THE SEMI-WEEKLY TELEGRAPH is issued every Wednesday and Saturday by THE TELEGRAPH PUBLISHING COMPANY, ST. JOHN, a company incorporated by Act of the Legislature of New Brunswick.

E. W. McCREADY,
President and Manager.

Subscription Rates—Sent by mail to any address in Canada at One Dollar a year. Sent by mail at any address in the United States at Two Dollars a year. All subscriptions must be paid in advance.

In mailing price of subscription always send money by P. O. Order or Registered Letter.

Advertising Rates — Ordinary commercial advertisements taking the run of the paper, each insertion, $1.00 per inch.

Advertisements of Wants, For Sale, etc., one cent a word for each insertion.

Notice of Births, Marriages and Deaths, 50 cents for each insertion.

Important Notice—All remittances must be sent by post office order or registered letter, and addressed to The Telegraph Publishing Company.

Correspondence must be addressed to the Editor of The Telegraph, St. John.

All letters sent to The Semi-Weekly Telegraph and intended for publication should contain stamps if return of manuscript is desired in case it is not published. Otherwise, rejected letters are destroyed.

Semi-Weekly Telegraph and The News

ST. JOHN, N. B., MARCH 13, 1915.

IS JOFFRE NEARLY READY?

Colonel F. N. Maude, C. B., writing of Joffre and Napoleon in the London Chronicle, holds that in the present war the Germans are following the strategy of Von Moltke and the French that of Napoleon, or a modification of it, and that gradually Joffre has come to hold the game in his own hands. He writes:

"The most extraordinary point in the whole matter is that though now we understand his (Napoleon's) method, and its advantages are as clear as day to us, yet at the time he never succeeded in conveying his thoughts to his marshals, or even to any of his contemporaries. It was only by a kind of inspiration of genius that a young officer employed in the historical section of the French General Staff, a Captain Gilbert, suddenly hit on the true solution of the great problem, and succeeded at once in convincing his superiors of the value of his discovery. In essence the matter was simplicity itself. Napoleon had found out that it was no use aiming a great converging movement to take effect the day after tomorrow, at a point on which the enemy was standing today, for the said enemy might exercise his independent volition and move away, right or left, as he pleased. The only way to make sure of finding him when or where you wanted him was to attack him with vigor with a force of all arms, too strong to be overcome, before the rest of the army came up and completed his defeat by attacking with fresh troops, after the enemy had been thrown into disorder, and induced to expend his reserves by the assaults of the holding force.

"If the enemy pressed hard, the holding force had to be trusted to gain time by retreating (losing men, of course, all the way), and this is just what the Germans believed to be impossible. But when the French reviewed their misfortunes of 1870, by the light of this newly-discovered doctrine, they concluded that whatever might be the case with the German troops, their men even then had been quite equal to fighting in retreat had their leaders only known how to profit by the time they would have gained and had called upon them for the effort.

"Now, this is the system upon which General Joffre is working, and with the fullest confidence in the forces under his control. Step by step he has been purchasing time to complete the equipment of his armies, and to allow our reinforcements to arrive, holding the enemy all the time in such a vice that he can be sure of finding him when he wants him, and dealing him such a blow, at a point of his own choice, that the rupture of his great defensive arch is certain.

"From day to day General Joffre prolongs the tension, until now at last the Germans, in despair of getting away from his grip and executing a real and independent concentration, are compelled to hurl themselves against his defences, merely in order to find out where the great masses of the Allies are gathered. There is no certainty and no coherent purpose about their leading, only a purposeless beating their wings against the bars which cage them. The French officers quoted by the 'Matin' are completely justified in saying that Joffre can defeat them when and where he pleases as soon as it is worth his while to do so."

DR. PUGSLEY AND ST. JOHN.

The Standard is having further difficulty with Dr. Pugsley. It no longer threatens him with a general election. A week or two ago the Conservative journal kept warning Dr. Pugsley that unless he abandoned his criticism of certain acts and policies of the government, the Standard would pull down the pillars of the temple by going to the country. Evidently it has been discovered that that cock will not fight. The Conservative organ now contents itself with predicting the defeat of Dr. Pugsley when the elections shall come on in the regular course. It will be sufficient to cross that bridge when we come to it.

