

## THE FARM BULLETIN.

### Would Bonuses Have Paid?

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

Again we are at the end of another mild winter, of which we get too few. Situated as we are in the zone between continuous snow and frost on the one side, and no snow and little frost on the other, we are liable to have almost any kind of weather in the winter season. This makes it very difficult to plan work or speculate on what the crops and live stock may be like in the spring. Usually, a mild winter, while good for the stock, is hard on the wheat and meadows, but this one seems to have been a fortunate exception. Winter wheat, so far, is looking exceptionally promising, and grass and clover is seldom better. A feature of the live-stock trade is the increasing scarcity of cattle. Really good stockers are almost a curiosity, and, judging from the way the trade in calves for veal and hides is developing, native cattle of any kind will be almost as scarce as horses. The poultry industry is developing rapidly; so much so that some enterprising farmers, with incubators, in order to supply the demand, have undertaken to supply newly-hatched chicks at 5 cents each; but, from the writer's observation, it is more difficult to rear incubator-hatched chicks than to hatch them. They seem to lack the vitality of those cared for by the old Biddy.

We expect seeding to be in full swing in a few days. Sugarmaking seems to be over, and the cheese season has again commenced. Dairying is the stand-by around here, and cheese takes the lead in summer, though about one-quarter the amount is made into butter in winter, and shipped (mostly) to Toronto commission men, along with the "hen fruit." The distance is about one hundred miles, and local merchants are beginning to complain at the loss of this trade. In summer, the country storekeepers gather the eggs direct themselves, exchanging for groceries, so that, between the city and the country, the town merchants are losing ground. But this is only another example of the modern tendency to divide into city and country, mostly the former, leaving the smaller places to struggle along as best they can. And in this connection, might it not be wise for the Legislature to relieve the town of some of the burden of road-building? If public money is to be used for this purpose, let the permanent roads be extended from the town outwards, or else compel the town to maintain as good roads within the limits of the corporation as there are in the surrounding townships. St. Mary's made a supreme effort to construct good roads with broken stone and a steam roller, and succeeded admirably while the money lasted, but taxes, getting too high, some of the leading roads to the town are left in a deplorable condition, much worse than the township's; while the town, in desperation, has taken to loaning money to corporations like the C. P. R., and various manufacturing industries, which, though it injures the town's credit temporarily, may, we hope, benefit it ultimately. But are the farmers to wade through mud to get into the town till those good times come? On this problem, the ratepayers of the writer's native township have again shown their good sense, by rejecting a raid on their treasury by what is commonly supposed to be the C. P. R., acting through a "straw" company of local men, that wanted a straight gift of \$20,000, as a slight acknowledgment of the honor and benefit of having a branch of the great C. P. R. through part of the township. On a former occasion the township refused aid to a cement company, and subsequent events have proved it wise in doing so, for if it produced the cement from marl, it would probably have failed, and anyway, another strong company is likely to locate in St. Mary's, which will benefit the township just as much. If the locality is worth it, these industries will come in good time, without aid; and so will the railway. And if it is not worth it, it is better without them, for you can't take blood out of a stone. St. Mary's has had bitter experience with the big creamery and the big quarries. Would it have paid the town to have bonused them? J. H. BURNS.  
Perth Co., Ont.

### Ancient History.

Commenting upon the customarily belated appearance and distribution of the Experimental Farms report, "The Farmer's Advocate," of Winnipeg, remarks: "The printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty, as the job-printer of the Government matter styles himself, may be working under a speed limit that will not permit any faster work, but it certainly does not add to the value of the report of experimental farms to have that one dealing with experiments carried on in 1907 ready for distribution by April 1st, 1909."

### To Our Club-raisers.

There are thousands of farmers who do not know what they are losing every year through not being subscribers to "The Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine." Therefore, we want all readers of "The Farmer's Advocate" to act as club-raisers this year, and send us large lists of NEW SUBSCRIBERS.

If you send us two new names and \$3.00 to cover same (each new subscriber paying \$1.50), we will mark date on your paper forward one year as remuneration to you; or, for each single NEW NAME, accompanied by \$1.50, we will advance the date of your address label six months. Cash commissions or premiums, as preferred, for larger lists of new names.

In clubs of FOUR RENEWALS OR OVER, we will accept \$1.25 each.

Premiums not included in club offers.

Start raising your club immediately. Get "The Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine" into every household in your locality.

