

matter of fact, under the policy I have to outline, the labor of 50,000 men would be so applied that the increase would be more than that calculated; moreover, the calculation as it stands does not take into account that the present rural population, 232,725, which is the basis of the calculation, includes the inhabitants of towns and villages, and women and children. 12,000,000 probable bushels is an absurdly low estimate, but, being very low, for that very reason is better to use in this argument.

Constructive Policy

Consider what the increase in wealth would be to the country.

Under present conditions, we are using our wealth—we have to, we want to. We borrowed \$50,000,000 to spend in rifles, in artillery, in uniforms, in transportation, and in food for our army in France. Rightly we did so, but that money is gone; ammunition, uniforms, rifles do not return even ammunition, uniforms and rifles. The war loan will not return the investment in money—if it ever does—for a long time. Whereas, money invested in agriculture makes not only food but surplus food, which is wealth. Soldiers are an army of destruction; farmers an army of production. Put a handful of seed into the earth and you get a bushel of wheat. The money that bought the seed is not lost—it is returned an hundredfold.

There is a farm in Saskatchewan, efficiently managed under modern business methods, on which this result has been attained: On one field of 3,000 acres from which the yield was 30 bushels to the acre, the cost of production being \$4.80, the profit was \$20.00 per acre, or \$60,000 from the whole field.

Apply these figures to the instance of Alberta: Comparing the rural population to the acreage in grain, means one person to every ten acres; this is not an adequate allowance for the allowance should be one man to every hundred acres. Even taking these figures of Alberta, 50,000 men farming 500,000 acres, producing 30 bushels to an acre, would produce a profit—profit—of \$10,000,000. It has been objected that 30 bushels is too high a figure; then take the average production, 12 bushels per acre, with one man per hundred acres, the profit would be \$3.00 per acre, or \$4,000,000, still a very big profit to take in—four times what we're spending now every year to get immigrants.

The Present Stand-Still

We have, through our government, spent millions of dollars on railroad construction to open up the new lands of Canada. By these railroads immigrants were to



This was a scene when the first contingent left for the front. Another contingent is going to leave for the front, and that front is going to be in Canadian wheat fields to grow grain for the whole world. There will be no tears shed then.

come to our country, settle the new lands, produce wheat for the world, pay for the railroads and build up our nation. This future is not for us just now. The immigration is stopped; the railroads are there—an unprofitable investment for the time being—the new lands are there; the world demands wheat—must have wheat. We have the men who could farm these lands. How can they do it?

The connection between men, land and wealth is machinery and equipment. The unemployed men in our country to-day are not in a position to take up homesteads for themselves. They lack money for food—much less could they get the machinery needed to farm. That instance of wealth producing I gave from Saskatchewan was of a farm managed as efficiently as a great business, by a father, a practical farmer with two sons, one a graduate of an agricultural college, the other a keen business man. It was the combination of these different abilities that made their farming successful. The ordinary settler



This is a copy of a cartoon that appeared in Punch. It represents Britannia addressing Holland, a brave little country that is trying hard to accommodate and feed two million Belgian refugees. Britannia says: "My resources are greater than yours, let this service fall on me." Canada should say to Britannia, "Our agricultural resources are greater than yours let us share a part of this burden."

works under a terrific handicap—lack of capital, lack of business brains, lack of co-operation with others.

We Can Get the Wheat

Can we have 50,000 men producing wheat in the West in 1915? Yes, with the labor organized efficiently as an

Hon. W. H. Hearst, Premier of Ontario, says: "Two great facts are being brought home to us daily: First, that the Mother Country needs all the food we can supply, and, second, that we need the market which Great Britain's sea power is to-day keeping open for us. Ontario this year must produce more food than ever before. The Department of Agriculture has made this duty and opportunity clear to our farmers."

The United States is considering stopping the export of wheat, for the European demand is so great that they fear they may be left without wheat for their own need.

The "big and little loaf" has always played so large a part in British politics that the jump in the price of bread from five pence half penny to seven pence per four pound loaf caused quite a flutter."

The poor harvest in Australia, and the prospect of the failure in Argentina, strengthen the recent statement of the British Minister that Canada can do signal service to the Empire by greatly enlarged production this year. The Times says: "There will be food, but the price,—the price will be more dependent on the harvest and the fewer number of supply countries than usual."

Major-General Sir William Otter, in his message to the Canadian people, said: "Above all, measures should be taken to stimulate the production of food stuffs. One of the greatest services which the Canadian people can render to the Empire at the present is to increase our supply of food for the British people. This is at once our duty and our opportunity."

army, the farming managed as a business, we can produce wheat, grain, and food in 1915, save our country from scarcity, England from famine, be prepared to help feed the world if necessary; and doing all this, make our action a mark of civilization in a year which we had feared meant the destruction of that civilization.

Lesson of War for Peace

War has taught us one lesson—how to gather, equip, and apply a force of men to a given end. In a month

35,000 men were encamped at Valcartier; in a month 35,000 men can be encamped at Edmonton. We have a Minister of Agriculture as we have a Minister of Militia; we have men trained in organization and in the art of agriculture—the railroad builders and the men of the experimental farms; we have the land—it cries for seed; we have the money—a loan for this purpose would yield more than the war loan; we have the machinery waiting in our warehouses; we have the men to labor—they starve for lack of food; we have the market, our Empire and its allies. Let us put the men, 25,000—50,000—on the land in a campaign organized by the Government to produce food, food and more food.

We have mobilized an army to fight the visible foe; let us mobilize an army to fight the invisible foe who slays more quickly and more terribly; let us devote an army of men to food production. They must be equipped, organized, and fed; instruments of peace given them instead of weapons of destruction; steam ploughs instead of guns, hoes instead of rifles, harvesting machines instead of bayonets. But let the army of production work as soldiers fight, as grimly, as efficiently, to the same end, the defeat, for the soldiers, of the foe; for the army of production, the conquest of Starvation.

Necessary as it is to kill men in this war, you will acknowledge that to minister to life is a greater privilege, with results farther reaching. The army of production serves life, not death. Therefore, let us recognize the services



IN THE BREAD LINE

The unemployed problem need be a problem no longer if Canada does the wise thing now. The Minister of Militia has gathered his army to help the mother country fight the Germans. The Minister of Agriculture must now gather his army of men to fight the common enemy "Starvation" right on Canadian grain fields. But he must muster his army in military fashion.

of these men as we recognize the services of the men who are fighting on the Aisne. Their work is for the nation, for the Empire, for humanity. It is worthy not only of the soldier's pay, but of the soldier's honorable recognition. It is patriotism in its highest form.

Results of this Policy

The 12 million bushels of wheat produced by the labor of 50,000 men would feed two million and a half people for a year. This is for wheat alone, and while I have used wheat as the chief instance, the working out of the plan

(Concluded on page 31)



Manning the guns and manning the reapers. Canadians know how to die for the Empire; but better still, and nobler, they know how to live for the Empire.—Twenty men to ten. How much more good ten men can do for Britain than twenty men can do harm to Britain's enemies! It would be good strategy to have an army raising wheat as well as an army fighting.