Hon. Mr. Hazen's course in rejecting the Cammel, Laird & Co. tender, which would have ensured the building of the vessels of the Canadian squadron at this port, is a subject which the Standard finds increasingly awkward. It argues that while Dr. Pugsley may have intended to have the ships built here, Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in favor of having them built in Montreal. It will occur to discriminating Standard readers that as Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Dr. Pugsley were no longer in office after September, 1911, Mr. Hazen and the new government cannot escape responsibility for the rejection of the Cammel, Laird tender.

It was the lowest tender, and it specified St. John as the proper place at which to build these ships. The firm of Cammel, Laird & Co., has built many of the finest British warships, and is a firm of high repute and responsibility. If Mr. Hazen had accepted that tender, instead of rejecting it, the ships would be now in service. But Mr. Hazen rejected the tender and returned the $100,000 cheque which Cammel, Laird & Co. had deposited as evidence of good faith. These are well known facts. The Standard argues laboriously and at length for the purpose of obscuring or breaking the force of them. It fails, of course.

"SAFETY FIRST."

The people of New Brunswick will no doubt read with a gasp of relief the Standard's account of the precautions arranged by Colonel J. B. M. Baxter to safeguard the Legislature and the legislative buildings during the session which is to begin on Thursday. The Standard says:

"Attorney-General Baxter is acting on behalf of the government in making the arrangements with Major-General Rutherford, the officer commanding the 6th divisional area, for the necessary military guards. The Attorney-General has had a wealth of military experience and thus is well qualified to handle the matter on behalf of the province. There will also probably be a number of detectives scattered about the legislature on Thursday during the opening ceremonies and the officials of the House will be instructed to see that every precaution is taken. Unknown persons will not be allowed to approach the buildings and it is expected that throughout the session admission to the legislative building will be by ticket only."

Judging by the last few sessions of the New Brunswick Legislature "a wealth of military experience" will indeed be needed, not so much to guard the lives of the legislators and the chamber in which they meet as to protect the public treasury and the assets of the province. The Standard's pride in Colonel Baxter's military experience and strategic ability no doubt finds an echo in civil and military circles alike during these stirring times, and there is no doubt that in the field of effort described by the Conservative journal he has a fine chance to distinguish himself further. He should have no trouble in throwing around the House a guard strong enough to repulse Messrs. Flemming, Teed and Berry if they return to the attack, or even to drive off the Tobique Indians if that fierce tribe should break from their reservation to follow Mr. B. Frank Smith to Fredericton. These activities would demand force rather than high strategy. With the aid of the detectives mentioned by the Standard Colonel Baxter might undertake other more delicate but no less useful enterprises. After he has given the detectives a few simple preliminary exercises he might commission them to bring in the author of the Foreshores Bill, dead or alive.

INVESTIGATIONS.

The Clarke-Baxter government is about to begin an investigation of its own departments, and has appointed Mr. W. B. Chandler, K.C., of Moncton, for that purpose. Mr. Chandler bears a good reputation as an investigator, and if he is given a free hand he no doubt will be able to tell the government and the public in what condition various provincial departments are found.

The public understands that this business of investigation was set on foot by a letter from Hon. John Morrissey, Minister of Works, to Premier Clarke, demanding an inquiry into his own department. Charges against Mr. Morrissey's department, or reflections upon it, have come to some extent from both sides of politics, but chiefly perhaps from the government side. There has been considerable public comment with respect to the conduct of other departments. Presumably Premier Clarke proposes to find out how matters really stand. If that be the case he will, no doubt, provide the machinery for a thorough investigation of all departments under suspicion. If he does so he will have to arrange for the attendance of witnesses from all over the province, together with payment of the necessary expenses. It is unlikely that any private individual will undertake the expense of counsel for the prosecution or defence, so it seems likely that, as the government is going to investigate itself, or its departments, it will be expected to finance the operation.