### Protection is Expensive.

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

I have read with much interest the articles which have appeared in your valued journal, relating to protection, and believe that, so far, the anti-protectionists have had much the best of the argument. The agriculturist does not ask for a bonus, a subsidy or exemption from



On Friendly Terms.

taxation, but simply to be placed on equal footing with other industries. Just give Canadian farmers free trade for five years, and agriculture would receive an impetus such as it has not known since the history of this country. Higher prices for farm products would attract thousands from the congested cities to the soil; farm values would advance by leaps and bounds; more hands would be employed on the farms; better methods would be employed; production would be wonderfully increased, and a market would be had for our surplus right at home, at greatly advanced prices. It seems absurd and unbusinesslike to send all our surplus across the Atlantic, with all the necessary loss from shrinkage, overstocked market, insurance, etc., when we have a better market right at our very door. That word "protection" spells all the difficulty, and debars us Canadian farmers from a market that should be ours, and a market that would be worth millions to us annually. The writer recently had occasion to penetrate Uncle Sam's domain a few hundred miles, and the following are some of the prevailing prices of farm products in the particular section which he visited:

Lambs, each, \$9.00; veal calves, live weight, per pound, 10 cents; Beef, live weight, per pound, 6 to 8 cents; hens, live weight, per pound, 20 cents; chickens, live weight, per pound, 25 to 30 cents; milk, retail, per quart, 10 cents; milk, wholesale, per gallon, 30 cents; cream, wholesale, per gallon, \$1.50; potatoes, per barrel, \$1.00 to \$5.00; turnips, per bushel,

50 cents; maple sugar, per pound, 25 cents; maple syrup, per gallon, \$2.00; hay, per ton, \$18 to \$24.

We have a little port-of-entry here, and formerly two men were employed to do this work, but now, I am told, there are nine, and one superannuated. This force must cost the country at least \$15,000 annually. Protection is expensive, and WE have to foot the bill.

AN OLD SUBSCRIBER.

Stanstead Co., Que.

### Mine Royalty Right and Expedient

Editor "The Farmer's Advocate":

"Why should a royalty be imposed on the miner?" asks John Seabrook, in your issue of April 8th, and he goes on to argue that no royalty should be imposed. Let me take the same illustration as Mr. Seabrook uses, and try to show why a progressive royalty should be imposed, not on the miner, but on the product of the mines.

Each of the seven sons, investing his \$10,000 in farming property, has a fairly definite chance of earning a livelihood, with a reasonable expenditure of industry and common sense. Why? Because the agricultural possibilities of a given piece of land are more or less apparent to any man who knows something of practical farming. Risks there are, but they are reasonably well estimated, and more or less common to all engaged in the same business.

But consider the case of the other three brothers, who invest in mining property. Mr. Seabrook admits that the business of prospecting and mining is a game of chance, and he assumes that the first of the three brothers loses all his \$10,000; the second begins fairly well, but finally has to suspend operations; while the third strikes a rich vein, and makes a nice "profit." I have no quarrel with Mr. Seabrook's illustration, or his characterization of the miner's business, but

both seem to me to point undeniably to the wisdom of a progressive royalty. The fact is that there is no fairly constant proportion between the labor a miner expends and his return therefor. The business is a game of chance. One man may work hard and get nothing, while another does little, and reaps an enormous return. A progressive royalty does nothing more than even up matters a little, and makes the successful miner help his less-successful fellow workmen. It is a system of insurance, whereby those who lose are partly recouped by those who gain. Under private ownership of the mines, it is the only way compatible with justice. A progressive royalty is

not levied until the earnings attain a certain magnitude, and it increases in proportion to the "luckiness" of the miner. The miner who does not "strike luck" is none the worse, as the royalty does not touch him, while the man who does make a rich find is still amply rewarded for his labor, after all royalties are paid.

Moreover, it can scarcely be maintained that a man is entitled to all the treasure that may be beneath the surface of any piece of land he may have legal claim to. The right of ownership of all that lies beneath the surface of land has not yet been conceded to the individual, and I much doubt if the popular sense of justice will ever concede it. Private property in air, water, etc., has never yet been conceded, and is not likely to be. Similarly, one cannot concede unlimited private ownership of mineral resources. And it is certainly not in the public interest that a few should grow immensely wealthy by striking rich veins of ore, while the majority of miners lose money, and the general public gets no share of the "luck" which awaits the few.

Mr. Seabrook says: "If the farmer has a good crop, he does not care to give a royalty from it to the Crown. Neither should the miner care to pay it." If Mr. Seabrook will look into the question a little more closely, he will see that there is but the remotest analogy between farming and mining, and that his argument, therefore, fails. And even supposing that the alleged analogy did exist, the just policy would be to levy a royalty on the lucky farmer, as