with THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE."—J. Ellis, Manitoba.

"THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE is a very good paper, and I like it."—Byron Lowe, Saskatchewan.

"I am very well pleased with THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE."—Arch. McMillan, Saskatchewan.

"THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE is a valuable paper to farmers."—W. J. Stafford, Saskatchewan.

"I must say I appreciate THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE very much and find it quite an acquisition in many instances on the farm."—W. Waller, Saskatchewan.

"I am well satisfied with THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE, and think it is \$1.50 well invested in any farmer's home."—Chas. Parker, Manitoba.

### Canada's Aid to Motherland

EDITOR FARMER'S ADVOCATE :

In your issue of December 29 you published a somewhat lengthy epistle from David Ross, on the "Naval Question," and as Mr. Ross made some statements which I should like to refute, I would be glad if you will allow me space to reply.

I have read of a certain section of Canadians being against the establishment of a "Canadian Navy," or even a contribution to aid the Imperial navy; but do not ascribe their reasons to the mean and selfish ones as adduced by Mr. Ross, but rather to ignorance as to the acuteness of the situation or a desire to hide under the benevolence of the Monroe Doctrine of the United States.

Mr. Ross makes the statement that "Great Britain last summer got scared of Germany's fleet," but he does not show whether there was sufficient reason for that "scare" or not. The fact is, that Great Britain, in order to protect the worldwide commerce of the nations of a world-wide empire, as well as the nations themselves and other colonies, has to maintain a fleet equal to the navies of the two next foreign powers in strength, and Germany is deliberately planning to challenge that position. It is, therefore, up to Great Britain, as well as the other nations comprising the Empire, to see that that position is kept, and the supremacy of the seas assured, for in that lies our safety, as well as our peace and prosperity. It is no newspaper talk or fancies, as Mr. Ross would have us believe, but real fact and a desire (which shows that Great Britain is alive to the situation) to meet the aggressive action of Germany by showing to her that the British Empire would not tolerate any interference in its supreme command of the seas, which caused the mother country to call the defence conference of last summer. Sir William White, the chief naval constructor at the British Admiralty, is my authority for saying that the supreme command of the seas is dependent upon the relative strength in battleships. Great Britain has 40 of these battleships, as against Germany's 20, but Germany is building and completing 10 of these ships as against Great Britain's 4. Hence the reason for the outcry in the old country to have more of these ships built, and the offers of Dreadnoughts by Australia and New Zealand. Moreover, Germany is spending more money on new construction work than Great Britain, as the following figures show: Germany, \$41,830,000; Great Britain, \$37,725,000.

Mr. Ross also makes a most unjust misrepresentation when he says that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was "pressed by British statesmen for a cash contribution, which he had to refuse." In reply to this I cannot do better than quote from the address of Lord Tweedmouth, who presented this question before the last colonial conference. He said: "We welcome you, and we ask you to take some leading part in making more complete than it is at present the naval defence of the Empire."

We thoroughly recognize that we are responsible for that defence. We want you to help us in that defence. We want you to give us all the assurance you can, but we do not come to you as beggars. We gladly take all that you can give us, but at the same time if you are not inclined to give us the help that we hope to have from you, we acknowledge our absolute obligation to defend the King's dominions across the seas to the best of our ability." Can any reasonable or unbiased-minded man say there is in that statement the "pressure" whereof Mr. Ross speaks? No, sir, it is a flat-footed statement that if the over-seas dominions don't want to do their duty, the mother country does not mean to shirk hers.

However, let me emphasize the fact that it is as much our duty as loyal citizens of the Empire as well as to our own interests and preservation to see to it that the British navy is in supreme command of the seas. The very prosperity of the West depends upon the free and uninterrupted passage of our product (wheat) to the British market. Every farmer knows that the price of his wheat is based upon the price prevailing at Liverpool, and what good would come if the Canadian government greedily and selfishly applied its money to public works and development and neglect to help in guarding and maintaining the very source of our wealth and prosperity.

Australia, New Zealand and South Africa are just as eager to develop themselves, and it is just as important to them as it is to Canada to do so, but we do not find them trying to shirk their responsibility.

Sask.

W. J. B. CANNAN.

### In Time of Peace Prepare for War

EDITOR FARMER'S ADVOCATE :

While pleased to see that you published an article in answer to your correspondent Don's somewhat cheap idealism, I must condemn its tone in that it attributes motives of envy, hatred and jealousy. I imagine Don a sincere and enthusiastic, if somewhat melodramatic, idealist, who hopes to convert the world to disarmament. May he succeed! It is my belief that the "Parliament of man—the federation of the world"—will come in the fullness of time, but first some one race or combination will have to be sufficiently powerful to force disarmament.

Your editorials, too, appear to condemn any expenditure upon the science of self-defence, and imply that everything should be spent upon the accumulation of more wealth. Why not accept denunciations against wealth as equally emphatic, or more so, than those against force? But apart from that striving for what you consider will contribute to the greatest happiness of the people, how is it proposed to defend liberties and retain the wealth which you (quite rightly in my opinion) seek to accumulate? I hardly think it can be done by acting as Don suggests and shouting to an admiring (?) world. "No, we will not make any preparation or learn military science; it is too costly. The sacrifice is too cruel."

One of three courses seem open to Canada:

1. *Annexation*, of which I will only say that it is much against the aspirations and sentiment of Canadians, and there also would be the military burden which you denounce.

2. *Independence*, in which you would either have to sneak under the protection of the Monroe Doctrine; be under a militarism greater in proportion to population than any nation, or be at the mercy of any aggressor.

3. *Remain part and parcel of the British Empire* and take your full share in defending it. How long will the general press of Canada keep publishing accounts of their marvellous prosperity and potential greatness and boast that there is no military burden (because, forsooth, some one else is assuming it)? There is not a thoughtful and manly young Canadian Imperialist who has not felt humiliated by the position, and it was chiefly that feeling which prompted so many to volunteer and the nation to approve of the aid given in South Africa. It may be pride or vanity, as Don says, but it is a proper pride which prompts him to defend the national liberty and a proper prudence which teaches him how to do so.

Awful as are the horrors of war, and sorrow as one must at the wounds and misery, even of opponents, I think that even Don himself would feel a manly satisfaction in having fought his best fight to resist interference with what he considered his just rights and liberty. We respect the Boers for having made the fight they did, and they have not lost their own self-respect as they would have done had they tamely submitted to what they thought injustice, under the plea that they knew nothing of military science because they would make no sacrifice in times of their prosperity.

Wealth and force when rightly directed should prove defenders, not destroyers, of just government and as there is certain to be force among mankind for a long time our aim should be to *rightly direct* it, and not be amongst those who shout weak platitudes in time of peace and are brushed to one side and have no influence when the real danger comes.

Thoughts of the attitude and influences of the churches in war time occur which it would interest me to talk to men like Don (who I take to be a clerical) about, but which (as probably this letter also) would be out of place in your practical journal.

It would be quite possible to make the military self-supporting and learn their profession also, in time of peace and only require the support of the nation in actual war. Would the people generally be any better off? Taxes cause a fractional portion of the poverty of the people.

Man.

A. J. MOORE.

"I am glad to say I like THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE very much."—M. E. Cooper, Saskatchewan.

"We like THE FARMER'S ADVOCATE and do not wish to be without it."—L. Jones, Alberta