The Telegraph republished yesterday an editorial from the Montreal Star in reference to the inquiry regarding boots provided for the Canadian soldiers. It may be well to commend to Premier Clarke certain paragraphs from that editorial. The Star said, in part:

"A parliamentary inquiry is not a court of law. It is not trying anybody. It will not sentence anybody to prison. If punishment is to be inflicted as a result of what this parliamentary committee may learn, it will be inflicted by the regularly established courts of the country in the regular way. The business of a parliamentary committee is not to administer justice but to uncover the truth. So it is simply ridiculous for it to pretend to be bound by the rigid laws of evidence which form the proper safeguards of 'the liberties of the subject' when that 'subject' is on trial before a court.

"It is precisely the difference between a business man inquiring into an irregularity in his own office, and a judge trying a case. The business man, who thinks he has been 'bled' by an employe or cheated by a contractor, does not bother with rules of evidence. He takes information wherever he can get it. He does not care whether a court would permit him to ask questions in the direct fashion he likes—he goes ahead and asks them. It is nothing to him that a judge might not permit the written report of a subordinate to be read in court—he reads it carefully and accepts it for what it is worth."

What Mr. Clarke proposes is not, strictly speaking, a parliamentary inquiry, but if the proceedings are to be fruitful the investigator will require, in the public interest, a considerable degree of latitude such as the Star commends. As no specific charges have been formulated, so far as the public knows, almost everything will depend upon the sincerity of the government and the scope of the commission entrusted to Mr. Chandler. If the government is determined to dig deep enough into its own business methods, the public should get much information of absorbing interest. If the government is planning only to give itself a certificate of character, the public will be quick to recognize the fact that the investigation gun is not loaded.

MEN AVAILABLE.

The government statistician of the Commonwealth of Australia has made public figures showing the number of men available in that country for military service under the Defence Act. He divides them into five classes. Class I. includes all unmarried men of eighteen years and upwards, but under thirty-five; Class II., from thirty-five to forty-five years (unmarried); Class III., eighteen to thirty-five years (married); Class IV., thirty-five to forty-five (married), and Class V., forty-five to sixty. Twenty per cent. is allowed as the proportion that might be omitted as medically or otherwise unfit:

Class I.	525,850
Class II.	87,250
Class III.	282,150
Class IV.	232,250
Class V.	336,700
Total	1,414,200

Deducting twenty per cent. as medically or otherwise unfit, the total of available men, including all five classes, would be 1,131,360.

Canada's population as compared with Australia's is about 7,500,000 to 5,000,000, speaking roundly. Applying the Australian classification to Canada, this country would have available for military service, again counting all five classes, and deducting the Australian percentage for medical or other unfitness, a total of more than 1,580,000 men.

As the Australians of the first class, that of unmarried men from eighteen to thirty-five, number 525,850, Canada should have, in the same class, about 750,000, and the Maritime Provinces alone nearly 100,000. If the whole Dominion sends 100,000 men to the theatre of war probably another 100,000 will be needed in order to supply the reinforcements made necessary by casualties and illness, and generally for the purpose of maintaining the field force at its original level of numerical strength and efficiency.

The Australian figures are interesting as showing the tremendous reserve fighting strength of the British Empire, and of the Allies generally. Necessarily a great many of the men of any country must be employed in carrying on the ordinary work of peace, such as operating the railways, the factories, and the farms; but statistics measuring the real fighting power of the Empire, and of Russia and France, tend to emphasize the superior position occupied by the Allies in a war of exhaustion. The men and the money are on our side, together with a safe preponderance in sea power. Another unavoidable lesson from the figures is that Canada has not yet furnished, or prepared to furnish, as many men as it should, or as many men as it can through the simple process of calling for volunteers.

THE NEW ST. JOHN.

The new boundaries of St. John for town-planning purposes as now proposed would give St. John plenty of space in which to grow, and would mean that growth, when it comes, would be healthful and symmetrical.

St. John people in all walks of life would do well to give this movement their attention, which will mean their support. A city, like a man, does not live by bread alone if it is to live its life well. We are folk of an exceedingly practical generation, given over largely to the pursuit of money or what it will buy, and when other matters are brought forward too many of us are likely to say, or to think, that we are sufficiently occupied with the events of the day—the bread and butter matters—to give ear and effort in new directions. Often we are wrong in taking that position. Much that is worth while, much that is essential if we are to live rather than exist, is of material not to be increased by the yard or sold by the pound.

Had town-planning on the right scale been adopted in St. John fifty or even 100 years ago, the city today would be one of the most beautiful on the continent. As it is, we owe much to the fathers who laid out a few broad streets and a few beauty spots and breathing places. They who did so were men of vision. Many who came after them neglected to follow up the good work.

It is time now to plan afresh so far as our outlying districts go, and with respect to such territory as will one day be brought within the city's extending lines. The ideas of those who are setting about these things are surely good enough, and unselfish and public-spirited enough, to command general support.

A TEMPTING WEAPON.

Most but not all of the wild words of the unhappy Standard are as water spilt on the ground which cannot be gathered up again. Apparently all unconscious of its own declared position on the subject of wars and emergencies, the Standard has been flailing Dr. Michael Clark and Mr. Lemieux because on various occasions in the House of Commons they declared that war with Germany was not to be expected. They did so, and frequently, and in so saying they were both in good and in bad company. More than four months after the war began the Standard lifted up its editorial voice and, with unaccustomed deliberation of manner, spake as follows:

"Up to the very day when this terrible war began, the vast majority of the people of the Empire simply could not conceive it possible that England and Germany could ever engage in war."

By its own pronouncement the Standard is numbered among "the vast majority of the people of the Empire who simply could not conceive" that this war was possible. Further along in its editorial from which we have quoted the Standard observed that Bernhardi's best known book was not translated into English until the spring of 1914, and that because of a "more or less universal lack of information throughout the British Empire as to what sentiments were being cultivated in Germany and as to what war preparations in all their magnitude were being arranged there, the early days of the war came upon us all ("all" would seem to include the Standard as well as Dr. Michael Clark and Mr. Lemieux) as a thief in the night."

"As a thief in the night" not only discloses some biblical knowledge on the part of the Standard but shows that when it rebukes Dr. Clark and Mr. Lemieux, and other Liberals, because they did not believe war was coming and said so, it is rebuking itself as well, and confessing the falsity and insincerity of all of its assaults upon Liberals who did not foresee or expect the present great conflict.

The Standard refers to Dr. Michael Clark as "an anti-British Grit," and in the next sentence says: "Today Dr. Clark's sons are fighting in Europe, helping to meet the emergency which their father denied." The Standard means that he denied the existence of an emergency. If that were a crime the Standard is equally guilty, for, as it told us in December last the war "came upon us all as a thief in the night," and "up to the very last day when this terrible war began, the vast majority of the people of the Empire simply could not conceive it possible."

The Standard seems not to realize that it has recorded these views as to the "emergency," which are substantially those of the Liberals whom it foolishly assails. When it childishly questions the loyalty of a man like Dr. Michael Clark, and in the next sentence notes that two of his sons have gone to the firing line, it rather temptingly places within reach of Dr. Clark that ancient and famous weapon with which Samson is reputed to have wrought such havoc in the ranks of the Phillistines at Lehi. Well might Dr. Clark or Mr. Lemieux, confronted by the Standard editorial from which we have quoted, be tempted to exclaim: "Is this a jaw-bone I see before me, the handle toward my hand?"

WHERE THE SHOE PINCHES.

The Standard is now inclined to think the elections will surely be brought on "if the Grits in the House of Commons persist in their childish and senseless opposition to the necessary war measures of the government."

Have the Liberals in the House of Commons objected to any "necessary war measures of the government?" The records of the House of Commons show that they have not. The Liberals, acting clearly within their rights and duties as representatives of the people, have asked for information regarding certain expenditures of the people, have asked for information regarding certain expenditures for war supplies, and all that information has not been forthcoming. In addition to that, the Liberals have very properly taken objection to an increased tariff against British products and to a flat increase in the general tariff, asserting that it is unjustifiable to impose a further fine upon those who import British goods, and that the increase in the general tariff, introduced under the plea that more revenue is necessary, will in many instances result in no revenue but will certainly enhance the cost of goods to the consumer by at least the amount of the tariff increase.

If an election comes it will be because of Liberal criticism of the new tariff, and not because of Liberal objection to "necessary war measures;" there has been no such Liberal objection. Soon after Mr. Borden came into power he was warned by the interests that no increase in the British preference would be permitted, and he was importuned again and again to raise the general tariff on imports. For a time the Borden government hesitated to yield to the interests which had largely financed the campaign of 1911 and who were clamoring for their money back. The Liberals had so arranged the tariff that it provided a surplus of revenue over ordinary expenditure. The Conservative government, which was under pledge to repay the interests for their campaign contributions and exertions, deliberately began to increase the expenditures on ordinary revenue, and continued this increase in the face of decreasing imports for the express purpose of creating a condition under which a cry would be raised that more revenue must be had and that it could only be had through a heavier tariff.

Canada is to borrow, and has begun to borrow, the money to pay its war expenses. Far from objecting to this course, the Liberals in the House of Commons have taken the position that Canada must provide promptly and liberally for all necessary war expenditures until victory has crowned the arms of the Allies, no matter how long the war may last, no matter how heavy the expenditure may be. But the Liberals have objected to the introduction of heavier tariff taxes under false pretences. The deficit deliberately brought about by the Borden government in furtherance of its protectionist policy is to be made up by fresh taxes upon the average consumer, and there is evidence in the budget speech that even this new tariff will be made heavier later on.

The country knows that these tariff taxes are in no sense a contribution to our war expenses. They are the result of protection and not of patriotic sentiment. They represent Mr. Borden's surrender to the interests which financed the campaign in 1911. Just as the old flag was waved then in order to divert the public thought from the real issue of the day, so it is being waved now, in the hope that the public may be deceived as to the meaning and intent of the new tariff. But the public knows.

PREMIER CLARKE AND MR. PINDER.

Mr. James K. Pinder, yclept "the King of the Nackawick," looms up before the pure and speculative gaze of Mr. Premier Clarke like a house on a hill. Mr. Clarke, look where he will, cannot but see his old friend Mr. Pinder. That statesman fills the foreground, and there is some to spare.

It is not that Mr. Pinder has added a span to his physical stature, but that he bulks large as a Problem. Ever since Mr. Hazen became Premier of New Brunswick, Mr. Pinder has been chairman of the public accounts committee. Mr. Hazen went, and Mr. Flemming came in his stead; but Mr. Pinder remained at his post as head of the most important committee—the one that is supposed to stand between politicians, and men behind politicians, and the treasury. Under Mr. Hazen and Mr. Flemming "the King of the Nackawick" passed in committee many an item about which there was scant information, and he was much criticized for so doing, but Premier Hazen and Premier Flemming said he was an admirable chairman (as doubtless he was from their viewpoint) and he remained.

Since the beginning of Mr. Flemming's downfall Mr. Pinder has been in violent collision with Mr. H. F. McLeod, M.P., as he already had been in collision with Hon. Mr. Morrissey and others. Also, there was that investigation of the Southampton Railway, followed by the Pringle report.

Hon. Mr. Clarke is by way of purifying the atmosphere in and about his government, or is said to be. Is he going to continue Mr. Pinder as chairman of the public accounts committee, or sever him therefrom? Either horn of the dilemma is long and sharp. To retain Mr. Pinder is awkward enough, and to throw him out is to invite consequences which wear a sinister face. Mr. Pinder knows a lot about the present government, and he is reputed the sort of man who does not quit without trouble. The future of "the King of the Nackawick" ought to be worth watching even in war time. By what happens the public will judge the Premier and Mr. Pinder.

NOTE AND COMMENT.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier's speech on the new tariff is one of the best he ever made. He thoroughly unmasks the protectionist designs which the government is trying to hide under the cloud of war. The new tariff, as he shows, is a surrender to the interests.

* * *

Frederick Palmer, who represents the Associated Press at the front, is convinced that the war will be ended this year. He has been in Germany recently, and is now with the British army. There are many who agree with him, but many who disagree. The next three months will make prediction a safer business than it is now.

* * *

"The beginning of the end" is the New York Sun's estimate of the foreshadowed fall of Constantinople:

"In four months campaigning nothing of any importance has been accomplished by the new ally. Worsted in the Caucasus, baffled in Egypt and unable to hold the entrance to the Dardanelles, the Turks have proved the weakest of reeds to lean on. With the fall of Constantinople expected, if not imminent, every neutral nation that would profit by the driving of the Turk from Europe, Greece, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Italy also, is straining at the leash to take part in the war on the side of Great Britain and her allies, Russia and France. It is now seen that the fall of Constantinople would be a turning point in the war and in all probability the beginning of the end."

* * *

The shells of the Queen Elizabeth, weighing 1,950 pounds, have a range of eighteen miles. Some of the Krupps in the forts are 14-inch guns. But, says one observer, "'Jacky' Fisher had a better plan. A warship carrying only 12-inch weapons might come off second best in an encounter with Fort L. In both range and weight of metal a 14-inch Krupp would have distinctly the advantage over a British naval 12-inch. The Queen Elizabeth, however, can with her 15's outrange anything the Turks have in the forts. Out of reach, therefore, she bombarded Fort L by 'indirect fire.' Across the peninsula sped her great 1,950-lb. projectiles, sailing over the intervening high land between her and the fort at a range calculated to drop them on the Turkish defences. The shells, rising perhaps as much as 15,000 feet in the air, dropped again with terrific force and produced what Admiral Carden speaks of as 'satisfactory results.' Twenty-nine shots were fired, and one of them destroyed the magazine of Fort L. That is wonderful gunnery. The men fired at an object over a hill, and which they could not see. The range must have been about fifteen miles. The warships stationed inside the Straits to observe where the shells fell and give directions by wireless as to how to train the guns of the Queen Elizabeth could not have been within five or six miles of the fort attacked. Yet so successful were the observers in directing the gunners that a magazine was blown up before thirty rounds had been fired. The reduction of the forts to heaps of rubbish is only a matter of time to gunners such as those of the Queen Elizabeth."

UNWISE TAXATION OF FERTILIZERS

Speaking in the house of commons on March 2 on Unwise Taxation of Fertilizers, Hon. William Pugsley said in part:

"It has been pointed out in the very able speech delivered by my hon. friend the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that amongst the many other things in regard to which there is imposed by this new tariff an increase of duty to the extent of 100 per cent, are fertilizers, the plant food, the life of the farmers' products. Why is that done? Can the minister of finance explain it? Can it be explained upon any other ground than to avoid the necessity for care, the necessity of going over the old tariff, taking up the different articles in regard to which in some cases the tariff was low and in some cases high and in some cases at a normal rate and adjusting the rates? Is it because it was easy simply to make an absolutely arbitrary horizontal rise of 5 per cent against Great Britain, 7½ per cent against countries enjoying the intermediate tariff and 7½ per cent against countries enjoying the general tariff? Under this new tariff the fertilizer of the farmer has been taxed by an increase in duty to the extent of 100 per cent against Great Britain, 75 per cent against countries enjoying the intermediate tariff, and 75 per cent against countries enjoying the general tariff.

"This was bad enough. But in case of another most important fertilizer, nitrate of soda, which is absolutely essential to the people of eastern Canada, particularly at this time when, by reason of the war, the importation of potash from Germany is shut off—whereas nitrates formerly came into Canada free of duty, this government has imposed upon that very important fertilizer the high tariff of 7½ per cent against the only country in which nitrates can be obtained. I speak now of a country in regard to which the members of the government seem ignorant, and more especially my hon. friend the minister of marine and fisheries (Mr. Hazen)—I refer to the republic of Chile. Chile has the only natural nitrate beds in the world. Last year there was brought into Canada from Chile some 45,000,000 pounds of nitrates. This was not all used for agricultural purposes; but a good deal, I presume, was used for making powder. Chile is a country with which Canada might have a good deal of trade; it is a country of enormous wealth and of vast possibilities. I hope the minister of marine and fisheries will give attention to that country, because it especially interests his own province, which needs this fertilizer. Last year the export duties upon nitrates collected by the Chilean government amounted to about $84,000,000 in Chilean money, or $42,000,000 in Canadian money. Under the former tariff nitrates came in absolutely free of duty, but now the minister of finance has put upon it a duty of 7½ per cent.

"In view of what I have said, what irony it seems for the minister of finance to declare that by this tariff a stimulus will be given to agricultural productions and to manufactures. As to manufactures, I do not think there is any doubt, because the very object of the tariff was to give increased protection to the manufacturers. But why the minister of finance should venture to say that the new tariff would encourage the farmers of this country I cannot understand, unless the minister of finance is becoming impressed with the view which was once put forward by the minister of trade and commerce (Sir George Foster), that increased taxation is the gateway to prosperity. Certainly, the farmers are getting the increased taxation, and on the reasoning of the minister of trade and commerce, they ought to find themselves at the gateway of prosperity. But I very much doubt it.

No Excuse For It.

"There was no excuse for this increased duty. For a considerable time the watchword of this government has been increased production. The minister of finance has said to the farmers: My word to you is Production, Production, Production. Therefore, when he was considering this question of taxation, he ought to have considered how he could make the farmer's burden less onerous rather than more onerous. Where was the minister of agriculture (Mr. Burrell)? Has he been spending his whole time circulating about San Francisco while the tariff was being prepared? Why is he not on hand to look after the interests of the farmers? Or if he is not here, where is my hon. friend the minister of marine and fisheries (Mr. Hazen), who knows how anxious the farmers of his own province, New Brunswick, are to obtain these fertilizers at as low a rate as possible? Surely, he cannot be oblivious to the fact that at the annual convention of the Farmers' and Dairymen's Association of New Brunswick, held in Fredericton in February, 1913, the following resolution was unanimously passed:

Whereas our farmers, in order to extend their operations, believe that it is necessary to use a considerable amount of commercial fertilizer; and,

Whereas the cost of such fertilizers is so high that it is about impossible to use them with profit;

Therefore resolved, that in the opinion of this convention of agriculturists from every county of New Brunswick, it is desirable that our government take such steps as are necessary to furnish the farmers with the chemicals for that purpose at first cost.

"Sir, that was an important meeting, held in the capital of the province which my hon. friend represents in the government. It was reported in all the newspapers. Its adoption of this resolution is only an evidence of the fact of which all of us in New Brunswick are aware, that for a number of years past the farmers have been of the opinion that, in order to carry on agriculture successfully they must have resort to agricultural fertilizers. Now, when the farmers require this fertilizer, when they are being urged from all quarters to engage in greater production, surely this is not the time to impose these burdens upon them, to put a tax upon every kind of fertilizer which they formerly got in free, both upon the manufactured chemical fertilizer which comes largely from the United States, and from the natural fertilizer which comes from the great republic of Chile.

The Result of the Burden.

"What has been the result of imposing these burdens? Since the resolution was passed which I have read, and since the farmers of New Brunswick through their various agricultural societies were

farmers will be the most effective tool they can use to increase the stable crops of the dominion.

Yours very truly,
W. H. BOKER,
President Bowker Fertilizer Co.

In Behalf of the Farmers.

"I have a similar letter from a gentle- induced to take hold of the matter, these societies have given orders for fertilizers. And I am told by my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Copp), whom I am delighted to see in his seat, and whom the house generally is delighted to see, that at least one agricultural society in the county of Westmorland has cancelled its order for a large quantity of fertilizer that it had intended to bring in, in an effort to stimulate agricultural production in that county.

"An honorable member on the other side has said that there has been no complaint in regard to this tariff and in regard to the way our farmers are being treated. My information is entirely different. I will read a letter which emphasizes what I have read as taking place in other countries. Germany for a considerable period has been favoring in the rightest degree the introduction of chemical fertilizers into that country. In the commonwealth of Australia, so anxious is the government to encourage the use of chemical fertilizers, that not only is no duty imposed upon them, but on the government railways fertilizers are carried absolutely free—absolutely no freight charges on fertilizers for the use of the farmers. How different is their course, so far as the treatment of the farmers is concerned, from the course pursued by this government. I have here a copy of a letter which was sent to the minister of agriculture and which I will read as it brings out strongly some of the points in favor of keeping fertilizers upon the free list.

February 19, 1915.

Honorable Martin Burrell,
Minister of Agriculture,
Ottawa, Canada.

Dear Sir,—A number of important newspapers published in Canada have recently solicited advertising from fertilizer manufacturers in the United States on the ground that the dominion government had entered upon an extensive campaign to encourage a greater production of the staple food crops.

We are also advised that the Canadian government has increased the duty on fertilizers by 7 1-2 per cent. ad valorem, making a total duty of 17 1-2 per cent., or almost double the previous rate.

In view of the increase in the tariff which carries the selling price of fertilizers to a point which will preclude their sale in Canada, we have been obliged to decline to advertise in Canadian newspapers, and in so doing have pointed out that the position of the dominion government in increasing the duty on fertilizer seemed almost incomprehensible.

No government in the world, except Canada, places a duty on fertilizers.

"Did the minister of agriculture bring that to the notice of the minister of finance before he framed this tariff? If he did so, surely the minister of finance would not place Canada in the insidious position of being the only country in the world which by a high tariff seeks to exclude fertilizers from the country and to deny to the people of Canada an opportunity of obtaining the cheapest possible food plant which can be procured. The letter continues:

Even the United States has always admitted fertilizers duty free and in the last revision of her tariff included sulphate of ammonia, even though it is extensively produced in this country.

According to recent reports in Australian papers, that government, in order to encourage the use of fertilizers, in growing wheat this year, has offered to finance farmers in the purchase of fertilizers at a rate of interest not exceeding 5 1-2 per cent.

The German government has agents in the United States authorized to buy large quantities of phosphates to be used in making fertilizers. Owing to war conditions she has recently classified fertilizers as preferred freight and offers to furnish free tarpaulins to cover shipments in open cars owing to the scarcity of closed cars. Yet Canada, although wishing to encourage the growth of food crops has placed an additional duty on fertilizers. By a strange coincidence she excepts insecticides and farm implements.

"The honorable minister of finance has strained a point. He says when you talk about ploughs, wagons and fertilizers being subject to the new tariff which we have imposed, do not forget nicotine sulphate, which we have put on the free list. The writer of this letter is mistaken in saying that "by a strange coincidence the tariff excepts insecticides and farm implements." The only farm implements which are free are steam ploughs, gasoline engines, and those larger implements which are used only by wealthy farmers. The letter proceeds:

Now why should she except these, when fertility is fundamental?

It seems to us that if Canada wants to increase her food crops she would remove the duty entirely on fertilizers,—and why not How much revenue does she derive from the importation of fertilizers, and to how large an extent are they produced in Canada? Not a pound of raw material except tankage and a little fish waste is produced in Canada, and only a few small concerns employing probably less than 1,000 laborers, are protected by her tariff.

We believe that if the matters were properly presented to the farmers they would not only rise up in opposition, to any further tax on fertility in the shape of raw or manufactured fertilizers, but would insist that the duty be entirely removed. If, in times of war, the cabinet has the right to increase duties, has it not also the right to remove duties on necessities? And certainly fertilizers come within the class.

Free fertility in the hands of your man in St. John who is engaged in the transportation business. He tells me that on a cargo upon which under the old tariff the duty was $650, the duty under the new tariff will be $500 more, almost double the duty imposed under the previous tariff. I suppose it is too late to appeal to my honorable friend the minister of finance and to the government, but I do on behalf of the farmers of this country make one last appeal before this tariff goes into operation. I ask the minister of finance not only to restore fertilizer to the tariff which previously existed, and to make it absolutely free, but to take off the duty which has been imposed upon nitrate of sode, which was previously free, thus making the burden of the farmers in respect of the food of the plant—that which gives life to the plant—just as light as possible, encouraging rather than discouraging him in the use of fertilizers."

THE OFFICIAL ANNOUNCEMENT.

London, March 10, 1.07 a.m.—It is officially announced that the second contingent of Canadian troops landed in England yesterday.